

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 67 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Water Corporation Act

Clause 4 (continued)

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned I believe the Leader of the Opposition had . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I got all kinds of staff . . . I believe the point that some of the House amendments that we had presented were, in fact, substantive amendments to the act, if I believe I understood what he said.

Well the point to be made, of course, is that the amendments are not to be water corporation acts but are amendments growing out of The Water Corporation Act and relating to other acts.

For instance the amendment we're dealing with is to the expropriations act, or The Expropriation Act, in the identification of "applicant" is being amended in the act to coincide with the terms and conditions, I suppose, if you will, of a water corporations act.

So yes, I'm advised by the legal folks in the legislative counsel that, in fact, there are some amendments that do appear to be lengthy but, in fact, they're not substantive amendments to The Water Corporation Act but to other acts as a result of the passage of that act. So I hope that clarifies it.

Mr. Chairman: — The section before the committee is the amendment of section 4 of the printed bill. Committee agrees.

When I'm reading the amendments I'm referring to section 4(2) to (4) and section 2 and section 3 as shown on page 1 of the amendment.

Clause 4 as amended agreed to.

Clause 5 as amended agreed to.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clause 7

Mr. Chairman: — On clause 7 of the bill, there is an amendment:

Amend section 7 of the printed bill by adding the following subsection after subsection (4):

Section 107 amended

(5) Section 107 is amended:

(a) by striking out "the director of lands of the Department of Agriculture" in subsection (3);

(b) by striking out "the chief engineer of the water rights branch of the Department of Agriculture" in subsection (3) and substituting "the Saskatchewan Water Corporation";

- (c) by striking out “the director of lands of the Department of Agriculture” in subsection (4) and substituting “the Saskatchewan Water Corporation”;
- (d) by striking out “transportation” in subsection (4) and substituting “transportation and”;
- (e) by striking out “, and the print thereof, on linen to the chief engineer of the water rights branch of the Department of Agriculture” in subsection (4).

Clause 7 as amended agreed to.

Clause 8

Mr. Chairman: — There is an amendment to section 8 of the printed bill.

Strike out section 8 of the printed bill, and substitute the following:

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, amendments like this, the ones in the next page, all of the subsequent ones, I don't think need to be read so far as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman: — . . . (inaudible) . . . agreeable to dispense with the reading of the amendments? Carried.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, where would that fit in? I'm just not finding out where section 8 of the printed bill . . . where is . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Section 8, page 5 of the printed bill. The amendment is found on page 2.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Clause 9 agreed to.

Clause 10 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 11 and 12 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — I'd like an interpretation from the Leader of the Opposition. Is it satisfactory to the members that the amendments as proposed are all acceptable, or do you wish to vote them individually?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — No, I have no quarrel with that.

Mr. Chairman: — Is the committee agreed to accept the amendments as proposed on pages 1 to 4 of the amendments? Carried.

Clauses 13 to 19 inclusive as amended agreed to.

Clause 20 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

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

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, to my left Mr. Allan Palmer, who's the executive director of the pension of PEBA (Public Employees Benefits Association), and Mr. Paul Robinson,

the Deputy Minister.

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I am looking at the wrong bill in front of me. I'm looking at last year's bill and note that last year's bill had a number of other provisions. And I particularly want to ask — I've already made the point that this year you're offering \$13, when last year you offered \$19.20.

So I'd like you to respond to why there has been a substantial cut-back in the amount of money that is being offered. I note that in each case the amount for the spouse is 60 per cent of the base, and that is the — I understand where that comes from. With respect to the figure of \$13 per year, per year, as opposed to \$19.20 per year, per year, would the minister care to make a comment on why he chose that figure?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, the amount is arrived at based on the previous year's CP (Consumer Price Index), the cost of living index. The Leader of the Opposition will note that in 1982, the cost of living index in that year, the CPI, was 10.8 per cent, whereas in 1983 it was 5.8, almost half the amount that it was in 1982. The percentage of the CPI in this year's case is 69 per cent of that CPI, which is considerably and significantly higher than it was last year and in some other years previously.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, last year — and I refer to Bill 85 of 1983, increased supplementary — you provided a supplementary allowance at the rate of \$19.20 per year for each, where the recipient is a superannuate; \$11.50 where the recipient is the spouse of a superannuate; and \$1.90 per year where the recipient is the child of the surviving spouse of a deceased employee or superannuate. Now this year you have provided nothing for the child, nothing where the recipient is a child of the surviving spouse. Why have you provided nothing where last year you provided \$1.90 per year, per year?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, the allowance that the member is referring to was done last year, and it was the first time that it had been done, to the best of our information.

It was never done during the previous eight years, that we know of, and it isn't done every year. So this year wasn't included. But as I said, last year we had \$1.90 in there, and it was the first time that it had ever been done.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Are you saying to the committee then, that while the amounts to the superannuates and the spouses might be annual affairs, the amounts to the children are considered from time to time, and you considered it, and did not include it this year?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it apparently was considered and was not included. But again, as I indicated earlier, it had never been considered previously to last year. That was the first time that it had been considered.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm not sure whether this question is on point. Where the superannuate is deceased, and where his widow is deceased and there is a surviving child, am I right in saying that the surviving child gets the amount that a spouse would get under this act?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, our information has it that they get the 10 per cent.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 53 — An Act to amend The Wildlife Act

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my immediate left, assistant deputy minister, Lyle Lensen; and immediately behind me is the acting director of wildlife, Wayne Pepper.

Clauses 1 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 3

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would the minister explain the purpose of this — the basic purpose of the amendments proposed?

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Mr. Chairman, the reason we're making these changes is the fact that the Saskatchewan fur marketing service is no longer required, since the fur marketing service no longer exists. And that is under section 12.

And under section 22 and 54, the new Canadian constitution has prompted changes in the . . . (inaudible) . . . of sections to ensure they do not violate the constitution.

In section 63 of the act, it should be amended to allow the passing of game and fur seasons by minister's orders rather than through order in council.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the setting the game seasons by minister's order, do they still have to be gazetted? Is it still going to be sort of public in the way that OCs were public? Or will it not be a regulation and so not have to be gazetted?

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Yes, they'll have to be gazetted. As the Leader of the Opposition is well aware, Mr. Chairman, that there are numerous OCs that come before cabinet when they meet and this would eliminate some of them coming before cabinet.

The season dates that we are mentioning that should come under minister's order have never been changed over the last 20 years by order, by Lieutenant Governor in Council. So that's why we're trying to go this route to simplify it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — On the issue of the game season, Mr. Minister, you will know of the . . . or may know of the problem that exists down in some of the pastures down in my constituency arena and several others where they are having some difficulty with the seasons that you have been setting. I know that they have met with you, I believe in Maple Creek last fall, talking to you about changing the dates — making it later so that the cattle can stay in the pastures. Will this allow you to do that, and are you taking under active consideration the possibility of fulfilling the needs of the ranchers and farmers in that area and the request that they have made?

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Yes, we've addressed that. They requested opening of the season October 29th and we've agreed to that.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I believe they gave a brief to you. I think that . . . or short brief at least that requested a certain date, and you have met the requirements that they gave to you in that brief?

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Yes, we have.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 52 — An Act to amend The Department of Parks and Renewable Resources Act

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, in section 2 it mentions:

The wildlife development fund, as that fund existed on the day (or) before the coming into force of this section, is continued as the Fish and Wildlife Development Fund, and the minister shall hold and administer the fund in accordance with the section.

What changes are taking place here, Mr. Minister? Can you briefly outline what you're, basically what you're up to here?

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Sounds like the member from Shaunavon smells a rat here, but I can assure him that there isn't one.

Rather than set up a separate subvote, we have decided to . . . as you're well aware of, the wildlife development fund has been in place for a long time. So we just added the fish and wildlife enhancement fund or development fund, which are two separate funds which will be identified by the dollars that come in with the increase in the fishing licences, will be designated under the fish enhancement fund.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Any idea at this time what that will mean to the fund in terms of dollars, and dollars and cents?

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — I think the 1983 figures are something like 230,000 fishing licences, and 30 per cent of the \$10 will go towards that, so it's well in excess of \$600,000 in the first year.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 73 — An Act to establish the Water Appeal Board

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my left here I have Bill Howard, executive director of environment protection. Further over on my left here I have Alan Carr, deputy minister. Behind me I have Rick Knoll, executive director of administration; and I have Judith Paul from the Attorney General's office.

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, I think I'll ask a couple of questions on the scheme of the bill under clause 1. I note that you are continuing the drainage appeal board and giving it what amount to some broaden powers.

And I noted under section 13 that anyone who wishes to use the appeal has to put up a cash

deposit in an amount that the board may determine. I must say I wasn't attracted to that clause. If it is an appeal board and if the board can require the payment of a deposit of an unlimited sum of money, the act permits them to set any figure they like.

This could very materially restrict anybody's right to appeal if they feel aggrieved by any decision of the minister or by any other decision which is appealable under The Water Corporation Act.

And I ask the minister: why are you attempting to restrict the appeal, or at least giving the board the right to restrict the appeal by providing that the board may require a deposit of that sum of money that the board may determine, with no limit and no ceiling.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question: it is in the drainage appeals act now, and what it does is the amount is set under regulations, which is right now \$100, and I assume it's going to continue at that amount.

It is so that somebody just won't file without at least intent of carrying it forward. So it's just so we don't get frivolous — people putting in just in case, just for the sake of putting in appeals. They have to be sincere about it. And the \$100, I understand, is refundable if the case is successful. That's correct.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, if it is set in the regulations under the drainage appeal board act, as I read this act, it won't be said in the regulations. As I read this act, it can be set by the board, as opposed to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and it can be a different amount for each appellant. It's not as if you're setting out something in regulations saying you're going to pay \$100 to file an appeal. This one says the board may set a figure, and a different figure, for each appellant.

And you know, if they don't like the cut of your jib, then it's \$1,000, and if they do like the cut of your jib, it's \$25. Now that is an odd power to give to a board which is exercising a judicial power.

If it were in regulations, then it would pretty well have to apply to everybody.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I understand, Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

The intention was to let the board set the amount would be required. And we would assume that it would continue at \$100. There has been some concern shown by the department here in regards to it. We would look and see what happens. We would at least, hopefully, have the board set it to one. My concern, or the concern of the department, is that it would have to be set one price for all. Certainly that has to be; and second of all, that the board would use that type of criteria to set it out. If not, we may have to bring it back for changes later in legislation if they don't carry that out, because that certainly would be a concern of mine.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm not necessarily sure there should be one price for all, in the sense that there may be very different kinds of appeals. An appeal on a distribution of water or the right to take water out of a stream, and another appeal which was challenging the construction of a water system which may be a very, very complicated appeal, I can see the possibility of some different rules, although I would share the minister's view that if you can have them the same, that would be better. But I really question the provision whereby the board should be setting this. These are supposed to be judges. It's not their job to set up the hoops, to see who can get to them, or set up the barriers or the hoops.

I note the minister's statement that you will be watching it, and that if there is a problem you will bring in legislation. I urge you to watch it. I urge you, if you are reviewing the legislation, to consider again the possibility of having this set by regulation, by the Lieutenant Governor, by someone who is responsible and can be got at.

The board is not responsible and can be got at. I mean, they're quasi-judges, and if they are shutting people out, it's pretty difficult for the public to be mad at the board. They will be mad at you, Mr. Minister, and they should be angry, should be angry at you. And it should be something that you can change if it is not working — you or your colleagues — by order in council. And I urge you to look at the possibility of having this done by regulation.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the member. We'll certainly take that under consideration. If we see any problem there, or if the member sees some problem that's arising, we'll certainly view it and, if necessary, in the fall legislation we'll make a change. We'll give it a try to see where it takes us and see what happens. But if there is a problem, certainly we'd be prepared to make changes.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 16

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, I think that this clause does not say what I think you want it to say. This is a board which is in effect a court, and it can be judging some very, very important rights.

And it says that if a member of the board is interested in the issue, he must disclose the issue and not vote on it. But he can sit there, he can hear it; he can argue with his colleagues; he can fully participate once he has disclosed his interest, just so long as he doesn't vote. And I don't really think you mean that. I think you mean that if he's interested, he shall disclose his interest and then not participate in the proceeding.

And that's important. These are . . . the people who you appoint may well turn out to be people who, let us say, are involved with the city — let's say someone who is the director of public works for the city of Saskatoon, and I don't know who he is, but he may show up on a board like this.

If the city of Saskatoon is involved and is in a red-hot dispute with someone over water allocation and whether or not works can be built, then if he's on the board, he simply shouldn't participate. It's not a case of him declaring his interest and not voting, but in there slugging for the city. That will only put the board in disrepute.

And I invite you to adopt a rule, as you might say, of the board — that they simply don't participate. And that when you are looking at the act again, you may well want to make that provision.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member. We will advise the board to adopt a rule that they have an interest in it — that they shouldn't participate in the debate at all, or be part of it — at that particular one. So we'll advise the Chairman of that.

Clause 16 agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 22

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I could have raised this under 14, but it fits easily here. It's not clear from this and from the preceding provisions whether the board must render a written decision. It certainly implies it, but doesn't say so, I think. It's pretty strongly implied when you say "shall cause a copy of the decision to be served." And perhaps all it means is that you have to give the

effect of the decision.

It is my belief that the board should give a decision and give reasons for its decision. It is, I think, so strongly implied as to be required that they give a written decision, but I don't think it's necessarily implied that they give any reasons for it. They can just say the appeal is denied, period, and then serve it on all the people.

Now that is very rough for the person who wants to appeal, particularly on the question of law, and that's his appeal to the court is on a question of law. Under those circumstances it seems to me that the board should give written reasons. I don't know whether you would be prepared to require the board to give written reasons, but it certainly would be in the highest degree desirable that they did. Otherwise an appeal to the court on a question of law is pretty heavy going. If there are no written reasons, then you have to, in effect, attack the jurisdiction of the board. You can't say that they applied the wrong law; you don't know what they applied. I therefore invite the minister to, by whatever route is open to him, have the board adopt a practice of having written reasons.

Once again, I think we should be aware of the fact that many of the rights we're dealing with here are very valuable rights. Water rights are valuable and are going to be more valuable. And as I look at The Water Corporation Act, there could be very major interests under determination, very major questions of whether or not someone can irrigate 1,000 acres, or whether or not a city can build a particular dam, maybe the Rafferty dam. That would be a fairly sporty endeavour. If the corporation wished to build the Rafferty dam, and a goodly number of farmers organized to oppose it before the board, to put it mildly, there would be an issue at stake. And we would want the board giving written reasons so that there could be an appeal to the court if there was thought to be a basis for it.

So my comment to the minister is: I would invite him, through whatever means are open to him, to get a practice adopted in every reasonable case of having written reasons.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, answer to the Leader of the Opposition's comments: we have run into that problem early with the drainage appeals board. Since then we have had minutes taken of all the meetings. Written decisions are given from now on because of one court case that didn't have it there, and the judge found it very hard to deal with. So it's being done now. A regular procedure is already being carried out because of a problem we've run into previously.

Clause 22 agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 25 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 26

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can the minister advise whether this appeal is about the same as under the drainage appeal board? This one is on the question of law alone. Is that the current provision for the drainage appeal board, or is there a wider or narrower appeal under the existing law?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that it is the same as under the drainage appeals board.

Clause 26 agreed to.

Clause 27 to 30 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 80 — An Act respecting the Livestock Investment Tax Credit

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

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To my immediate right is Jack Drew, Deputy Minister, Department of Agriculture, and to his right, Doug Maley, director of the economics branch.

Clause 1

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, I was reviewing *Hansard*, page 3042 and 43 where you made your introductory remarks on this bill. You seem to spend most of your time talking about what the former administration didn't do, and neglected to.

An Hon. Member: — Well they didn't do a lot.

Mr. Engel: — Yes, never mind. You can say that again if you like. But let me first make some very quiet comments, and it won't be a long evening, Mr. Leader, if we could get minister face some facts of life. I think that the livestock industry benefited from programs in the past, and I would like your department to tell us, seeing that you made these comments . . . Mr. Chairman, I'm relating it to the bill because I'm taking directly from what the minister said in his second reading speech when he introduced an Act respecting a Livestock Investment Tax Credit.

I would like you to tell us how much money was given to livestock men in year '81, for example, under the beef stabilization program. How much money was paid out under the beef stabilization program? You seem to have all the numbers on how jobs and livestock were leaving Saskatchewan. You said that we were exporting everything — livestock. Under this new bill the tax credit "will keep our livestock here in Saskatchewan where they belong, and all those jobs and economic benefits will be available". Could you give us an indication of what the dollar value was of the beef stabilization, of the beef stabilization fund in just the year before you took office?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, zero.

Mr. Engel: — You seem to think that's very funny.

An Hon. Member: — It started in 1982, Allen.

Mr. Engel: — Yes, the year it was implemented, the first year, the program that was implemented, the beef stabilization bill, that was about 70, 75, \$78 a head, I believe. Is that the right number? Was it 75 or \$78 a head?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, I didn't mean to be facetious, but in '81 there was no pay-out. The plan didn't start, I think, effective January 1, 1982. Under the cow-calf plan in 1982, \$33.7 million was paid out; '83, 17.5 million; quarter 1 of '84 brought that total to 53.3.

Under the feeder plan, 1982, quarter 4 only, which was the first quarter of a pay-out, was .82 million; 1983 was 3.62 million for a total of 4.44 million. That's the most recent number I have with me.

Mr. Engel: — The question was: how much a head was that?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well I haven't got that number for you. I wasn't, I suppose, expecting those kinds of questions in the consideration of the item by item on this bill. But just to put it in perspective for you, for example, the cow-calf plan, since it was instituted, has paid out

on the average net — and that would be having deducted what the producer paid in premiums — around \$135 a head.

Mr. Engel: — You suggested that:

... members opposite were in power, the livestock industry flowed out of Saskatchewan. The floodgates were open, our livestock and the businesses they supported gushed out, and yet the members opposite did nothing.

I think the program that we introduced that we felt was something that covered the cost of production — guaranteed a cattle man the cost of production. Your predecessor, your predecessor amended that formula. Now what I'd like to know is: how much a head was paid out when the program was implemented, and what did it build up to? And then when the minister — the fat-cat travelling minister, the member in the cabinet that had lots of money to travel and sell bulls in Bulgaria and all over — said the program wasn't any good. We've got to make it actuary sound. What did you do with that program? Would you just in simple terms tell your colleagues and the members that aren't farmers, and just don't really know what's going on, what you did with the good program that guaranteed their cost of production? What did you do with that program? ... you, your government.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — We took a lot of what I think was good advice and direction from the beef stabilization board. Included in the recommendations to the government, and not necessarily this minister, but perhaps my predecessor, were things like scrapping the fifty-feeder option which had proved to be an actuarially unsound nightmare. Secondly, the central sales approach, which was the only sales approach prior to our coming government, has been expanded into now that the producer can take bids at his feedlot if he likes, and there's also provision for sales at auction marts. Those are a couple of the kinds of good things, that good changes that have been made to the beef insurance program in the province.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, you seem to have trouble coming up with a number of \$78 a head that the program originally was designed to do in that year, counting the cost and the market value. Has market value substantially increased that you've lowered that figure, or can you tell us what that figure is today? Because it's part of, Mr. Chairman, it's part of the package — the beef stabilization, together with the tax credit. I'm trying to build a case of where this government is going, and where it's leading, and who they want in the farming, and who they really want to help producing beef.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I am, despite the fact that the issues you raise may be somewhat off the target in so far as line by line discussion, if I could put it in perspective for you, my most recent understanding of, for example, the cow-calf plan would have a support level for the calf based on about 95 cents per pound and the cost of gain at 68 cents per pound.

Mr. Engel: — And you're saying that you're supporting at a 95 cents a pound and the producer cost is 68 cents; what would you say the average calf sells for — about 400 pounds? Let's get some average numbers here.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, I'm sorry I was conferring with my officials and missed the point you were making.

Mr. Engel: — You suggested that the producer ... Your officials then should have been listening. Your producer level — you said the selling price is stabilized at 95 cents, you figure at 95 cents a pound is what they should be selling to pay in the cost of production. Is that the number you're using, or what does this relate to with an average 400-pound calf or 600-pound calf? There must be some average figures that the industry deals with to indicate that in one program they were getting \$78 a head, and in another program they're getting what? — 35, 40 or whatever your number is. I'd like to determine what you feel that support levels at.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The models are — with the exception of having removed the 50-feeder option — the models are essentially unchanged. In the cow-calf-to-finish, it's 100 per cent of cash costs and 55 per cent of none-cash costs. That's the model.

And obviously the price of barley as it changes, the price of feeders as they come in — that changes it; that moves within the model. And that's why the numbers I gave you . . . and part of that model would have the calf being pegged at something around 95 cents per pound and the cost of gain at about 68 cents per pound.

Mr. Engel: — I suppose that the real issue then is when you made that legislation — “actuary sound,” I think is a word the former minister liked to use, the member from Souris-Cannington — he was talking about, “we've got to make a program that's actuary sound.”

What kind of a level of support did the industry give you? What percentage of the farmers that were signed up originally still are signed up today? Can you tell us where that's at — has that grown? Any program as it's in the field, and after two or three years like this, this should be year four for this feeder year coming up. How much has this grown?

I know when we first introduced crop insurance, it went from a very low 7-8,000 farmers involved until today when we have 75, 80 per cent of the farmers involved. I think your program, if it's one that's accepted by the beef industry, would indicate that there'd be a massive support for it. Can you tell me about where that's at today, and how the ranchers are taking to that program?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well my best and latest understanding of it would be that about 80 per cent of the fat cattle production in the province is covered by one or the other of the two plans.

But you . . . the end of your question suggested or asked about how the ranchers were taking to the program. If I was to talk about the numbers of livestock producers enrolled, the number would be significantly smaller because a lot of cow-calvers, or the ranchers, aren't in either one of these program, simply because they do not choose to feed out their cattle, nor are they necessarily feeders.

So if you took a percentage of the total number of people out there with cattle on the farms and said what percentage of those are in one of the two plans, the number might be 15 or 20 per cent. And of those who are, in fact, fattening cattle out, about 80 per cent of the production is covered by one or the other of the two insurance programs.

Mr. Engel: — Of the insurance programs you have in place — the two programs you call insurance programs as such — can somebody participate in that particular insurance program, and just have shares in a feedlot, or does he have to be a bona fide farmers?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member . . . and I'm sorry I'm slow at getting these answers up for you, but wasn't totally expecting these kinds of questions. In the feeder-to-finish, essentially anybody could be a participant in that plan. In the cow-calf, my understanding would be that you have signed up a number of cows to have as . . . to be eligible under the plan. In the cow-calf plan you'd be a bona fide cow-calver, so to speak.

Mr. Engel: — The program that we're talking about tonight hinges on that very issue. A person that owns (just for sake of discussion) a car agency, for example, maybe even in a city you represent — likes to wear cowboy boots and dabbles a little bit in investing and in risk capital — can buy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Don't tell me what to not to talk about, Mr. Minister. I'm very disappointed that a person that's

paid \$70,000 a year after he's graduated from veterinary school, doesn't make it his point to know what the basic programs that are in place in agriculture, and that they take a long time answering questions.

What I want to know is: here is a person that takes a risk trying to sell automobiles, gambles a little bit, makes some money, has this money socked away, either through inheritance or whatever. But he can take that money and decide to get into the feeder-finish cattle business. He can enrol in your program and you're going to guarantee him through another program, the entire cost of production. He can put in that program the cost of his calves, the cost of feed, the cost of the feedlot. And he's going to be guaranteed a fixed price on those cattle at the taxpayers' expense, at the taxpayers' expense.

Now you add to that piece of gravy, you add to that piece of gravy, a \$25-a-head tax credit where he can virtually eliminate any provincial tax he pays. He's the only kind of farmer that I know in southern Saskatchewan that's paying tax today.

Things aren't that good for the young cow-calf person that you said is a bona fide cow-calf man. Those fellows are looking for a program that's got some meat in it. They're looking for a program that . . . They like the original cow-calf beef stabilization plan we had in place. They liked that, because they knew if they contribute and they belong to that program, they will get their cost of production — not an actuary sound program that you have whittled down to 55 per cent coverage.

You've whittled this program down to 55 per cent coverage. You've squeezed them to the place where they can't make any more money. Now you say the treasury is going to put up again, the treasury is going to put up again.

And you know, the sad part is, you're not going to have to pay that bill. You're not going to have to stay here and fact the music of the incentives you're creating. The only thing I don't like about your plan and your sister plan, like you called it — I think it's the word you used, you used the sister plan, the one for the businessman — he's got two. If he pays any provincial tax after he's through buying his calves, he's got another sister plan that he can get some money under venture capital.

And the minister referred to these, so I'm not out of order. I've read carefully what I can talk about tonight, Mr. Chairman. So I appreciate the latitude he gave me when he introduced the bill originally. You just have to read on page 3042 and 3043 to see how broad an area he covered.

But the point I'm making is: this government is designing programs, is designing programs for those guys that don't need it. They're giving tax credits and tax incentives to the guys that don't need it. And if that's not bad enough, they're telling us to pay for it. Because they can accumulate them for seven years and there's no way the people of Saskatchewan are going to tolerate you, as good as the chairman is — but, you know, friends there for seven years. They're not going to be around to have to pay the bill. We're going to have to pay the bill for helping out your friends here. As good as those . . . (inaudible) . . . can be.

Now the minister talks about, the minister talks about this, but . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Maybe the oil companies will come back to rescue. You've got 100 million for the farmers. But it's not there, Mr. Minister. It's in a form of a tax credit, something you're going to have to pay for. It's something, it's something that doesn't help the guy that needs it.

Why didn't you come up with a program and come up with some money? Come up with some money for the guys that need it, the guys that want to farm. I can show you hundreds of young people in southern Saskatchewan that would love to get a little shot in the arm to buy some cattle and stay around. I can show you guys that came in and wanted to apply for your loan at that 4 per cent interest, and they told them, "Sorry, you don't qualify. You can't use that money

for buying cattle.”

This bill is not going to help the cattle industry. All it's going to do is help your rich friends avoid paying some income tax. And I think that's a sad story because that's money that we should be collecting when we form the next government to implement some programs that will work. I'd like you to respond to that.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, quite frankly I'm surprised to see the hon. member attack the livestock industry like this. I was of the view that he would be supportive of measures that would, in fact, enhance the livestock industry, and his attack surprises me.

First of all, once again, to correct some misstatements that you have made, to correct some misstatements that you have made. Number one, the model has not been changed since we took government — 100 per cent of cash cost, 55 per cent of non-cash. Point number one has not been changed. The model is the same, 100 per cent, 55.

Number two, when that program was developed, it was designed to at least try and be actuarially sound. Now certainly that 50-feeder fiasco affected that, but that was the intent; it's an insurance fund. You know that; I know that. It was a stabilization fund designed to be actuarially sound, I believe, over a 20-year period based on a retrospective analysis.

Thirdly, it has never guaranteed all the costs, as I said, 100 plus 55 of non-cash.

Fourthly, in so far as why not, why not allow some of the people whether they be from the town, non-farmer investors — why not allow them to invest in agriculture? You know, you seem to be quite content to let them invest in RRSPs and MURBs and cinemas and have a good, a good portion of that money end up in central Canada.

We're saying: here's another tool, another investment vehicle that you may want to invest in, in Saskatchewan, in agriculture. A lot of these people have their roots on the farm. A lot of those people who live in the small towns and the cities came from the farm and so it seems to me only to make good sense to give them another option, and perhaps keep some of those jobs. And if the hon. member is against Saskatchewan people having jobs in the meat processing and the livestock feeding industry here, then your rationale really does confuse me.

And finally, in so far as our commitment to the livestock sector, there has probably never been probably never been a government who has put forth such an impressive array of programs to the livestock sector. I could go through our farm purchase program, our amendments of the Agriculture Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan which was formerly FarmStart, our Crown land policy, the bill I gave first reading of today, the feeder loans, the feeder association loans guarantee, and I could go on and on and on. Certainly, I think everyone in this House would agree that probably never has a government come forth with such an impression array of building-block programs to enhance the livestock industry.

Mr. Engel: — The minister has made quite a number of statements here about how this is going to keep the industry in Saskatchewan, and I'll just take one step at a time.

Livestock market inside and outside Saskatchewan. How much benefit is it going to be to Saskatchewan workers for livestock marketed outside Saskatchewan, page 3043?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, it was not our intention to interfere with, first of all, the interprovincial movement of meat; and secondly, it is not our intention ever to necessarily disrupt the normal marketing processes out there.

And you know, at least I would presume you know, and I know, that a lot of the people in the

south-eastern part of the province market and have their cattle slaughtered in plants in Manitoba, and that seems to be their normal pattern. There's a certain geography that's involved there.

But over and above that, I think if we were to see perhaps another 100 or 200,000 head fed out in this province — the natural effect, the cause and effect relationship, if you like — it may well be that we'd see expansion of either the existing plants of which some have announced, and/or perhaps even anew processing facility built here. You know, you can try and push a string, or you can put some tools in place for the people to use.

Mr. Engel: — If I may suggest, Mr. Minister, you're not only pushing a string, you're blowing at a feather. Why do you use phrases and expressions that you know are deceiving the livestock producer? Now you're talking about all the wonderful jobs this is going to create, and, you know, you're whistling in the dark, Dixie. That's the simplest way I can put it, because it just isn't going to do that.

You have no specific intention of keeping any more cattle in Saskatchewan, because you are a puppet to the international firms, and they tell you, Mr. Minister: don't you dare interfere in our plans. We want to move our plant, we want to move our little Intercon plant to Alberta, and don't you mess around about trying to leave that plant in Regina. Don't get involved. Sell the plant off. Let the plant go. That's what you did.

When there were jobs in Saskatchewan, when Saskatchewan people had control, that those jobs stayed here, what did you do? For a few cents you sold the bowl of pottage. You give the industry away, and now you use expressions that you're going to keep it here when you know you're doing the opposite.

Mr. Minister, be truthful. The farmers know what's going on. They know what's going on. They can read between the lines. You are definitely trying to deceive and mislead and say we're going to build a Saskatchewan-based industry when you have no intentions. You have no plan in place to keep it at home. We did. We did. You gave it away.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, the hon. member suggests that we have no plan in place. I would suggest to you that any plan that was in place before we took over, first of all, for the most part is still in place with one major alteration in most cases, in that it's been improved. And I already alluded to the beef stabilization program and how we've improved that, and over and above that we've put in place the Ag Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan. It always was to me an enigma that we had, for example, FarmStart that could finance rabbit operations, but couldn't get into financing feedlots. That was to me an enigma in this province. It was to me, I would suggest to you, a funny set of priorities. A funny set of priorities.

And certainly I can recall vividly the picture in one of the FarmStart annual reports of the hon. member from Shaunavon proudly cutting the ribbon when that rabbit plan in Swift Current opened. But certainly it seemed to me a funny mix of priorities when we had that kind of situation in Saskatchewan. And I could go on, as once again, and detail all the programs we've put in place over and above anything that existed. But I think I've already touched on those.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, let me just make it plain and simple and short. We had a beef processing industry in Saskatchewan. We had a guarantee that that industry stays here with Saskatchewan bucks. We invested in it, so it stays here. You got rid of that.

We had a beef stabilization plan in place that was actuary sound, was in a word, that was used in that plant. It paid; it was cheap for the farmers. You tripled the cost to the farmers and reduced their coverage. You know you did. And now you implement a plan that just gives a tax break. No cash, no ready cash — isn't going to cost you a nickel. It's just a tax break for the guy that's paying tax. You have no intention of helping the little guy. You have no intention of helping the guy that needs it. You have no intention of helping the

guy that wants to get started.

And the programs were in place. The programs were in place. You watered them down; you watered them down or flushed them out. One or the other. But both — both — are applicable. And the farmers will remember you for it. The farmers who have FarmStart loans, and who you're getting tough with, and who you're sending the semi-trailers out and picking up the cattle. They'll remember you. They'll remember you next time around.

Mr. Minister, you have no concern for the guys that need it. All yours have been concerned for is for the guys that already have it. You were going to shore up success. Those were the words you used in this House. And I believe you. You're giving us a message loud and clear. Because the only ones you want to help are those that are super successful in this province. They're the ones that are going to get the tax breaks. You use money like \$25,000 — no provincial tax; \$25,000 worth of provincial tax credits you're giving to some people.

Well, I know a lot of farmers that wish they'd have to pay \$25 tax. I really do. And they'd like a little help, and they'd like a little consideration. This program won't give them that. If you think this program is going to develop a million bushels of barley extra, if you think this program is going to get all these cattle to a feedlot, I wish you good luck and I wish you every success. Because I think it's just a big, old smoke-screen and a little bit of window dressing. It just isn't going to work out. I'll let my colleagues ask you some questions . . .

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, your logic escapes me. However, I think that what you're trying to tell the ranchers of Saskatchewan, the cow-calf producers, the custom feeders, the feedlots out there, the backgrounders out there, is that, yes, you are quite content to see the same kinds of things happen as been happening in this province for years and years and years.

What you are telling them is: sure, fine; ship your calves out of this province every fall, the 4 or 500,000 of them. Send them to Ontario, Alberta, Quebec, across the line; second them, send them out, and with them, export the jobs, the spin-off at the feed mill level, the spin-off at the equipment manufacture level. Send all that everywhere else in Canada, but don't keep it in Saskatchewan; don't allow our people to have those jobs; don't allow our province to have access to that value that could be added to our economy, that economic wealth that would build schools, and hospitals, and nursing homes. No, we don't want it. Keep shipping it out, keep shipping it out — export it.

It's the same old line, it's the same old logic, that you guys have been espousing for years and years and years. And for years and years and years we've had a half a million calves move out of this province, as regular as clockwork.

What we are saying to the people is that, fine: if you want to access those markets and continue to ship the calves there, fine. But we're also prepared to maybe put 1,000 or maybe 2,000 new bidders — and they might be your neighbours across the road — in the market-place for your calves. And you've mentioned the fact about a million bushels of barley . . . Good luck, Mr. Minister, in accessing or developing a new million-bushel barley market.

Well, it doesn't take very much intelligence. It doesn't take very much intelligence to, on an intensive barley ration, an intensive barley ration . . . If we were to feed out every calf in Saskatchewan today that we produce — and we produce one-quarter of all the beef calves in this country, right here in Saskatchewan, we've got the basic factory — and on intensive barley ration, even if they took only 40 bushels each to finish out, that's something like a 32 million bushel, 40 million bushel, new barley market — brand-new. Not one million bushels — 30 or 40 million bushels.

So there's the beauty of this program, because not only do the cow-calf people like it, not only

does the backgrounder like it, not only does the custom feedlot guy like it, but also the grain growers like it, because he would like a new, cash, 50 million-bushel barley market out there. And that's the beauty of this tax credit.

It's not a grant; it's not a subsidy. And I know you had some trouble with this new concept. I know you are a little jealous that we are the first province, the first government, the first Tory government in Canada, to introduce something as innovative and imaginative as this.

And I want to tell you, I want to tell you as well, we know we're on the right track, because governments across the nation are jealous of this program. They wish that they'd thought of it first. So here we have a program that can touch all sectors, increase profitability on the farms and ranches, number one, but equally important, it could add economic wealth to this province. And that's what this government stands for — helping everybody out there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — You know what the farmers of Saskatchewan are saying, Mr. Minister? You know what the farmers are saying? Let me read a short little clip into the record what the farmers are really saying about this minister:

The farmers criticized Agriculture Minister Lorne Hepworth for not requesting disaster assistance from the federal government, which, according to the federal . . .

That's not the line I was looking for. They were saying . . . they were saying . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll make sure. I'll make sure when they listen to you.

We've got . . . Here it is. Here it is.

The farmers were talking to the minister, Lorne Hepworth, Federal Minister of Agriculture Eugene Whelan, Environment Minister Neil Hardy, and Premier Grant Devine and Local MLA Lloyd Sauder since last fall. (And what did they say?) We got lots of sympathy, but that's all we got.

That's all we got. That's all we got. We got lots of sympathy. And what we're getting here tonight, what we're getting here tonight is a little grandstand, a little orator that gets up, and this little orator spells out the wonderful things that could happen.

All I'm saying is, Mr. Minister, why did you let the processing plant go that was here? Why did you let it go? Are you going to guarantee us tonight that there are going to be some 120 jobs back here in Regina that you let go?

Are you going to guarantee that this new bill of yours is going to bring that processing plant back into fruition and we're going to see that thing operating again, or are they going to build a grand, brand-new processing plant, like they have all across the United States, that can process efficiently and do it for a decent job and make some money.

Are you saying that this is going to happen? Have you got any plan or any scheme around that might bring that about? Because you gave it away. It was here before you got here. It was here before you got here. It was here while your predecessor was around, but by the time you got to be Minister of Agriculture, it's gone. The jobs are gone. The jobs are gone, and you can give all the flowery speeches in the world, Mr. Minister, but you're going to pay the same kind of money out of next year's tax dollars. You're going to pay the same kind of money out for beef to be processed outside of the province. And I kind of would like a little assurance that maybe we will get some jobs here.

What have you got in this package or what kind of control have you got in place that's going to

put a little emphasis on doing it here in Saskatchewan, doing it with the know how we have here, doing it with the people that used to do it here. There's no guarantee here. I see nothing here. All I see is a fancy tax break for your rich friends. You don't like it, and you make some fancy speeches, but basically what this bill does is give some tax concessions to people who don't need it, and you hope maybe, by the way, it might encourage some calves to be sold locally and fed out locally.

I hope you're right. I hope you're right. And that will likely happen in some cases, because I know some people that will buy some cattle and then feed them. I know some that will. But those guys don't need it. They don't need it. But there are an awful lot of young fellows that will. That are going to either become hired hands, or slingers of hay and bull. You know, that's what you're making out of our young cowboys. You're not giving them a chance to get ahead, because there's nothing in it. There's nothing around here for a young guy to start on his own. There's room to get him on the end of a pitchfork, but there's no room here to get him his own feedlot. There's not even any room for him to buy a saddle, let alone a horse. This bill doesn't do it for the guy that needs it or the guy that wants it.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, on the one hand, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is trying to tell us that the beef stabilization programs, the models of which are the same as when he was in government, with the exception of that 50-feeder operation, that they aren't doing a job in the livestock sector.

As well, he raised the issue of: could I guarantee 120 jobs? And the answer is no. And my data would suggest that we might be closer with 900 jobs, just with the finishing out of an additional 100,000 head. And as well, with the finishing out of an additional 100,000 head which would be 25, 30 per cent more than we're doing right now, which is not a terrible insensible goal, I would suggest, that could well stimulate another \$25 million in capital investment alone. So certainly I can't guarantee 120 jobs — maybe 900.

As well, talking about what happened, what was the legacy you left us with? During your administration, beef cow numbers in this province peaked, about 1.2 million. Where were they when we took over? What was the cow herd in Saskatchewan? Was it 1.2 million? No. Was it 1.1 million? No. Was it 900,000? No. It was roughly 850,000 and it's down now at 830,000.

The factory was in jeopardy of being wiped out in Saskatchewan. We've improved the beef stabilization program, and I believe with programs like this we can stabilize and, in fact, enhance that livestock sector.

But you did more than that when you were in power. Between 1971 and 1981, the NDP years in this country, what else happened? Ten thousand census farms were wiped off the map in Saskatchewan. That's the legacy you've left the people of Saskatchewan with — 10,000 farms wiped out of Saskatchewan rural woof and weave, if you like. That's your legacy.

Cow numbers went from 1.2 million down to 800,000, 900,000; 10,000 farms wiped off the face of the earth. That's your record, and I will stand on my record 10 years from now and judge a bill like this.

You continue to suggest that this is only a program for the rich. I want to tell you about one of the scenarios that I think is, in fact, going to be one of the predominant ones with this bill.

It is my view that there are a lot of dads out there who now have no long-term debt necessarily, who certainly, given the cyclical variations out there in the price that they receive commodities, do face more often than they like sometimes, a fairly hefty tax bill. Wheat prices creep up, they have a good year in the market and are faced with paying substantial, substantial taxes.

And what I could see happening is those dads — is those dads facing a substantial tax bill, saying

to their son, why maybe now is beating out fifty or a hundred, "Why don't you field another hundred head?" And the son certainly, who maybe is struggling, as you suggested, with a cash flow problem, now becomes a price-taker instead of price — or a price-maker instead of a price-taker. So here we have a program that can solve not only the dad's problem, if you like, but as well, help that son. And I believe the security of the family farm, that whole family farm concept, is very much alive and real out there, and we intend to enhance it with bills like this.

Mr. Engel: — I guess I should read the entire article how Carrot River farmers are near financial ruin.

I would like to know how much the take-home pay on the price of grain has increased since he's minister. That is in line with this bill. I know it is. He's the one that raised it. But he said — and it's got to be challenged — because the price of grain since you're minister, since you're minister or your colleague that was a former minister of . . . (inaudible) . . . office has been really doing wonderful things for my pocket book. Let me assure you.

I am really proud of your record on the freight rate on top of the price of grain because you're a national disaster. You're a disaster, and when it gets down to stabilizing the beef industry and saying that we've got money, and we've got money left over to invest in a tax credit because of the price of grain, and you're negotiating with your friends in Ottawa . . . Things are pretty tough. Mister, if you think the price of grain's gone up in the last two years since you're in office, then that's why you'd introduce a bill like this. Now I got the answer, because, Mr. Minister, I can tell you don't know anything about growing grain. If you think that price has increased . . . because the member sitting behind you knows that that isn't the case. Even a member that is that wealthy with all his curling success and everything else to supplement his farm income isn't making any money on his wheat production. I know he isn't. And he's not going to for a while. He's not going to for a while as long your friends are in the Minister of Agriculture. Maybe if the member for Bengough-Milestone would get the agriculture portfolio, he could use his influence and throw some rocks at the guys in Ottawa, and we could get some results down there.

But the way it's going now, the way it's going now, there is no immediate help there. There is no immediate help there for the farmers. And if you think there's money to invest in a tax credit, so be it. So be it. And the point I'm making is that any program you've implemented today has been exactly like the program you've implemented. You've got \$300 million for the oil company. You've got \$300 million for our oil company. And now you've got another little program in here that some farmers are paying from Saskatchewan income tax, and we're going to give them a break as well. Well all I'm saying, I wish you'd have given a break to the young guy that's starting farming and that needs it.

And you've admitted, you've admitted, I'm glad you have, that there are very few farmers that have bought their land the last ten years and got farming the last 10 or 15 years that are making any money. I appreciate the fact that you admit that. They're the backbone of agriculture. They're the guys that are going to be around, not the 57 and 60-year-olds. Those aren't the guys. Those are the guys that can afford to pay a little tax, can afford to support some programs that we need in place.

You cut them off the tax base and, mister, that \$825 million deficit you've got today is going to look pretty good. It's going to look pretty good because what I'm saying is the money that you should be getting, the money you should be getting from a tax return from your friends in big business that are going to invest in cattle isn't a long term stay, isn't a long term stay in the agricultural industry. This bill is a little bit of good for those that have lots. But it's nothing for those who haven't got anything.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, some perhaps would argue relative to the points you've made about grain prices. Some would perhaps argue that those observations border on lunacy, and I think that I might, quite frankly, agree with them. For you to stand up and

suggest that the government in power today here, the Tory government, can control world grain prices out there does, in fact, border on lunacy. You could stand up there and make that observation, I could stand up and refer to *Star-Phoenix* from Friday, May 25, "Rape-seed prices at an all time high," \$684 it closed at, and it went higher since then. And I could stand up here and say, yes, that's a Tory government. We've been responsible for the highest prices of rape-seed in the history of the province. And I would be equally as lunatic as you are and suggest that we are responsible for decreased grain prices.

Your arguments, your arguments do, in fact, border on lunacy. As well, it's very much our view, it's very much our view that we should put, we should put some programs in place that are long-term, that the building of rock approach, and not the typical knee jerk reaction. I think the provision for the seven-year carry forward, the seven-year carry forward is part of that sensible, long-term planning and strategy, and if you don't need, or can't use the tax credit this year, perhaps when you're in the up cycles or the down cycle it will trigger. And I could get in to arguments about what we've done for the young, starting-out farmers out there, things like the Farm Purchase Program, things like the Agriculture Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan, things like our changes to the Crown lands policy, but I won't.

Mr. Engel: — I suppose that basically what I'd really like to get from the minister is some projections, the numbers you state in your speech. Were you really throwing wild numbers around, or do you believe these numbers? What would you project will be the amount of tax credit that will have to be paid back, and how many head do you expect it will apply this coming year?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, for example, in the case of cattle, I suppose no one can ever really know exactly how many people will access the program. I think, because it's new and innovative, there's got to be a certain understanding again by the people out there, and certainly we, as a government, are prepared to get out and communicate that message, not only with the farmer investors, the feedlot side, but the non-farmer investors as well.

And some people would suggest that 10 or 20 per cent increase in our feeding might not be an unreasonable goal. And I would kind of like to see that happen.

I'd rather see that than, say, going from 300,000 head being fed out today to 600,000 overnight because, quite frankly, I believe that there's certain underpinnings that have to be put in place. There's certain capacity that may not be out there now in the feedlots. I'm certain it can come.

I believe the young farmers out there in the feedlots have the expertise, but certainly others, who are perhaps jealous of our program, have suggested that as many as 160,000 additional head could be fed in Saskatchewan as a result of this tax credit — and I refer to an article I read recently out of Alberta.

So certain some would view this program with a great deal of potential. I do too, but I hate to put numbers on it. But a 10 or 20 per cent increase would certainly be a success.

Mr. Engel: — I just have a copy that was given to me from *Agricultural Statistics, 1982*, published by the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, using your own numbers. And it's table 54, "Livestock on Farms by Province, July 1, 1980 to 1982." And cattle and calves, these are the numbers you were using as a source when you suggested the amount of cattle that would be fed out.

And you suggest that about 10 per cent? You're saying there'd be about additional 30,000 head fed in . . . Is that a fair estimate that we can mark you down for? What do you project as your learned department and the stats you have with you, and the amount of cattle that were fed in years past, and the potential for feeding cattle — to at least peak up to an '81 or '82 level? Do you expect it could go that high, or where do you expect it would peak at?

I think we should be able to tie the minister down to a number that two years from now we can hold before you and say: this is what you projected, and here's where your results, where you were so much better than you even projected. Or the other way around, which might be the case. So I think you should come up with some numbers that are close.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well I suppose I could stand up here and suggest to you and to the members of this legislature that I think there will be approximately 32,313 additional head fed in Saskatchewan, on Saskatchewan farms and feedlots because of the program. But I think I would be grasping at straws, just as you might be. The view is that the potential exists, certainly, to increase by 10 or 20 per cent over and above of what we do now, as a result of this program.

Once again, I think it is going to require a certain understanding that has to be transmitted to the people out there. As I said earlier, I've seen reports out of Alberta that suggest 160,000 additional head being fed in Saskatchewan wouldn't be an unreasonable guesstimate. So take your choice anywhere in those numbers that I've had, have suggested to you, and not necessarily that I worked any of them out.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend The Industrial Development Act

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce Mr. Russ Cheslock, director of administration.

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister why he feels it necessary to increase the amounts which do not require the consent of the Lieutenant Governor in Council before the corporation disposes of property.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Chairman, the prescribed limit for financial assistance was last increased during the 1960's. Inflation alone justifies an increase in this limit. And as a matter of fact, this recommendation was approved by the Sedco board of directors in 1981 during the prior administration, so I can't see why it should be of any particular problem at this time.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, the boards of directors of Crown corporations have approved a good number of things which from time to time the administration did not. And I think that that will happen under any administration. I trust it will. Otherwise we don't need a cabinet for most things. The boards of directors are going to decide them, and the figure that I asked the minister to comment on is the figure of \$2,500,000 which is a very substantial increase from the existing figure.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Chairman, I guess that all I can explain to the opposition is that this figure simply hasn't been adjusted since the 1960's, and inflation alone dictates that that amount be dealt with, and I suppose that his remarks concerning the board of directors is well taken. But in this instance we found that the amount that we're trying to deal with at this time makes it rather unwieldy. We've discovered that in our existing board of directors, and that this provision would simply allow us to operate a little more efficiently than at present.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, is the present figure \$1 million?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Chairman, it's a million and a half right now and we propose to put it up to 2.5, so an increase of \$1 million since the 60's.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to the provisions requiring that directors, or permitting directors to vote on Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) matters with respect to . . . at Sedco meetings perhaps is a better way to phrase it. With respect to the affairs of companies of which they are directors, do I understand that to be confined to cases where the person voting on the board of Sedco and voting at the Sedco board meetings, is on the client company's board effectively as a nominee of Sedco, and not in his own beneficial way? Is it confined to that circumstance, if I read the act?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Chairman, yes, that's absolutely right.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, in section 8, you're going from 300 million to 500 million. That's the total amount of indebtedness of Sedco. Can you give us a brief outline on that?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Chairman, this is almost the same response as the earlier question. The borrowing limit was last increased in 1974. And since that time, Sedco size is more than doubled, and it's presently considered timely to increase the statutory limit to allow for the expected demand in future years from our growing economy. And here again, it was a carry-over of a recommendation from the board in 1981, that we have dealt with for the last couple of years, and have come to the conclusion that the suggestion at that time applies more so right now. And henceforth, we just decided to clean it up at this time.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, what would Sedco's present indebtedness be? I mean, how much money have they got outstanding? Were you within legislative guide-lines, or where have you exceeded that?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — No, we haven't exceeded any limits, and it's in the neighbourhood of — I don't have the statement with me — but as I recall it's in the neighbourhood of 134 million or somewhere in that area.

Mr. Engel: — Well, that's interesting that you'd want to increase its amount — 300 million to 500 million. It's not even half way to what your legislative limits are at the present time. Is that an all-time . . . have you slumped into an all-time low just recently, or are you not servicing loans to small businessmen, or what's happened? Because I think Sedco's activity increased. By volume of customers you handled more than by dollar amount, if my recollection serves me correct. Over a number of past years, with some changes in the legislation pattern and loaning pattern has affected more loans with the smaller dollar amount. And is that why you're that much below the limit at this present time? Or why would you be wanting to increase borrowings to 500 million if they're not even half-ways to the present limit?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to advise the member that I believe that it's just timely to increase that statutory limit at this point in time. If we intend on doing anything at all with Sedco in the future, it wouldn't take too much more to be above our statutory limit, and we would have to introduce legislation at some other point in time. It could take . . . by the time we get that legislation in, statutory limit, get some funding across from the government and so on, we could find ourself in an embarrassing position. And simply because we have this type of a statutory limit doesn't mean that we're going to go out and use it, because we haven't even used our existing limit. But I think it'd just be a safeguard to have that provision there.

Mr. Engel: — Are you really telling me that, or are you saying, Mr. Minister, that under this new direction and a new big-business government, that you maybe have in mind financing through Sedco some major program that could use this all up in one shot? Is it a possibility, maybe, that you're looking at using Sedco to stimulate some larger business activity than what they have been doing in the past?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Well I don't know that it's fair to speculate on the future role of Sedco, but just as easily as that could certainly occur, it's just as easy that we could have a program for all kinds of small businesses. And it wouldn't take long to use up that kind of funding as well. I'm sure that if you added up a bunch of small little loans, it wouldn't take long to get to that amount either. So, you know, you can speculate whichever way you want.

This whole act is designed for a matter of housekeeping only. It has no reflection as to the future role of Sedco. We have taken into consideration suggestions that have been made over the past several years, and we deem it advisable to proceed with that line of reasoning at this time.

Mr. Engel: — It seems strange that in the dying moments of the legislation we do just general housekeeping amendments, when Sedco is at 130 or \$135 million worth of borrowings. Their ceiling is 300 million, and all of a sudden the minister comes in and asks for 500 million and is trying to tell the members on this side of the House and the public at large that they have no master plan around, or no people in the planning bureau that got the message up through to the minister and said: hey, minister, it's time you sharpened your pencil a little, because Sedco is going to be involved in a new master financial plan of this province, and here's the direction we want to go, and get geared up and ready to move in that way.

If this isn't part of the case, I think the minister is really part and parcel of a group that's just floundering and swinging away and building a province and building an industrial climate like Topsy. And you hit and miss, and maybe if we hit a good one — lucky; and if we don't — well, that's too bad.

But I'd have thought you had some master plan or some strategy around where you're using your expertise; you're using your talented friends in the business community, and saying: hey, we're going to build an upgrader, or we're going to build a heavy water plant, or we're going to do this, or we're going to do that, or we're going to get involved in some major development — we need \$500 million worth of borrowing here.

But if you're trying to fool us and just sneak this by on the side, I think that that's not a very good role for a minister. I think you should come clean and say what you're really trying to do, and where it's going. Possibly, possibly you're going to use this money through the co-op program and this upgrader you're building here in Regina, and they could use that all up.

And, if you do, it's a good thing. But come clean and tell us why you need to almost double Sedco's borrowing when they aren't even at half-way of where they're supposed to be. You're not fooling anybody, Mr. Minister.

Maybe you're fooling yourself. If you are, better get back home and look in a mirror and see who you really are, because you've got a more serious position than that. You're getting paid close to 70-some thousand dollars a year to do a job that's meaningful and constructive and has some planning in it, and not just flipping around like Topsy. And you have like a committee designing a cow and everybody can milk from every side.

I think it's more important than that. It's more important than that. I think you must, at some time, have some strategy in place, and saying that here we need an additional loaning company to help us support that. If you don't . . . If you don't, Mr. Minister, you're only kidding yourself.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm really trying to sneak this one through, and I was hoping that they wouldn't have noticed, because second reading was April 5th, and it's been on the order paper since that time. Now I don't know how many weeks that is, but if that's sneaking something by you, all I can do is apologize.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Minister, I come back to this point of the 250 — the 2.5 million.

While that is perhaps not an unreasonable limit as a loan limit, it seems to me a very high figure for the limit provided for in section 6 which says that the corporation can sell off its assets, and if it sells off assets of more than 2.5 million, it needs to check with cabinet. That strikes me as a high figure as a limit for the sale of any assets that it considers surplus to its needs. So I make that point.

And this second question I want to ask which the minister may wish to reply to when or if he comments on my earlier one is: what changes are there with respect to the form of the annual report? I see you've got anew provision in annual report, and how is that changed from the existing annual report provisions?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Chairman, I'll deal with the last question first. The existing provision conflicts with the tabling of documents acts, which prescribes it when documents are to be tabled. And in the case of Crown corporations, the date is not necessarily within 90 days after the end of the fiscal year, as the existing provision states. So this is just cleaning that up. We had a conflict there.

Regarding the sale of assets, Sedco always had the provision to sell assets, but it was in regulation. And we chose at this time to put it into the act, right up front where everybody knows what we've got. And the \$2.5 million number just simply coincides with the other authority. And we figure rather than have several different limits to worry about, it would just . . . one would work with the other and they were both part of legislation and there would be no problems with anybody looking at the legislation.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 43 — An Act to amend The Crown Corporation Act

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce Mrs. Kay Wellman, general counsel for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, this is a provision which exempts the power corporation from liability for two types of action on behalf — or action or inaction — on behalf of the power corporation. The first one is a failure to supply electrical energy except a failure to exercise a reasonable standard of care. And the second one is:

For any injury, loss, or damage to persons or property arising out of, directly or indirectly resulting from, the supply or use of electrical energy or natural or manufactured gas by a customer beyond the . . . delivery to the customer's premises.

Now it will be observed that the first one says that you're liable unless you're careless — that you're not liable unless you're careless. The second one says you're not liable even though you are careless. It doesn't say it in those terms, but that, that's the clear implication. It can't be otherwise interpreted.

Now I want to ask the minister: what sort of instances have arisen which cause you to want to give yourself this legislative shield against being sued by the citizen? Why do you want to

protect yourself against the citizen?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, no issues have arisen. We have always had that clause with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, where a card used to have to be signed by the customer. That's been in effect for years and years. We are just putting it into legislation, to cover it automatically, so that people can pick up a telephone, request service, and we don't have to go through the bother of getting cards signed. There's no difference than what was there in the past.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I think there's a great deal of difference between getting a card signed, which a court may interpret as it wishes — and mind you, there are some pretty vigorous court decisions on the so-called ticket cases where a monopoly says you accept the service on these terms - a— d particularly where you're a monopoly, the court interprets those terms very strictly against the utility, as they should. There's a very big difference between doing that and giving it a legislative *imprimatur* which says that whatever happens, however negligent we are, however careless we are, if the damage results from the supply of, let's say, natural gas, beyond the point of delivery to the customer's premises, if our carelessness causes one of your machines in some way to blow out, then that's just tough. That's your problem, not ours, no matter how careless we are. I don't think you should be putting that in, Mr. Minister.

If you don't have instances where you have been subjected to possible unfair litigation, you can take out liability insurance, or the power corporation doesn't have any difficulty taking out liability insurance, but you're saying: look, here's a little citizen who has got to take his power from you. You can send — I don't know whether this is a possible case — but send a surge of power through, ruin his machine. Tough luck, tough luck — because it happens beyond the point of delivery.

And I don't think you should be doing that, Mr. Minister, and I want to know what argument you mount for saying that a large \$2 billion corporation which is in the business, in the monopoly business, of providing electricity and natural gas — which is has to be; I'm not quarrelling about the monopoly, I'm just saying you shouldn't be asking for legislative protection against your own carelessness if it costs the citizens money. And I think that the power corporation is plenty big enough to protect itself by insurance. Many ordinary citizens would not be taking out insurance against the power corporation's carelessness, and I don't think you should be legislating so that you are protected and the individual citizen is the insurer of the power corporation's negligence, and that's what you're doing.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, we have already indicated that Saskatchewan Power Corporation are liable up to the premises, upstream from that connection. If something happens beyond that point, that's out of our control. That belongs to the customer; that's his side of the hook-up. If the surge comes, that's upstream, and it blows up something on the other side, and that's our responsibility. But if there is something beyond that point and within the person's house, we don't have that control. That's the customer's responsibility at that point. Anything upstream occurring beyond that point and it's Saskatchewan Power's fault, we will be liable.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — But, Mr. Minister, if it's the customer's problem, if he's going to be responsible anyway, what do you need this for? You couldn't go to court; you couldn't protect yourself in court against the citizen. This strikes me as they're saying, "Oh my, the Ajax Machinery Company is going to bring the power corporation into court, and how will they pay their legal bills against that great big Ajax?" It's just not a credible case. If you're not careless, you're not going to be held responsible, and there's no earthly reason why you should be protecting yourself by legislation against an ordinary citizen who clearly can't protect himself against you. He's got to do business with you and that's right enough.

But the fact that he has to do business with you shouldn't give you the right to say, you, Mr.

Customer, have to share the risk, indeed, have to assume the risk of power corporation carelessness if the results are felt beyond the point of delivery of the customer's premises. I see no point. You haven't had cases of it in the past. You're not telling me it's dealing with a real problem. You're just telling me that you want to be extra careful in protecting you against the citizen, and I think you're going at it the wrong way. I think you shouldn't be asking for any special protection. You should be out there, be able to be sued the same as anyone else. You shouldn't be a . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I don't know what the member for Moosomin is saying, but he can stand up and enter the debate. It seems to be perfectly clear that the power corporation ought not to be asking for special privileges. It ought not to have any special burden either. It's out there doing business and if it were a private power corporation, it couldn't do this by statute. We know that. And it shouldn't be asking to do it because it's a public power corporation. There's just no need for this provision. If you're careless you should pay, and if you're not careless you won't have to pay, and you don't need the legislation.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we are not doing anything that is any different than was done before. The customers sign the card waiving the liability.

As far as Ajax is concerned, I'll just read you the paragraph that they signed.

In the event that the corporation shall at any time during the term of this agreement or any continuation or renewal thereof be prevented from supplying the electrical energy or any portion thereof to the consumer by reason of any strike, lock-out, riot, fire, invasion, hurricane, flood, act of God, and the Queen's enemies or any other causes beyond the control of the corporation, the corporation shall not be liable to the consumer or to any party claiming through the consumer for the non-supply of electrical energy during such time or times.

And in construing this provision, the rule of construction, or *ejusdem generis* shall not apply.

Whatever those legal terms mean. But the legislation is covering all this. It's in the legislation for everyone to see. We're not having to run around getting thousands of cards signed, it's just improving the system and making it more efficient. We're not changing anything, as far as the consumer is concerned, from what they've had for the last number of years.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you have dealt with one-half of the section, but you have been completely silent as to the second half. And the second half is the one I was doing the most of the talking about. It may well be that you are going to make a further comment and, if so, then I will withhold my comments until you make a further one.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Yes, we have the same similar document.

Title to the electrical energy delivered hereunder shall pass to the consumer at each point of delivery and thereafter sole responsibility and liability in relation thereto and to the use thereof shall attach to the consumer.

And there's many other paragraphs.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with all deference, I don't think that the last one you read means quite the same as section 3(b) of the bill . . . or what is 3 of the new section 2.1(b) of the bill. It's similar all right, but whether title to the electricity passes is not really relevant to the fact that the . . . Perhaps the circumstance which I envisage could not happen, but I think it could.

The negligence is yours. It's on your side of the line. You send a surge of power through or a wave of natural gas through, if that's possible; the damage is on the other side. Now, I say that this says that you're not responsible for damage — loss or damage — resulting from a supply of electricity beyond the point of delivery. And it's the damage that's beyond the point of delivery, and the damage is indeed beyond the point of delivery, even though your liability is all on your side of the fence.

And, furthermore, I just don't see why you should be putting this stuff in legislation in any case. I don't see why you need to protect yourself in this way. And I can only conclude that you intend to, in effect, lower your standards of safety, lower your operating procedures. You haven't had any trouble over 30 years, so it's not exactly an urgent problem.

But it's the sort of direction that I don't think that public corporations should be going — attempting by legislation to protect themselves against their carelessness. They should be ready to take the rap in court, just the same as anybody else. And while I don't object to them fighting in court and trying to prove that it wasn't their fault, they're not a sugar-daddy. But neither are they an untouchable icon that can do anything it likes and the citizen has to accept it. And that's what you're trying to make the power corporation into, and I say it's bad legislation.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we are saying that we would not be responsible for the loss. Just to pick out a few words there, "loss resulting from the use of electrical energy beyond the point of delivery." But if we were upstream, the problem occurred because of Sask Power and caused damage on the other side of the premises, we would be responsible.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Minister, the fence is in one place. You're sending power down the line. The damage is on Ajax's side of the fence. The carelessness is on the other side of the fence. The power is used on Ajax's side, and it's for loss or damage to property arising out of the use of electrical energy beyond the point of delivery. It was the use of electrical energy on Ajax's side of the fence that busted his machine. And your carelessness did it and you are protected by this bill, and you shouldn't be.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, I guess we could argue all night, but we don't agree with the interpretation that the member opposite is using. It's the use of the energy. If a customer used a wrong type of appliance or something and used the energy improperly, he's responsible. But if we in Sask Power — it's something that happens with the power coming into the premises beyond the delivery point and we cause some harm in that person's premises, Sask Power is responsible.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — How is he going to make you responsible if he puts in the wrong type of machinery? Why do you need a piece of legislation to protect you? You haven't needed it for 30 years. He wouldn't have a ghost of a chance at making you responsible.

So you don't need any special legislation. It's got to be for some other reason. The provision saying that Sask Power shall be responsible in the ordinary way, the same as any other company, has been there since 1950. You now say that you need something else. And you've offered no explanation as to why you need something else taking away people's right to sue you, that they've had for 34 years. And I haven't heard the explanation which makes it sensible for you to want laws which prevent the person from suing you for your carelessness, a law which you haven't needed for 34 years.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, I believe I said from the outset why we were doing it. It's got away from getting thousands of cards signed. A lot of the time they never do get signed so we don't even have the cards signed. We don't have to get these contracts signed. It's in the legislation. The people can see the legislation, and it's doing away with a bunch of office procedure and administration costs, and so on, as far as the corporation is concerned. We have it done once, and here the cards are eliminated, and as I say, we haven't been getting those cards

signed for years.

And the way it happens now, a fellow can phone up to Sask Power and say, "I want a hook-up of power." It's done; we don't have to worry about cards. It's in the legislation, and the same . . . The legislation is doing the same thing as signing these contracts did in the past.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I don't agree with you that the legislation is doing the same as the cards, but let's leave that aside. You're telling me you haven't used the cards, in many cases, for years. What ill has befallen the corporation? You haven't had any protection except your ordinary protection, and so far as I can see, you've never been sued. Now, what seems to be the trouble?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — That's just a housekeeping measure, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, with respect to increasing the limits, with respect to real property, from 25,000 to 150,000, and from contracts, from 250,000 to a million, this will have the effect of significantly reducing the amount of information about the power corporation that becomes public. That will be the effect of it. No more Brucker's house would be . . . No more information on that would be available to the public because it wouldn't be worth \$150,000, and a good number of other similar bits of information which are now available to the public would no longer be available.

And I ask you why you need to increase these limits by, in the one case, six times, and in the other case, four times. Admittedly, some increase is in order, because inflation has . . . You know, if you were doubling them, fine, but you're not doing that. You're increasing them to, in one case, six times and the other case, four times, and the effect will be less information given to the public about the power corporation.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, just in 1983 alone we put through 11 OCs and eight of them were above the \$1 million figure. It doesn't mean that every item is more than a million, but most of the OCs go through with a number of items on the OC. And here again it's just a cutting down the amount of paper work that we have to do, and I don't think you'll be losing that much of the information, really.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you're telling us this is to do away with disclosing three orders in council, one of them being the Sheila Brucker house.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is not buying houses any more, so we won't have to show that kind of figure on any OCs.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, they weren't buying many before and obviously there were . . . I am sure that if they aren't buying any more in the future, that's all the less reason why we need to avoid orders in council for houses you're not going to buy. It doesn't seem to me a pressing problem if it's to avoid orders in council for property you're not going to buy in any case. But I won't belabour this point except to say that once again it is more information which will not be available.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, Saskatchewan Power had the 25,000 and the 250,000 limits before, but a number of other Crown corporations — PCS, they don't put through orders in council. Saskoil doesn't put through orders in council. SMDC don't put through order in council. Sask Tel, theirs is a 100,000 or more, in excess of 100,000. So we're not the only unique one. There's a number of others that don't even put through orders in council.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, this has to do with interest on overdue accounts if I've got the right section.

No, I think it does not, so I'll wait until we get to section 12.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 12

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, what sort of interest rates do you intend to charge? You are going to charge interest on overdue accounts, and there is no limit in the act; or is there any provision for any limit in any regulation, so it's up to the management or the board of the power corporation, and what is it you have in mind?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, the board sets the rate. I may be wrong, but I believe it's at one and three-quarter per cent over prime.

We may have to clarify that for you. I'm not too sure.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, is it thought that interest on accounts is a charge which would require the consent of the Public Utilities Review Commission, or is it through otherwise?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — We make our recommendations. It is the Public Utilities Review Commission that ends up deciding for sure what rate we will charge.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I might perhaps better have asked this under section 11, but I will put the question, and you may or may not wish to answer it.

The section deals with advances to customers, presumably to pay the charge which is assessed to the customer where there is a power or gas installation that involves payment by the customer. Does the corporation have a regular policy of making loans or advances to customers for installation charges or construction charges, whatever we wish to call them? And is it a regular policy, allowing them to pay over time, or whatever, or is it one that you are going to develop in the future?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — The two sections that are already in the act, section 55 and 55.1:

The corporation may advance through owners of buildings, on such terms and conditions respecting repayment as the corporation may deem advisable, a portion or the whole of the cost of improving, extending, or replacing the electrical wiring in buildings.

Well we haven't changed that, those provisions at all. We do have the Enerwise program where we are loaning \$3,000, up to a maximum of \$3,000, repayable in five years, I believe it is.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clause 13 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 62 — An Act to amend The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, to my right, my Deputy Minister, Mr. Peter Grady, and behind me, Mr. Bert Sheasby, director of the safety services branch.

Clause 1

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I have read the bill. I do not have any objections to the contents of it. Indeed it would appear the changes appear to be, in part, housekeeping, and they appear to make sense.

Mr. Minister, the only question I have is: what consultation has taken place with the trade unions with respect to your board? Have they been kept informed? Have they had an opportunity to discuss it with you? What consultation has taken place?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, yes. We've had consultation with the professional and power engineers — meetings, letters, telephone calls — for some time now.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, I have no questions on the bill at all, really. I hope the bill works out, and I hope the board works out. I agree that it is probably an improvement over an appeal to the minister alone. The board is probably an improvement, and probably seen to be an improvement by those who would make use of it, so I really have no questions, Mr. Chairman, and we can, as far as I'm concerned speed through this committee of the whole.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I ask leave of the committee to revert to section 18 of Bill 67.

Bill No. 67 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Water Corporation Act

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — At a time like this, I wish there was somebody I could blame, but I have to take full responsibility.

When we dealt with the amendments to section 18 of the consequential act regarding the water Crown, Bill No. 67, there was a mistake made, and rather than amend the amendment, I would like to make the following motion:

That the votes with respect to Bill 67 to adopt section 18 as amended, and to adopt the amendment to section 18 be declared null and void.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to withdraw the previous amendments, and as well, I would like to move that section 18 of the printed bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

18(1) The Water Users Act is amended in the manner set forth in this section.

(2) Clause 2(b) is repealed and the following substituted:

(b) “minister” means the member of the Executive Council to whom for the time being the administration of this Act is assigned.

Section 10 amended.

(3) Clause 10(1)(a) is repealed and the following substituted: (a) apply . . . Pardon me, Mr. Chairman.

(a) apply in the name and for the benefit of any or all of its members for the rights to use water pursuant to The Water Corporation Act.

(4) Subsection 39(1) is amended by striking out “Subject,” substituting:

Subject to The Water Corporation Act.

And section 44 is amended.

(5) Section 44 is amended by striking out “Water Rights Act and regulations thereunder” and substituting:

Water Corporation Act and approvals pursuant to the act.

I think that is all.

Mr. Chairman: — There is before the committee a motion moved by the Minister of Energy. Does the committee wish to have the motion read?

Mr. Koskie: — I was wondering, in view of the unusual procedure that has been adopted, and with some difficulty that we've had in being able to follow this, this foul-up, I was wondering whether the minister could briefly explain the implications of the amendment that he has now passed by a motion. Could you briefly outline to us, very succinctly and briefly, what, in fact, you're attempting to do with the amendment as proposed?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I will try to keep this within the realm of the intellect of the member who asked the question. The Water Users Act is now amended so that it is in keeping with The Water Corporation Act.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, that helps us very much. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the minister for that very clear and this succinct explanation.

Motion agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 19 — An Act respecting Building and Accessibility Standards and the Inspection of Buildings

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, it's the same officials that I had before.

Clause 1

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I would admit that the amendments which you have

tabled, and which I understand you are going to be proceeding with, are an improvement over the bill as originally tabled. We will have improvements to suggest, but nevertheless I will admit what you have tabled is an improvement.

What I do not understand is how on earth it could have taken you so long to have come up with a bill which is not substantially different than what your colleague, the member from Regina South introduced when in opposition; not substantially different from what the former Attorney General introduced, and which all 8 of your, or 17 or whatever it was, of your former colleagues voted for.

Mr. Minister, I do not understand how it could have taken you two years to decide if you were going to go with something substantially the same as what you agreed with when in opposition. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, if at this point in time you have any explanation for the delay. It apparently had little to do with consultation because virtually all of the groups involved have complained in the beginning that you haven't consulted with them. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can give us some explanation for the inordinate delay of bringing this forward?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe I answered the member opposite during estimates. The handicapped waited for ten years from you people and never had any indication of an act whatsoever. Within a year and a half, at least we tabled something — after a lot of consultation, by the way.

An Hon. Member: — It's exactly the same as we had then.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — The building code is part of it now. That wasn't in your previous act or my member, the minister, Mr. Rousseau. We spent a lot of consultation. We had to go through a lot of things because it was new to myself. We had new people on board. We did a lot of talking to people of the provincial committee on accessibility, the Voice of the Handicapped, the CNIB, and it went on, and on, and on. We did meet a lot of people.

And I might say that we continued to do that after the bill got first reading last December where we held hearings around the province in January, 'cause we knew that we couldn't satisfy everyone. The demands of one group were different to the demands of another. The provincial committee, even their own members, some of them refused to sign that document and the study that they did. So there was even differences of opinion within the committee themselves.

Following those hearings we made more amendments — made the amendments which we felt was going to satisfy the various groups. And I'm pleased to say that that is what's happened. And the fact that it took us 18 months to two years, I'm not making any apologies whatsoever.

And the reason I say that is because we have agreement in principle from all the interest groups right now, instead of people not being satisfied. And if it means waiting a couple of years to get that kind of co-operation with the people out there, I'll take two years.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, what were you listening to — the Howdy Doody Show? I don't understand.

If you took a year and a half, how could you have introduced a bill so badly flawed as the one of December, which met the satisfaction of no one? How on earth, if you spent a year and a half consulting, could you have ever brought forth that bill in December, which I suggest should have disgraced you, and did, indeed, alarm virtually everyone connected with the field.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would say that it wasn't Howdy Doody input. It was a lot of input from a lot of people out there that are handicapped. And they all have various concerns — many, many concerns. And we're not going to be able to look after it all in one bill. There's going to be a lot of time spent in writing regulations as well, and the fact that we have

letters commending us for what we've done now, compared to what we were hearing a year ago or six months ago . . . I feel very good about what has all happened now, and we've got the groups onside. We're working as a group to get the balance of the job done, and that's what I call co-operation.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, what concerns me is that you might be as slow and as incompetent in drafting the regulations as you have the bill, and I wonder, Mr. Minister . . . Mr. Minister, it has at times past been the practice of not only the former administration, but administrations before that, when they introduced a bill where regulations played a significant part of it, to table the regulations with the bill, and then the Legislative Assembly got a complete picture of what we were voting for.

That isn't the practice of this government because you haven't got the regulations drafted yet. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could give us any idea what process is going to be used in drafting the regulations, and consulting with people, and how long you think that'll take.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we are starting something that is maybe a bit unique, as far as regulations and that is concerned. We'll be announcing, probably tomorrow, if it didn't go out this afternoon, where we have formed a committee of representatives from all the interest groups, or covering the majority of the interest groups. Those people have been chosen today, and they will be writing the regulations for us as a recommendation for our consideration by my caucus and cabinet colleagues. And they are feeling very good about that too, I might add, Mr. Chairman, that they will have some input as far as the regulations are concerned.

And I'll read some of the names: Mr. Ron Kuzeniski, commissioner of the human rights; Ms. Pat Danforth, Voice of the Handicapped; Joan Blanchette, provincial accessibility committee; Mr. Ken McKinlay of HUDAC; Lawrence Hladun of the city of Regina, with the building and properties department; and Leo Freis of the Saskatchewan Construction Association; plus an independent chairman, Mr. Les Prosser, who has a legal background.

And the only person involved in the committee from the government side is going to be my liaison officer, Mr. Lorne Schaeffer, who will be responsible, after it's all passed, to come with the awareness program to cover the whole province of Saskatchewan, so that contractors, the architects, the people of Saskatchewan, and the various handicapped groups will know what the whole act is about.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, I can only hope that you proceed to draft the regulations in a more competent fashion than you proceeded with the bill. I only hope that you don't put handicapped people, the province, and this legislature through the incredible circus, with respect to the regulations, that you put us through with respect to the bill. I hope, Mr. Minister, you've turned over a new leaf, and you've learned the error of your ways.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, I just finished telling the member opposite that the committee's in place, and I'm sure they'll be getting on with the job in the next few days, as far as I know.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — With respect to section 2, there are various amendments to section 2, and other sections. The amendments contain eight pages. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendments with the sections?

An Hon. Member: — Yes, but not until we see them, Mr. Chairman. May I have a copy of it?

Mr. Chairman: — I hadn't realized you didn't have a copy, and I certainly will have one sent over.

Mr. Shillington: — Okay. I think, Mr. Chairman, I will not be objecting to the amendment as such. I will have one of my own when these pass, but I do not object to these amendment as such.

Mr. Chairman: — Are the members prepared to take the amendments as read?

Carried.

Clause 2

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the definition of “accessibility,” of “accessible,” is not, indeed, in the act; nor is it, I see, in the amendments. And I believe, Mr. Minister, that the act should contain a definition of “accessible.” There is no definition now in the act of “accessible.” There is a definition of “accessibility standards,” but nothing that’s “accessible.” That word, I suppose, Mr. Minister, might await defining in the regulations, but it strikes me, Mr. Minister, that the word itself should have been amended in the bill. Mr. Minister, one of the groups which has supported this position is the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.

I’m moving an amendment, Mr. Minister, and I’ll read it to you. I don’t have copies for you, and I wonder if I might get the page to make copies of these. I have additional amendments. This one, unfortunately, I have no copy of, so we’ll have to proceed without it. I believe though, Mr. Minister, the act should contain the definition. I think we should define “accessible.” If we don’t, much of the value of this legislation, and much of the hopes that have been pinned on it may be lost.

The amendment which I’m going to move, Mr. Minister, reflects the amendment which was proposed by the human rights commission. I, therefore, move, seconded by the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that section 2 of the printed bill be amended by inserting the following:

- (a) “accessible” means the accommodation of various elements into the built environment to allow entrance to, egress from and use of buildings, grounds, and facilities by the physically disabled in accordance with the accessibility standards;

as subsection (a) and renumbering subclauses (a) to (n) as (b) to (o).

I so move, seconded by the member of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

We now, I guess, don’t have a page left in the room.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I would ask leave of the Assembly . . . Order. I would ask leave of the committee to move back to clause 2. This amendment comes before the House amendment. Is that agreed? Carried.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, “access” is not in the bill, so it really doesn’t need to be defined, and we feel that it is adequately covered in section 11(1). The human rights commissioner will be on the committee that is going to be writing the recommendations of the regulations, and it can be defined in regulations.

Mr. Shillington: — I’m not here to make this, to turn this into a holy war, Mr. Minister. Suffice it to say that if the word “accessible” were in the legislation, it would set a minimum standard beyond which the regulations couldn’t go. Without the definition in the act, Mr. Minister, I think there are no limits to which the intent of a legislation can be watered down by a government which has no sympathy for the thrust of the bill.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, that it was part of the first version of the act. The definition surely cannot

be something you don't agree with. It sets a minimum standard beyond which no government can water down the act, and I suggest, Mr. Minister, that it is a worthwhile addition to the bill. It was suggested by your own human rights commission, and it ought to be adopted.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite aware of the human rights commission's last few recommendations that they made.

But on our looking at the bill, we feel that 11(1) covers it:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing accessibility standards requiring the combination of various elements of the built environment to allow entrance to, egress from and use of buildings, grounds, and facilities by the physically disabled.

And we feel that if it can be covered in regulations, I'm sure the committee will put it into regulations as a recommendation.

Amendment negated on division.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 6

Mr. Chairman: — Will the committee accept the amendment as read?

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — Clause 7 has an amendment. Do I have leave to revert back to clause 7? Is leave granted? Agreed.

Clause 7 as amended agreed to.

Clause 9 as amended agreed to.

Clause 10

Mr. Shillington: — I have an amendment to clause (1) and I guess you do as well. All right. I shall let your amendment go first. I think yours has to precede mine, so I'll allow the minister's to go first and then I'll move mine, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, one of the shortcomings in this legislation is that it does not appear to cover renovations, as distinct from the construction of new buildings. And, Mr. Minister, we think it should.

In no doubt, some renovations do not lend themselves to any consideration of whether or not the renovation is accessible to handicapped, but certainly some do. I think most do. Even relatively simple things — putting in a new sink or new washroom facilities — do lend themselves to considerations of whether or not the renovation which is being done is accessible to the handicapped.

Mr. Minister, I suspect that this was an oversight in drafting the legislation. I think it was. I am sure it was assumed that renovations to the extent that it's reasonable would be, would meet the standards of this legislation. And I suggest, Mr. Minister, that the legislation ought to be amended and I move, seconded by the hon. member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, that subsection (1) be amended by adding the following after "standards":

And any alteration, repair, or renovation is required to meet the accessibility standards.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this section is to specify which buildings the accessibility standards apply to, and it seems to do that in our mind, in the bill. We have no argument about renovations taking place if it is a bathroom, a washroom, and a fellow is renovating that apartment building for example, that he would, in fact, make those changes in his renovations. And the regulations may amplify any meaning pursuant to that section 11(2), so in our mind the intent is there, and we don't think that it's necessary to make any change to that clause.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I cannot for the life of me see why you're being so obstinate, Mr. Minister. You say that you intend renovations to be included. In my humble opinion, in my humble view, the scope of the act may not be broad enough to allow regulations to require that all renovations meet these standards. I think you may not be able to do that in the regulations, Mr. Minister. You say that it is your intention to include renovations. Why don't you make that clear, Mr. Minister? Why be so obstinate? Why pretend that you're infallible and can make no mistakes? Not even, Mr. Minister, not even I claim that. I don't know why, Mr. Minister, you should. I know it's false modesty, but not even I claim that. Mr. Minister, I would suggest that these renovations, they make sense, you say it as what you intended; why not improve the act, pass the amendments and get on?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion I think we've exactly said that in section 10(1), where we say all building have to meet the accessibility standards . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It doesn't matter. We are saying renovations in the various clauses, and saying all buildings. Subject to subsection (2), "the owner of each building in Saskatchewan shall ensure that the buildings meets"; the accessibility standards. All buildings.

Mr. Shillington: — But, Mr. Minister, you don't say all renovations. And the act is not clear, and you cannot pretend it is, Mr. Minister. If you say you intended it, why don't you include it, Mr. Minister? Why be so obstinate? You can't claim to have been perfect. Anyone who brought in the bill last December can't claim to have been perfect. You must admit you're capable of mistake. Why don't you admit that this was an oversight, agree to the amendment, and get on with the bill?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we are very confident that the clause covers what the member opposite is concerned about, and also the human rights. And if, in fact, it's a problem down the road, it's not etched in stone and we can change it. But in our feeling that that clause covers all buildings, and that would include renovations.

Amendment negated on division.

Clause 10 as amended agreed to.

Clause 11 as amended agreed to.

Clause 12

Mr. Chairman: — There's a House amendment to clause 12. Will you take it as read?

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, here I have my most serious quarrel with your legislation. This, Mr. Minister, I do feel strongly about. I think, Mr. Minister, unless you adopt this amendment, the appeal process is neither going to be fair, nor will it be seen to be fair.

Mr. Minister, your current legislation appears to give only property owners status before the appeal board. Mr. Minister, it might occur to you that others may feel themselves aggrieved by the way in which this legislation is enforced and the way which it is expanded by regulations.

Mr. Minister, I would suggest to you that an appeal ought to be available to everybody, and everybody ought to be able to appear on an appeal. That is the way the human rights legislation works. By and large, with some exceptions, it has worked well. People have felt the process to be fair, and I think that the process which the human rights commission has used has gone a good deal towards promoting an understanding of human rights. And I suggest, Mr. Minister, if this legislation were better drafted in a similar fashion, by allowing all interested parties to appear, you might well be able to accomplish the same thing.

So I'm once again going to move, seconded by the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg:

That subsection 12(2) of the amendment be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Upon receipt of an application mentioned in subsection (1), the appeal board shall give 20 days notice to interested parties prior to the consideration of the application, and shall allow interested parties to make written or oral representations to the appeal board. Within 30 days of consideration of an application mentioned in subsection (1), the appeal board shall render its decision in writing.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! Order! The question before the committee is the amendment by the member from Regina Centre, seconded by the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. Will the members take it as read? Is the committee ready for the question?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, in the act, the appeal board may establish rules of procedure respecting the hearing of appeals before it, and it has the power of commissioners pursuant to The Public Inquiries Act.

They have the option of — that they may wish to give status to an interested group to come and appear at a hearing. Our fear is that there could be no end of delays in the construction of jobs, because of appeals going on days after days after days. And we feel that the interest groups have the opportunity to hear if the appeal board so wishes to have them appear at that hearing. And we feel that this is much better than saying it's mandatory that they have that appeal at every time.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, the process has worked well with the human rights commission. I think it's nothing more than finding someone competent to sit on the appeal board, as I think you have done with the human rights commission.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, it's worked with the human rights commission. I don't understand why the Minister of Justice can make it work on the human rights commission, but you apparently can't make it work on the appeal board. The processes are very similar. What is it, Mr. Minister, that the Minister of Justice has — what special wisdom does he have — that is not available to you?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I still think that if we give everybody the right to be appealing all the time, we will never get anywhere. And as I said, section 7 there, gives the appeal board the opportunity to allow — may give them status if they so wish to attend any particular hearing.

Amendment negated on division.

Clause 13 as amended agreed to.

Clause 13

Mr. Chairman: — There's a House amendment to clause 13:

Strike out section 13 of the printed bill.

Clause 13 as amended agreed to.

Clause 14

Mr. Chairman: — Clause 14, House amendment:

Strike out section 14 of the printed bill.

Clause 14 as amended agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, it's very difficult to hear in . . . Order. It's very difficult to conduct the business of the committee with so much noise in the Assembly.

Clause 15

Mr. Chairman: — Order. There's a House amendment to section 15 of the printed bill:

Renumber section 15 of the printed bill as section 13.

Clause 15 as amended agreed to.

Clause 16

Mr. Chairman: — There's a House amendment re section 16 of the printed bill. Will you take it as read?

Clause 16 as amended agreed to.

Clause 17

Mr. Chairman: — There's a House amendment to section 17.

Clause 17 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 28 inclusive as amended agreed to.

Clause 29

Mr. Shillington: — I don't think that's technically right; I think it's now subsection 28. It doesn't matter though. I do want to ask the minister, but I think technically the coming into force section is now 28, not 29. I didn't rise specifically to correct you though, Mr. Minister. I wanted to ask the Minister: what is your target date for having this legislation proclaimed, in force, and in effect?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, I guess my answer to the member opposite would be

just as quickly as the committee can get their regulations, recommendations to us, my caucus and cabinet colleagues to approve them, and I've assured the interest groups that that will be with all haste. They are anxious to see it in place and I'm sure they'll give us all their co-operation to make it happen. So, it'll be happening very, very quickly.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, you frighten me. In the past you have given us specific commitments by fall — at the fall session, almost immediately. And that has turned out to be a year and a half. Now, when you are butterflying around saying, “Well, sometime soon, as soon as we can do it,” you really frighten me, Mr. Minister. I'm only 390 years of age, and I may not live to see this thing introduced. And I would like to before I go the next world. It's taken you a year and a half to date, Mr. Minister. I really wished . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I really wished, Mr. Minister, that you would establish a specific time.

I also want to say, Mr. Minister, as a parting comment, I want to wish you all the luck in the world drawing up the regulations. After the incredibly incompetent manner in which you've proceeded with this bill to date, you're going to need all the luck you can get. And for the sake of the handicapped people out there, I really hope you have it.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned to the member opposite, maybe it doesn't happen as quickly as he would like to think. But, at least it came in two years, and that's more than you did in 10. And I've got every confidence that the committee will do their job. We've got some people to hire to get in our own department. We've got work ahead of us. But I can assure you that the bill will be in place. And the various interest groups are happy that finally they've gotten an accessibility and building code standards in place.

Mr. Shillington: — I'll make you a bet, Mr. Minister. I'll make you abet that when the session resumes next year, one of the questions I'm going to be asking you in question period is: where are the regulations for the accessibility act? I'll bet you a year from now, I'm asking you for them, Mr. Minister. I hope I'm wrong, but I'll bet you I'm not.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the member's question.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, I would ask the committee to report the bill as amended. And, Mr. Chairman, if I may at this time, I would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Health from Indian Head-Wolseley:

That the Committee of the Whole under rule 54, that the Bill No. 19 be reprinted as amended.

Motion agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 42 — An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill now be

read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend The Education Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 64 — An Act to provide for the establishment and Maintenance of Public Libraries

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and be passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 48 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and be passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 56 — An Act respecting Medical Radiation Technologists

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 72 — An Act respecting the Practice of Physical Therapy

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Constitutional Questions Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 68 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments be now read a first and second time, very quickly.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 69 — An Act to amend The Liquor Consumption Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

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

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I move that the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 53 — An Act to amend The Wildlife Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 52 — An Act to amend The Department of Parks and Renewable Resources Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 73 — An Act to establish the Water Appeal Board

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

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

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend The Industrial Development Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 43 — An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 62 — An Act to amend The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 67 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Water Corporation Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 19 — An Act respecting Building and Accessibility Standards and the Inspection of Buildings

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Before I call the first item of business in the committee of finance, I'd come back to the ruling from last night.

On Monday, May 28, 1984, during review of Executive Council estimates in committee of finance, a point of order was raised by the Minister of Finance that the member from Shaunavon had said the word "bloody" and this was an unparliamentary expression.

I deferred my ruling at that time. I've reviewed the verbatim transcripts of last night's proceeding and find that, in fact, the member from Shaunavon did say the word "bloody".

I have reviewed *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, page 105 and onward, and find the word "bloody" has not been considered unparliamentary by the Canadian House of Commons.

Order!

I find that the use of the word was not any more unparliamentary than many of the other words and actions which took place last night. In view of this, I want to reprimand many members of both sides of the House for the outbursts last night.

Even though certain words and expressions have not been ruled out, this does not mean that these words enhance the debate or improve the public image of this institution. I'm afraid last night's debate did not improve parliament's image, and I ask all hon. members to make a conscious effort to raise the level of debate and decorum in this committee.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 46

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

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to introduce my officials. On my right, sitting beside me, is the general manager, Wayne Funk; sitting directly in front of me is Mr. Merv Ross, director of research; and on my right, in front of me, is Jim Walters, administrator.

Item 1

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, have you had a reorganization of the crop insurance staff? How long has the member you introduced been general manager?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — The general manager took over his duties on February 1st.

Mr. Engel: — I was wondering if you could answer the entire question that I asked.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — What was the question?

Mr. Engel: — Have you had a major overhaul or reorganization?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, in the crop insurance office on Albert Street, he is the only staff that has changed — just the general manager, no one else. There might have been addition or two, but no temporary staff that I'm not involved with, but he is only change.

Mr. Engel: — Crop insurance touches a lot of farmers and deals directly with them and the people out in the field. Have you had a major overhaul in that regard as far as field personnel are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — No.

Mr. Engel: — How many people have changed? And if you don't call that major, how many field and area representatives have changed?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question, there would be . . . In the North Battleford office, the supervisor left the community and we moved a gentleman called Mr. Erickson, who has always been working for crop insurance for many years, in there as supervisor. And at the Yorkton office, we had a change there.

Mr. Engel: — What about Swift Current office?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, in the Swift Current office we gave early retirement to somebody who had four — Mr. Lautermilch, I believe his name was — four months.

Mr. Engel: — And only other office I guess left, is Yorkton. Have you had any change there?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — If you had listened, Mr. Chairman, if the member had've listened, I said Yorkton.

Mr. Engel: — Oh, so basically each of your area managers were changed or shifted around.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, the gentleman we had working as a supervisor in the Kinderlsey office has been working for crop insurance since back in the 60's, maybe even sooner than that — I'm not sure of the exact date — a long time. He moved to Swift Current.

We moved a long-term worker for crop insurance to take the Kindersley position. And as I said, the other two positions: Yorkton, a long-term crop insurance adjuster moved into that position; and in North Battleford, that person left the community, and we brought in a long-term crop insurance adjuster to take that position. And, Mr. Chairman, and Hon. Minister, in Tisdale office there was no change whatsoever.

Mr. Engel: — It's very interesting that you left one office the way it was and changed all the others and said that" not a major overhaul or a major change in your top personnel. The people that put in place the adjusters and the field men, people that contact directly with farmers, those that are involved in seeing who does what, were all moved around a little bit, and in the direction.

And when you move people around in an administrative capacity as yours, how long would it take you tonight to assure this House and the people of Saskatchewan that you're not trying to make crop insurance political?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question, there are six regional offices in this province. And I'll go through each one of them: in Weyburn, there's been no change; in Yorkton, there was a change; in Tisdale, there was no change; and in North Battleford, I cannot help, Mr. Hon. Member, that someone left the community so we had to move someone in, and I am not to blame; and in Swift Current, that the gentleman there was ready to be retired automatically on December 31st.

So the request did not come from me, Mr. Chairman. The request came from the gentleman from Kindersley, who his home town area was in the Swift Current area, working for crop insurance for 20-some years, made the request. Can I move it to the Swift Current area when Mr. Lautermilch retires? I said: yes, we have to make some adjustments now in the North Battleford area, in the Kindersley area — all started because one person left.

Now, I don't think that's political. And it is absolutely not.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, you move competent people around, you pushed people into place from your own constituency or from wherever they came.

Who did you let go at Yorkton, and can you give us reasons for that dismissal?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — We let a man by the name of Mr. Lekness go from Yorkton, and we brought in a long-time field person. We brought in a long-time field person to take his position. And I will not be answering one question in concerning Mr. Lekness because it is now in the courts. And that is all I'm going to be answering.

Mr. Engel: — How long had Mr. Lekness been working for crop insurance?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Eleven years, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Engel: — In these 11 years, were there people in Yorkton area not getting proper coverage in insurance or were field men in place that weren't doing their job? Have you a cause for firing this person?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — I answered your question, Mr. Hon. Member, that the gentleman worked for 11 years for crop insurance. And any further information whatsoever will not be answered by men, because this case is in the courts.

Mr. Engel: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think you should be doing like the hon. minister that is in charge of SGI when you let people go without cause. What about the general manager? How long had Mr. Campbell been working for crop insurance?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Campbell was working for crop insurance from 1973.

Mr. Engel: — In the 10 years he served as putting crop insurance in place, did crop insurance grow, or expand, or was it going backwards? Give us a little 10-year history of Saskatchewan Crop Insurance.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — In my view, Mr. Chairman, crop insurance started back sometime in the '60s, and it's been growing ever since. And we expect it to grow much more. This year is the, I guess the largest growth we've had for quite a few years. It's going to keep on growing as long as we show need to the farmers.

Mr. Engel: — How many contracts were in effect, and how many had the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Board written, say, in the year 1973? How many were in place at that time?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — In 1973, there was 24,000.

An Hon. Member: — In 1981, how many?

Mr. Engel: — My colleague has asked a question — 1981?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — In 1981, there was 46,000.

Mr. Engel: — Did you have farm groups, like the SARM or the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, or commodity groups like Sask Wheat Pool, or did you have any organization officially coming to you and saying that Mr. Campbell wasn't doing an excellent job? Superb, top management, just the best around?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — As I said before, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member, these cases are before the courts and I'll be answering nothing that has any connection, so it will not endanger the courts for the sake of Mr. Campbell, for the sake of Mr. Campbell. If you want to pursue it, that's you doing it.

Mr. Engel: — Did your officials fire Mr. Campbell, or did you do it yourself? Or how did you terminate Campbell's position?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I will not be answering that question because those are pertinent questions that are in the courts.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chairman, we had, in Saskatchewan, an insurance company that was funded by the federal government, administered by the province of Saskatchewan — that was one area dealing with farmers that was apolitical.

We had a member — I would challenge anybody on that side of the House to tell me what politics Mr. Campbell was. I would challenge them. I would challenge them to stand up and tell me that he was politically oriented. This was a man that administered a crop insurance that more than doubled in a short time, funded by the federal government — acceptable to the federal government; acceptable to the provincial government; acceptable to the rural communities; acceptable every which way; and you left him go. You left him go, Mr. Minister.

And I think your presence in the crop insurance field . . . I know we had a chance and we've reviewed many of these questions before Crown corporations. And I appreciate that the staff were there, that the minister stretched the lenience of the Crown Corporations Committee and answered a lot of questions in the committee that we're duplicating, we're duplicating tonight.

And I think there are some specific areas that the people of Saskatchewan really want to know

about and are really concerned about. And I think that now that we have a minister, how many staff people have you in your office — secretaries, EAs? How many people like that have you got working for you that help you administer this little political operation you're trying to make crop insurance into?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — I have three, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, including my secretary, including my secretary.

Mr. Engel: — Could you give us the names, the positions and what they do, and how much they get?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, I'll be sending a copy over to you.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to another one of his questions with insinuations that we are making this a political corporation, I just have one statement to make on that to the people of this here Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan to hear.

When we formed government in 1980, April, 1982, in the first year, the Premier received many, many letters of complaints of the past government for 11 years making this a political program throughout this province. And when he split agriculture and gave crop insurance to me, he said, "I want you to make this a complete non-political insurance company".

And as I stand here, I will make this a complete non-political corporation, and will be run as if . . . it's not a mandate like the way you people run your Crown corporations. It'll be run as if there is an opposition next door. And that's the way we're going to run crop insurance corporation.

Mr. Engel: — You know, the minister is treading on some very slippery ground. I think the Speaker would call it: you're standing on some loose ground, Mr. Minister.

Here you have a staff: ministerial assistant IV getting \$3,740 a month, Gerald Williams; an assistant III, Debbie Marcyniuk, \$3,051 a month; Louise Lafontaine, \$1,874 a month. Mr. Minister, you're spending \$100,000 a year on staff members to do something that the Minister of Agriculture could do, along with his department, run it efficient like it has been in the past.

Now maybe this minister can't. Maybe this minister can't. But I know a lot of ministers of agriculture, Gordon MacMurchy, Edgar Kaeding, and Jack Messer, built those organizations when they doubled their coverage they . . . (inaudible) . . .

When I first got elected, Mr. Minister, when I first got elected, you couldn't buy crop insurance in our area. It wasn't available. And that grew from a zero, to today where there are people buying insurance, and they have some hope in spite of these programs, in spite of your lack of initiative and enthusiasm to help farmers. They have some hope and some security.

I'm not sure, with this \$100,000 staff — with this \$100,000 staff besides your own, besides your own . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 70,000 he says. It's 170,000 bucks. Mr. Minister, you're trying to tell me that's not political, that you're not using those people to make some political input? You're involved in firing key people that were doing a good job. You're firing some key people. You're putting some salesmen in place that aren't contacting the farmers any more. You're letting it run on their own.

Now the rumours we're hearing around and the information that's coming up — you're planning on making some major changes to the kind of insurance you're doing. What are these changes? Would you please spell out what are some of the things you're looking at? And what directions are you planning on taking the crop insurance?

We had some discussion with the Premier last night. It got a little loud. Some of you people were

getting very uncomfortable and nervous and were interrupting us and making it difficult to make ourselves heard. And the Premier was coming back with some answers that the farmers are phoning me today and saying, "Boy, when it's cool, the grass grows better than when it's hot," and quite contrary to what your minister was saying. But aside from how good the grass grows, I'm wondering what changes are you planning in crop insurance.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Firstly, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member, the hon. member says I'm sitting on loose and dangerous ground. That is not a fact, and he knows right well that if any staff that I have extra to look after crop insurance would just be that much less staff from the Department of Agriculture. And he knows right well that there's only so much work that a person does. We run a very efficient office, and everybody's working.

And I'll just . . . Seeing the hour is getting late, Mr. Speaker, I won't dwell any more on that, but I'll talk about some of the plans. But, Mr. Chairman, it looks like he's not interested, only. . . he's not even listening.

But we have in 1984, for the 1985 crop, we have included winter wheat which will be insurable. We have had the concept and generalities passed for individual coverage for crop insurance for 1985, but we have a problem with the final policies because our board has passed it 100 per cent. The farmers of Saskatchewan that I have visited throughout the area offices want individual coverage. But the stone wall we've run into right now — we hope it's just temporary — has been with our counterpart, the Hon. Mr. Whelan, who has to put his rubber stamp on all changes of policy, and that's where we're sitting right now. That's where we're sitting now, Mr. Chairman.

We are also looking, Mr. Chairman, at spot loss flood coverage for stubble crop. We're also looking for an increase in coverage. Naturally, if we're going to do a job for all these thousands of farmers, which is a large percentage of the farmers of Saskatchewan, we're looking at all programs, anything possibly. We will take recommendations from people from this side of the House and from that side of the House and from all farmers in Saskatchewan to improve the crop insurance program for all farmers in Saskatchewan.

But you must understand, and I want all people in Saskatchewan to understand, that it's 50 per cent covered by our federal counterparts. Until they sign on the dotted line, we can't obtain these things. We need your help to help and your backing to help sustain these things. We don't need you to go down there and go against us which you have before. If you hadn't of went against before, we would have a different government in power. So we're asking you right now, if we can't get these things done, Mr. Chairman, if we can't get these things to happen through the government we have in Ottawa today, the present Minister of Agriculture, then we ask you to help us change that government so that we can get what we want.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, you're accusing the opposition of having some muscle in Ottawa. Would you run that by me again? What did we present Ottawa from doing and how and when?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, I've had several meetings with our counterparts in Ottawa, and they do not seem to understand the conditions of the farmers in western Canada, which you've said that yourselves. But why? And where I'm blaming you people is why did your counterparts, the NDP in Ottawa, help defeat the Clark government? And if that hadn't happened, we would be in a much better situation.

Mr. Engel: — Well, Mr. Minister, I kind of think I could point my finger, and I would name at least 20 people that helped defeat Clark when he had your party up at 56 per cent. I can name quite a few people and I see the guilty looks . . . (inaudible) . . . The blood's dripping from their fingers, Mr. Minister.

Every time we get a leader from the West that looks as though he could accomplish something,

your friends that are controlling the capital resources of this country dump him. Dalton Camp knew what to do with Diefenbaker when he was doing a good job.

If you need a lesson leadership, my dear friend, we didn't defeat Joe Clark when he finally went to the polls. There's an awful lot of people in Saskatchewan did . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You raised the issue. Don't you stop me on this one. Because he said that we defeated Joe Clark. We didn't. And if the minister thinks, if the minister thinks . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . If the minister thinks that Joe Clark and his troupe would have implemented an individual insurance policy, I, for one, am glad he was defeated.

If you are trying to tell me the farmers in southern Saskatchewan want individual insurance coverage, then you're talking to farmers who don't have any insurance at all. Because the only reason we've got insurance coverage is so that we can match up our losses with all the rest of the farmers, and the federal government who pays not 50 per cent. Mr. Minister, you tried to inform this House that you're in charge of something that's 50 per cent of the premiums. I beg to tell you that after . . . I don't know how long you've been a cabinet minister, but you better get those numbers straightened out because that is not the premium coverage.

The province of Saskatchewan pays for the administration, period! And the premium coverage is an administration that's paid entirely, the premium coverage is paid entirely by the federal counterpart. All you're doing is responsible for the bodies you have in place trying to get out there and using your office to sell political gain and make it a political thing. Now, if you say that insurance is good when you rent it up as individual coverage, what are you going to do next? Where are you going with this insurance that's been working? Where are you going, Mr. Minister?

This year, in southern Saskatchewan, if you don't know what's happening, it is dry. It is dry. It's so dry that if one of the farmers get out of his tractor and spits, he spits dust, it's so dry. There is three or four inches of top soil across southern Saskatchewan that has zero amount of moisture. And those indications are — the submoisture's not bad; the crops germinated pretty nice. The crops germinated pretty nice, Mr. Minister, but the chances of collecting this year are pretty good. The chances of collecting. People are pretty happy that they have crop insurance because they know they can get some coverage.

That isn't the case for my friends up at Hudson Bay area. That's not the case for them, and I'm going to get to that a little later on. I don't want you to comment on the Hudson Bay one because you'll get off the track of individual coverage. Why are you recommending individual coverage?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, that's a very, very easy question to answer. I've done something that the past ministers of agriculture have not done. I've covered this entire province visiting farmers. And they pay 50 per cent of the premiums; the federal government pays the other 50 per cent. And I intend to listen to farmers — of what they want.

And I have many farmers in your area, in your own area, that want to go into continuous cropping. They want to irrigate, and it's no good to them the way the policy is today. If you are continuous cropping on marginal land in the north-east, in the east side of the province, and in the irrigated area and you can only insure stubble crop for 12 or \$13 an acre, it's no good to you. But individual coverage — they will be able to use their own yields over a five-year period. And that's what I call listening to the farmers and not listening to government.

I have not brought these ideas up, I never even suggested . . . brought the suggestion of individual coverage. I got it from the farmers as I went to the 32 area offices and visit with farm groups. And I had many . . . yes, I had your . . . I had many farm groups, including the farmers' union, the Sask Wheat Pool, the departments of agriculture from several different provinces, all saying that individual coverage is the way to move and almost every province in the province of Saskatchewan has moved to individual coverage. And so we have been behind and that's

because of the thinking of the past administration, Mr. Chairman. We've been behind in thinking.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chairman, I believe that crop insurance needs to be upgraded with the change in farm practice and the farm economy. I agree with that. But when you talk to farmers and you listen to the farmers that want individual coverage and that want their own unit taken into account and are looking for ways to reduce their crop insurance coverage, is that not one of the reasons why you've had some people that you fired, some of your local people, some of your main administrative people? Is that not what the debate was all about? When it really gets right down to brass tacks, is that not what the argument was all about? When it really gets ready to . . . and they argued with you and the former general manager created . . . got into an argument with you because he didn't believe in the concept of individual coverage. Is that why you fired him?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Fired who?

Mr. Engel: — The general manager.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — In answer to your question, absolutely no.

I don't think you understand, Mr. Hon. Member, what individual coverage is all about. There's where we have the problem with the feds. They want to bring individual coverage in and make it a blanket right across Saskatchewan — everybody forced to have individual coverage or not. And our board, the crop insurance board, endorsed by me, will not do that. We want to give the farmers a choice: stay the way they are or individual coverage. And that will not happen as long as I'm the minister responsible for the crop insurance corporation. Farmers will not be forced to do what they don't want to do.

Mr. Engel: — Well, Mr. Minister, some of the people opposite tell me I don't understand it. But I didn't believe I'd live long enough to see that even crop insurance . . . even crop insurance, the one thing that 90 per cent of the small farmers buy. A lot of the larger farmers don't buy crop insurance. But when you take the 80 per cent of farmers that are covered in crop insurance, you'll find that that represents the bulk of the small farmers, and the 20 per cent that aren't covered would represent larger farmers. I feel confident ion that, because I've talked to enough adjusters and enough people that are writing the insurance claims. And by taking in the size of farmers and the size of contracts you're covering, I think that that is an assessment of where it is happening.

Now you are listening to the people . . . you're listening to the people that have the bucks. You're listening to people that are looking at their crop insurance as an option like they'd buy options on the stock exchange or on the stock market. And they're looking at the thing and saying: "I'm investing \$6,000 in a crop insurance premium, and I can't even get coverage on the stuff I'm irrigating. And I can't even get coverage on that."

And you're listening to the people that are in it just for the almighty dollar. They're not interested in giving peace of mind to the young farmer. They're not interested in providing some coverage to pay their payments and make their commitments. You want to get it cut down, so that the big guy can make some money on it. And then the other guy can pay his own way. And if he isn't, is in a position to pay his own way, you're like the Minister of Agriculture says. You even fit in the cap of that weasel. You fit in the cap of that person.

That says that if you can't pay your own way, get out. We're going to shore up success. That's what you're doing in crop insurance. And if you don't understand that principle — why they want individual coverage — you haven't been listening to the farm groups that speak for the small farmers. I'd suggest it's time you go and visit a farmers' union meeting and listen to them describe what individual coverage is all about. And then you'll know what it's all about. Or better still, like my colleagues say, give up your \$100,000 staff and you're \$70,000 job, and give the farmers some protection. \$170,000 will help 10 farmers in Hudson Bay. Then we've got something.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, I can only add . . . My first comment is what the Premier said last night — that he thanks the good Lord that you're not the Minister of Agriculture. And I'd really believe that.

Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, you do not know how many hundreds of farmers I've talked to in this province about individual coverage. And I am yet, yet to find, and I challenge you to bring as many as you can. I ask you, if you can find people that's opposing individual coverage, but I'm yet to find one that doesn't say it's a good plan because we're not going to force people into it.

And you're made the accusations that it's for the rich and for the big farmer. I never head of individual coverage for the large farming area where I come from. And where you come from, until I got dwelling into it. But I'll tell you where it started from — is for the small farms in the east and north-east Saskatchewan where they're continuous cropping. We have farmers that have come to me with only a half section, maybe 300 and 400 acres of cultivated land, and saying, "We cannot input crop insurance on because it's no good to us. We have to have — by the time you use expensive chemicals and fertilizer, and this cost of continuous cropping is \$30 to \$40 an acre and some places up to 50 and 60, and we have to have more than 10, 12 bushels an acre on marginal land to even think of putting crop insurance on." So that is why we're looking at individual coverage.

It has come from the small farmer in Saskatchewan, not the large farmer in Saskatchewan, because if your farm is like my farm, we're probably half and half summer fallow, or close to it. We've been listening to the irrigated farmer that's going broke out there, and to the small farmer that in the north-east and eastern side of the province that is having a real problem. And I mean a serious problem. And I think the member understands that these people are having a serious problem with continuous cropping, and they're only small farmers.

And I will not stand here and have you accuse the corporation of saying that we're catering to large farmers because that is absolutely false — absolutely a false statement.

Mr. Engel: — I wish the conditions were still like they were three years ago, Mr. Minister, in the north-east. I have two headlines here, "Farmers in Big Trouble". The other headline, "Carrot River Farmers Near Financial Ruin", thanks to the minister in charge of crop insurance. You were unable to respond in three years.

We dealt with this situation with the Premier last night and went into detail. But these farmers are in serious trouble. They don't want your sympathy; they don't want your sympathy. Sure you can sympathize with them and suggest that they're in big trouble. They don't want your sympathy. Given ideal drying conditions, and absolutely no more rain before June 10, they may be able to get back on the land, and then they have to seed crops that are short duration and early germination. These people, what kind of coverage can they get after a third year? What kind of coverage can they get after the third year? What percentage are you prepared to come with your fancy program and under your good leadership?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, no one needs to, that will understand the situation in this province more than I would. I've been driving tractors back in the hard-up times and out when we didn't grow any crop. My first year of farming was 1949, when I had three bushels an acre, so I know about hard times, and I think the member opposite does, too. We've been through some hard times. So naturally, if the people in the north-east have lost two crops completely — they've lost two crops completely and perhaps losing their third — I don't know how you can blame the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Association.

And I want to correct the statement, I want to correct the statement that the Leader of the Opposition said to the Premier last night when he made the statement that in the first year of coverage that you'd be able to insure 70 per cent of the 100 per cent, and then you lose your

good farming practice and the second year would be 70 per cent of 70 per cent, then it would be 70 per cent of the last per cent, and down to practically nothing. Well that is absolutely a false statement, and I will give you an example.

The example would be that in your risk area, in the risk area, we'll say that coverage in the risk area, Mr. Chairman, would be \$80 per acre - \$80 per acre is what you're covered for. Now under a complete loss we'll say that they're insured, ask for 70 per cent coverage. You had the choice of 60 per cent or 70 per cent. So if he asked and was insured for 70 per cent, then he could collect on his first crop loss any place in Saskatchewan, be it in your area, be it in my area where they lost three years with drought, or up in the north-east where they lost a year with frost, and a year with flood, they would receive \$56 an acre. And it is a false statement, because the second year they would stay at the same \$56 an acre, and they third year it would stay exactly the same \$56 a year, or \$56 an acre.

Now keep in mind, I'm only using an example of this farmer that's insured for \$80 — some is more, some is less, and you understand that. There is no change for the first three years, but on the fourth year, if he's had three continuous years, he will take one drop. And the lowest he could drop would be 70 per cent of 70 per cent, which would give him 49 per cent of the original 70, which is the lowest he could be covered for is \$40 an acre, and no less. So what the Premier . . . What the Leader of the Opposition left the people of Saskatchewan thinking last night was absolutely wrong, and I wanted to correct that statement, and for the record.

Mr. Engel: — Are you challenging the fact that . . . Are you challenging the fact, Mr. Minister, that the farmers in eastern Canada have lost from a hundred thousand to three to four hundred thousand dollars in the last few years? Are you challenging the fact that 90 per cent of all the bins in the area were empty within a week after harvest? And are you challenging the fact that practically everybody had to buy their own seed this year? Are you saying that the conditions aren't that serious up in the Carrot River-Hudson Bay area?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — You sure like to put words in people's mouths, Mr. Chairman, because I never said such a thing, and you know I didn't say such a thing.

You soon got off the questions that we were talking about, because you knew I'd give you the right answer. And I want to tell you that that system for crop insurance has been exactly same with that sliding scale since 1970, through your administration. We haven't changed it. But what we did change, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member, is I had the police and the people from then north-east and throughout Saskatchewan that they could not pay their premium at the end of the 30th of April, 1984. So they were not going to be covered, and some were not covered for 1983. So we took post-dated cheques from these people — hundreds of them, hundreds of them in the province, and they are covered. They are covered for 1984 crop. Now, that's something your government was never passionate enough to do.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, you'd better get the little guy to help you out. He sure knows all the answers. He knows how to answer that question. And I can see where the Minister of Agriculture helped you, both that little guy and yourself and different ones that are up there.

And you know what the farmers say, and what they said publicly: "We got lots of sympathy, but that's all we got." I want to tell you, Mr. Member, that if there would have been a different government in place, those people in Carrot River would have never had that kind of trouble, because we would have done for them exactly the same as we did for the farmers in southern Saskatchewan when they didn't have hay.

What did we do when they didn't have hay? What did we do? We paid their freight to haul their cattle to pasture. We paid their freight to bring in feed. We didn't let them sit high and dry, like you're doing.

Today we have people that have trouble and you're doing nothing. Zero. And that's why they're in trouble. You didn't implement programs.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. It's getting very difficult to hear in the committee.

Mr. Engel: — There are members shouting louder than I am, Mr. Chairman, and it's getting hard on my voice.

Mr. Minister, those people at Carrot River should have never gotten in that kind of trouble, three years in a row when 90 per cent of them are facing bankruptcy and can't stay in farming. They should have never gotten into trouble. Your government should have acted with an emergency program when you have three floods in a row. You know that that never happened under our administration. We never let farmers get that bad off.

And you can tell me of all the changes you want to make in crop insurance in the world. That will never accommodate disasters or acts of God like they call it. That is something where you have to step in with a special program. You'll never design an insurance program to help with a situation that is a disaster, like when you have a drought, or when you have a flood. And you're lucky enough this year where the two of you got to handle a situation where we've got both. We've got floods in one corner of the province, and you're blessed with drought in another. I can't see why you're living like that. I think it's the way this government is acting that you're being punished. And I'm not calling that a joke. I think that's serious.

You should make some changes in your program that will accommodate some special help, and some special relief programs, and not try and make a coverage available. This wonderful thing you did with accepting an advance cheque, you know, that's post-dated to pay their premiums. What is that costing the province?

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, it doesn't cost the province any money at all.

Mr. Engel: — Well, why stand up and brag about it? If you were lucky enough to get the federal government to agree to that, but why — why are you charging the farmers 15 per cent when they're already in trouble and couldn't afford to pay their bill, not with the increased freight rates, increased everything else, you're still slapping on a 15 per cent penalty. Why stay in farming if you're going to make it that rough for them? Why not put up a few bucks, and give them the same kind of deal as the oil companies or everybody else gets?

When the oil companies are in trouble, you got \$300 million. When the farmers are in trouble you haven't got 10 cents. I think it's a disgrace.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the answer I got for that is when you and I had a private conversation about that, you said, "I hope to goodness you don't let them have it for nothing, cause it wouldn't be fair to the people that paid their crop insurance" . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

An Hon. Member: — I didn't say anything like . . . (inaudible) . . .

An Hon. Member: — You did so.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! Order! . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order! It's getting impossible to hear what's being . . . conducting the business of the committee.

Mr. Engel: — What that minister says, maybe it's better you wouldn't hear; maybe it's better you wouldn't hear, if he suggests I said any kind of program is better than that those farmers not get insurance.

But surely you could come up with something better than it cost you nothing. What kind of sacrifice is that? What kind of government have we got that gives nothing to farmers that for three years in a row couldn't pay their premiums? Couldn't pay their premiums!

And now all of a sudden he's got nothing for them. And the Minister of Agriculture sits in the front and thinks it's a joke, it's a laughing matter, when they have \$300 million for the oil companies, and they got nothing for farmers that are in trouble.

If those farmers would have some money, if they'd be some wealthy farmers, you know what they'd do? They'll give them a \$25,000 tax credit. That's what the minister implemented today. If they've got some money, you've got money. But if they're broke, and they're in trouble, you've got nothing for them.

And I think it's a disgrace to have a separate department. We wasted our time now, because we could have handled this in agriculture estimates. I think we just paid off a minister that did a political number for you, collected a couple of — 2,000 guys at a thousand dollars each, and got you some election money, so he got a post. That's all we got here — we got a pay-off.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — I tell you what we got, Mr. Chairman, we got several hundreds of people that are insured for this crop, and if you're against those people being insured, well, stand up and say so.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 46 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

SASKATCHEWAN CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION — Vote 161 — Nil Vote

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

SASKATCHEWAN CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 101

Item 1

Mr. Engel: — I decided I might have one thing I'd like to do, and I believe I could move an amendment to that, a motion.

I think that the minister is in much better shape financially than the farmers are at Carrot River. And I think until he comes up with some plan that will help the farmers at Carrot River, I think his salary should be reduced to \$1. And once he gets some help for the farmers at Carrot River, then he deserves the balance of his pay. And my colleague is writing up this motion for me at this time.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. This type of motion is moved on Item 1 of the main estimates, and it's not in order on the supplementaries.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, on you're ruling, Mr. Chairman, what I would like is an authority for the proposition that you cannot, in fact, move a resolution other than on the first subvote.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Every motion must be relevant. Order . . .

In *Beauchesne's* book, page 170, number 491: "No amendments can be moved which are not relevant to the Vote under consideration." . . .

Order, order. The only thing that's relative, that is permissible in committee, is an amendment, not a motion. No amendments can be moved which are not relevant to the vote under consideration.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, I accept that no amendment, but what we are doing here is a motion, and the relevant section which you are dealing with does not deal with the right of the members to move a motion.

This is a substantive motion, dealing with the evaluation of the member's quality of work. And I think that the member is certainly representing what the farmers of this province feel towards his effort, and certainly towards the farmers of Hudson Bay who are saying he'll do nothing. And what we want to do is to represent in this motion the value of this minister to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman: — Substantive motions . . .

Order! Order! Order!

Substantive motions are not allowed in Committee of Finance and, therefore, is out of order.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, the last ruling does surprise me. Section 491, from which you just read, said:

The procedure to be following by the standing committees while studying the Estimates follows the ordinary usage of a standing committee. No amendment can be moved which are not relevant to the Vote under consideration.

But correspondingly, amendments can be moved which are relevant.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest what you're doing is highly technical. It may be that with the specific item under consideration now, we can't move it, but we can move it at the end when we go to vote. The sum total of 6,538,000 . . . (inaudible) . . . we can move the amendment then. And I don't know why you insist on being so technical in not allowing it now.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 101 agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

MOTIONS

Additional Hours of Sitting

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — By leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by the member from Shaunavon, that notwithstanding rule no. 3, this Assembly shall, on Thursday, May 31, 1984, meet at 10 o'clock a.m. until 12 noon p.m., in addition to its regular meeting hours.

Mr. Speaker: — The member has asked for leave. Is leave granted?

An Hon. Member: — No, I don't agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Did you not agree to give the leave?

An Hon. Member: — I don't agree to give leave. No.

Mr. Speaker: — Leave was granted.

An Hon. Member: — I think require unanimous on a leave.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes . . . I didn't notice him on his feet. I'm sorry.

An Hon. Member: — I refuse leave.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been refused.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:45 p.m.