

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
June 1, 1984

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Crown Corporations

Deputy Clerk: — Mr. Gerich from the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations presents the fourth report of the said committee which is as follows:

Your committee has completed its consideration of reports of the following corporations outstanding from 1981 and 1982:

Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan (1981 and 1982)

Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan (1982)

Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation (1982)

Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation (1982)

Saskatchewan Power Corporation (1982)

Your committee has completed consideration of the 1983 reports of the following corporations:

Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation

Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation

Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation

Saskatchewan Government Printing Company

Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation

Saskatchewan Telecommunications

Saskatchewan Transportation Company

Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation

Agricultural Development Corporation

Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan

Saskatchewan Government Insurance

Saskatchewan Water Supply Board

Sask Oil and Gas Corporation

Saskatchewan Minerals

Municipal Financing Corporation

It is your committee's intention to complete the examination of the reports of the following corporations before the end of the current session:

Saskatchewan Housing Corporation

Saskatchewan Development Fund

Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation

Crown Management Board

Saskatchewan Power Corporation

During 24 meetings totalling more than 63 hours in the current session, your committee worked diligently to deal with many important matters relating to Crown corporations of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Gerich: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move a motion by myself, and seconded by the member from Shaunavon:

That the fourth report of the standing committee on Crown corporations be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Clerk Assistant: — Mr. Shillington, from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presents the sixth report of the said committee, the text of which will appear in today's *Votes and Proceedings*.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, the member has called in and a complication has arisen at his office, and he'll be a few minutes late. Could I ask for leave to have him move this report later this day?

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce through you and to the legislature, 19 grade 9 students from the Lake Lenore High School. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Schafhauser; Mr. Gerwing and Mr. Michelle Yeager. I want to welcome each and everyone of you here today. I am very pleased that you are able to make it today because we are becoming very close to the end of the session, and you will have at least an opportunity of seeing the effectiveness of our opposition and the effectiveness of the government. I'd like you to rise, and I ask all members to join in welcoming this group.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my colleague, the Hon. Neil Hardy, the MLA for Kelsey-Tisdale, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the House, 16 students from the grade 9 class of the town of Bjorkdale who are

seated here in the west gallery. Accompanying the students are Noella Tromblay and Bill Dovell. On behalf of all the members here, we wish you a very pleasant stay and a safe trip home. I'll be meeting with the students at 10:30 this morning in the rotunda, and I ask all members on both sides of the House to join with me in according them a very warm welcome. Would you stand and be acknowledged, please?

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Drought Conditions in Saskatchewan

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I have a question, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, for the Premier of Saskatchewan. As background information to my question, I would like to refer you to some information that's dated March 27, 1981, and it's a copy of the ministerial statement that was made on that day, March 27, 1981. In 1981, Mr. Speaker, conditions were fairly dry in southern Saskatchewan. What I would like to say to the Premier, that this spring is even drier. In March of '81, the program included the announcements that the livestock producers are facing severe conditions because of the drought and depleted pasture; native grasses are in acute condition; ability to feed is a shame.

And that was in March, Mr. Premier. Today we are at June 1, and you still haven't announced any kind of program. You're saying you're accumulating and making out lists of people that have pasture. And I'm saying the farmers down in southern Saskatchewan are desperate. They're wondering when are you going to act? When are you going to announce a program? How much longer are the livestock producers in the drought areas going to have to wait?

A subsidy was announced in this program of \$25 a ton for transporting forage to dry areas. A subsidy of \$10 a ton was involved for transporting feed. There was financial help to move cattle. When are you going to announce a program that's of some financial help to the people that need it, rather than announce programs for people that don't need it like you have been doing this spring?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, in March I believe there's usually snow on the ground . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Give the Premier an opportunity to answer.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, not every year is the same. This year we have a great deal of moisture and a large amount of feed in the northern half of Saskatchewan — a great deal of it. In the South we have less rain and we don't have sufficient feed. Now we're trying to put the two together.

The Minister of Agriculture says that he is going to be looking at the possibilities for new pasture. He's met with groups. The south-west cattle association, he met with them in Moose Jaw a couple or three days ago. I believe there's 70 or 80 of them. They talked about all kinds of things, and they never, you know, frankly, mentioned the specific critical concerns that the hon. member mentions.

But we are talking to people in every corner of the province. The Minister of Agriculture will be making his announcements when he puts together the kind of feed program that he sees in northern Saskatchewan, the kind of cattle marketing or movement program that he thinks may be appropriate, and that the cattle men themselves feel is appropriate. So he is meeting with them and discussing it with them — large numbers — so that they can bring him up to date on what they think will work best at this time, this year, in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Engel: — New question, Mr. Speaker. In 1981, there was no run-off. This spring we had no run-off. I farmed my entire farm this spring without going around one slough. Not one slough, and usually I got 100. Not one. Not one, Mr. Premier. And there was no run-off. The drought conditions are there.

In 1981, my new question says that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Not one. In 1981, they were prepared to say that a deductible of 35 miles is in place, and any feed that had to be transferred over that amount was getting \$25 a ton. Grain was given \$10 a ton with a 35-mile deductible. Mr. Premier, there was moisture in the North that year, as well. Hay was available, and pastures were available. And people were moving them. They're phoning me and asking me, "When are we going to make this" . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There certainly was, there certainly was. There certainly was and you know it, that a lot of feed was . . . (inaudible) . . .

And from the area where it's raining, from where I live it is a 250 to 300 to 400-mile trip to haul cattle and hay. One farmer, as background information, Mr. Speaker, one farmer told me that his bill was over \$2,000 just to haul his cattle to pasture. That does not include the pasture fees he's paying. He was able to get some PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration) pasture in the North.

Two thousand dollars to haul his cattle up there, and you're saying that this is no additional expense to these people, that this isn't going to affect the cattle industry. The bills you're introducing aren't going to work if these people aren't going to get some help. And I would suggest, and I'm asking you: when are you going to come up with a meaningful program? They don't need your sympathy. They don't need your agreement. They want a meaningful program.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, The Minister of Agriculture is talking with the very farmers the hon. member is alluding to. He's talking with them. In fact, he's talking with the agriculture industry this morning. I was supposed to be in North Battleford visiting with the agrologist. The Minister of Agriculture is talking with him this morning, and he will be announcing his program, after the kind of deliberations he thinks is important with people in the North and people in the South — the cattle feeders, those that have feed, and so forth. That's precisely what he's going to do, so I say to the hon. member: the Minister of Agriculture will be making his announcement in due course.

Mr. Sveinson: — With respect to the same problem in north-eastern Saskatchewan, there are farmers in north-eastern Saskatchewan who have suffered throughout the five years, and the response of this government has been nothing. In fact, the loan guarantee program that you recently legislated . . . There's even been a delay with respect to the loan guarantees. You've laid the blame on many occasions in this House squarely at the feet of the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa. He indicates that he's only received . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The member rose on a supplementary. Supplementaries do not provide long lead-ins. If the member has a question, get directly to it.

Mr. Sveinson: — I would ask you: has a detailed submission been made to the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, and if so, when was it made, and what were the contents of that detailed submission?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, there's two questions I believe the hon. member raises: one with respect to our loan program, and the other with respect to the negotiations with the federal minister.

The Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan met personally with the Minister of Agriculture for Canada in march; met personally with him, and outlined the programs in detail, the problems in detail, pardon me, in the north-east part of the province. He went through them in detail and he met personally. Then he wrote three subsequent letters asking the minister to

meet with him again to go over the details, to respond to the concerns of the people in Saskatchewan north-east. So he met with him personally and he wrote him letters and he received no reply — after a personal meeting, sitting down and talking to him eye to eye, describing the problems, writing him letters. No reply.

So the question that we had is: why would he only reply when the media says, why didn't you reply? "Well," he says, "I didn't have enough information." Well for heaven's sake, he met with them face to face once, and sent him letters.

And secondly, why won't he meet with him today? He's in the province of Saskatchewan. And it's my understanding that he refuses to meet with him today to discuss the problems of the north-east part of the province. Now, when you meet personally with the minister, you describe the problems with him. When you write him letters and he acknowledges that he has received them, and he won't respond until the media asks him why he didn't respond. Well, he says I didn't have enough data. It was in the wrong form. And it's a little interesting that he would just respond like that after the media asks him.

Why wouldn't he respond to the Minister of Agriculture and say, I need more information? Why wouldn't he meet with them today when he's in the very province where the problem is? I don't know. But first of all, let's make that very clear that we have hounded the Minister of Agriculture for some help.

Secondly, with respect to the loan program, I will . . . Mr. Chairman, with respect to our loan program for farmers, within the next 24 to 36 hours there will be, it's my information, over 50 loans that have been approved. Now, I will acknowledge, I will acknowledge, that there has been some start-up problems and we have addressed those; that those 50 applications and more are coming in, will be approved for extended credit, and particularly for people in the north-east part of the province which, I might say, is an awful lot more to date and an awful lot more help than has been received by the federal Minister of Agriculture who doesn't even return the calls.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Premier, and the Premier will be aware of the very, very serious problem facing the farmers in the Carrot River area.

Headlines saying, "Carrot River farmers near financial ruin; farmers in big trouble." These are a group of farmers, Mr. Minister, who, through no fault of their own, since 1979 they've had crop failures and disasters. They are on the verge of financial bankruptcy, and I tell you, Mr. Premier, what you are saying in the House here today is just not good enough. When we had a disaster with a snowstorm down in the South and the ranchers and some of the cattle were killed, you declared a disaster under the then minister of agriculture, and there was participation of federal and provincial sharing.

The credit union manager at Carrot River says, in respect to your loan guarantee program: "Craig says he doesn't expect the 4 million assistance program announced in the provincial budget in April will be of any real assistance to the plight of these farmers." I ask you, Mr. Premier . . . You have been able to design a program for the big oil companies. Can you design a program to prevent the bankruptcy of farmers in north-eastern Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we have been aware, and I have met personally, and the Minister of Agriculture has met personally, with individuals, with reeves, and people across north-eastern Saskatchewan. We have made modifications to the crop insurance system, and thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars from crop insurance have gone. We've even extended the coverage for crop insurance for those who didn't pay.

We've set up a new agricultural loan fund to extend credit to people who have been cut off from credit, either by financial institutions, like banks and credit unions, or others. The financial fund . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I just pointed out that the majority of the people having financial difficulties are in north-eastern Saskatchewan. If you find 50, or in the neighbourhood of 50 farmers who have had extended credit because of this program, they shouldn't be making fun of it. I don't think they should make fun of it.

Mr. Chairman, when you come in with \$4 million, and you pick out 50 farmers who have their credit cut off, and you say there's extended credit because you didn't get any help from the federal government at all — and we provide that kind of program, administered by farmers themselves — the opposition shouldn't be ridiculing that program. Because those 50 farmers feel that it's something important. And the 50 more that will receive it think it's important. So we will continue to provide that kind of loan guarantee, and that kind of new agricultural funding, and that kind of new credit, administered by farmers themselves in the province of Saskatchewan — not just in the north-east, but indeed all across the province.

Mr. Koskie: — As a clarification, I don't want the Premier to be putting words into my mouth. I did not criticize or laugh at his program. I gave a quotation from a financial institution, Mr. Premier. That's who commented. So don't criticize me.

Mr. Speaker: — Does the member have a question? This is not an opportunity for you to get up and make speeches, but if you have questions, let's hear the question.

Mr. Koskie: — I have a new question to the Premier. The farmers have been meeting with you. They have met with your Minister of Agriculture; they're met with the federal Minister of Agriculture. And do you know what they say? "We got lots of sympathy — sympathy — but that's all we got."

And that's what you're doing here again. Here are hundreds of farmers in the Carrot River area, their whole life spent on building an equity in a farm are being destroyed, and you stand in here, and you pass on the solution to the federal government, and you say we can't act because the federal . . . I want to say you could help the oil companies. Cannot you bring in a disaster program to assist these farmers in their crisis?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture and his cabinet colleagues are reviewing the problems in the south-east part of the province because of drought; are reviewing the situation in Saskatchewan north-east. They've already made modifications to crop insurance; they've already made modifications to a new fund to extend credit to people that were cut off by financial institutions.

And they are continuing to look at what's necessary under the circumstances with respect to people who haven't been able to seed their crop because of acts of God. They will be making the appropriate announcements when they have pulled together all the information, talked to those people to say what specifically is necessary, which farmer is eligible or which farmer isn't. What is the best thing to do with feed supplies across Saskatchewan when there's too much rain in the North, and not enough in the South? To put the whole program together. And the Minister of Agriculture will be making the announcements in due time.

Mr. Koskie: — Supplementary, Mr. Premier. I want to ask the Premier, then, and I've asked you on behalf of these farmers in the desperate state, and you've responded. What I want to ask you is a simple question: do you feel that you and your Minister of Agriculture have taken adequate steps to meet the crisis that the farmers in north-east Saskatchewan face today? Do you feel that your steps are adequate?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the steps that this administration will take will be very clear and very well understood and very adequate when the minister announces it.

Mr. Sveinsson: — I would just like to remind the Premier that the situation is very critical and the farmers so far, according to the headlines in the *Leader-Post*: “Loan guarantee delay upsets farmers”. They are not happy with the band-aid solutions you’ve offered. The minister from Ottawa indicates that he’s willing to co-operate, but he has not received — he has not received — any detailed proposal from this provincial government. He’s had two letters. When is this detailed proposal forthcoming? And when is this government willing to address a problem that is extremely critical, if these farmers of north-eastern Saskatchewan are to survive the 1984 crop season?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture for Canada comes into the province and refuses to meet with us, period, he has no concern for any of the farmers in north-east Saskatchewan. I mean, he’s right here in the province. He’s met with the minister face to face. He’s received information in the mail. And right here in the province of Saskatchewan he says, “No, I don’t have any time to meet you.” He doesn’t have any time for the farmers. Let us make this very clear. He’s right here today. He’s holding news conferences. And we have approached him personally, and through the mail, and he said, “No, it’s not the kind of information I need.”

Well, if he was really concerned about farmers, and he is in the province of Saskatchewan, he’d say, let’s sit down right now and find out exactly what we can do together. But he refuses to do that. The only thing he does, he says to the media, “I don’t think they’ve given me enough data.” Well, why didn’t he tell us that? He didn’t even respond. Why doesn’t he just respond, Mr. Speaker, and say, all right, I want this or this or this? And here he is in Saskatchewan — he could go look for himself if he’d like.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you: if a Minister of Agriculture for this country comes into a province that is asking for help — and we’ve asked several times face to face, and in letter — and he comes into the province and won’t even meet with us, won’t even talk with the farmers, Mr. Speaker, then the province of Saskatchewan is going to have to go alone on the whole program. We’ve had to make changes ourselves in crop insurance, even though it’s the federal people that are financing a good part of it. We have to make the changes because the federal government won’t listen.

Mr. Sveinsson: — I would like to remind the Premier that the content of your proposal, as the minister indicates, has not been sufficient to arrive at a co-operative agreement. When are you going to send your minister into the north-east part of this province, survey the situation, and in all conscience come in with a proposal that has some conscience, and has consideration for the farmers of north-eastern Saskatchewan in mind? That has not been done, Mr. Premier. You admitted that this morning. When is this going to be forthcoming?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, two points. One, if the Minister of Agriculture, federally, wanted more information, why didn’t he tell us that? Why did he have to do it through the media? I mean, it doesn’t make any sense. If he was sincere, if he was sincere, he would phone up the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan or the Deputy Premier, and say, here’s the information. Here’s the information. But he won’t react, so we have phoned, and we have written, and we have been to him, and we have said, here are the problems. But he won’t respond until the media asked him, what are you doing? And he says, “Well, there isn’t good enough data.” Well, why didn’t he tell us that?

Secondly, our ministers are there. Our ministers represent that area. And we have reviewed those programs in detail, saying, this is what we could do with the federal government. The federal government, as usual, would like to see the province spend the money. Then they won’t have to do anything themselves. We are saying, “Could we have a substantial amount of money from the Government of Canada to help this part of this nation? And they said, “We don’t hear you. We don’t hear you.”

So the Minister of Agriculture is in Saskatchewan, he wants data, he wants information . . . We have offered it to him no end of times. He's in the province today. He can call me up. He can call the Minister of Agriculture up. He can call the Deputy Premier up. He can call any of the cabinet ministers, and we'll provide him with the information.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask a new question to the Premier. We've listened to your dissertation in the reply to a number of important questions in respect to the crisis of the farming community of Carrot River.

I want to ask you, Mr. Speaker, because what you have done is to pass the buck. In view of the fact, is this your position: that if the federal government, in fact, will do nothing, that you will do nothing?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, you can rest assured, and the hon. member can rest assured, and the people of the north-east part of this province can rest assured, that there will be an excellent program and sufficient help for all those people in north-east Saskatchewan. The federal government may not want to listen, and it may not want to participate, but the people of north-east Saskatchewan can rest assured that this province will not let them down.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Premier, if indeed this is a disaster area, and as you dealt with the cattle, with the freak snowstorm, is it not incumbent upon the province, you as Premier, to declare the north-east farming area as a disaster area to get federal funding? Why have you not, in fact? Or do you not treat it as a disaster area? I mean, hundreds of farmers are losing their farms. Why don't you declare it a disaster area and take that step to force the federal government to address it, if, indeed, they are not?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, it is not the entire north-east, and the hon. member knows that. There are pockets of areas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's precisely what we're doing. There are pockets of areas that need concern. There are pockets that have either been froze or drowned out or whatever the problem may be. And they're not even connected in many cases. So it is not just the north-east area, north-east corner of the entire province of Saskatchewan. There may be parts of a community here, parts of an R.M. here, parts of an R.M. there. You can't just blanket and say everybody in the north-east is going to receive several thousand dollars.

Some have already got their entire crop in. Some have had their crops for three years. So that's precisely why we're putting together a program to help those people that need it, to help those people that need it. And the Minister of Agriculture will be announcing a program that helps those that need the help.

Mr. Koskie: — Are you saying that you have the programs, then? That you've isolated the individual areas and municipalities that have problems? And do you say that your Minister of Agriculture has in place the programs in place to assist them? Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — What I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister of Agriculture will be announcing his program in due course.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Premier, two questions . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Thank you, Mr. Deputy House Leader. I have two questions: one, how large does the area have to be before you will consider it a disaster area? Are five R.M.s not a big enough area to have some problem? That's my first part of the question.

And the second is, and we've asked you this before: will you make your program retroactive to cover off those that have already had the expense, as far as getting involved in implementing these increased costs, because of either the drought in the South or the flooding in the North?

That two-part question.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, to qualify for a disaster areas, there's a formula that reflects the percentage mill rate of an R.M. And in some cases there would be more farmers in a particular R.M. that were in difficulty; in some cases there were fewer farmers. And we are putting together all that information so that we can designate exactly what the problem . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it's a per cent of the mill rate. And that's something that has been in effect in the previous administration. It is, crossed, in several others. We are putting that together and the minister will be announcing a program that will be effective for those R.M.s that are in trouble.

Secondly, with respect to the program's retroactivity, the minister is examining activities that are going on now with respect to the movement of feed and the movement of cattle. And he will announce in his announcement the kinds of things he thinks are important with respect to any retroactivity. So he will be making those announcements.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

MOTIONS

White Paper on Proposals for a new Chartered Accountants Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake:

That the white paper on proposals for the new chartered accounts act, tabled as a sessional paper no. 210, by the Hon. Mr. Andrew on May 31st, will be referred to the Special Committee on Regulations, and that said committee shall have powers to send for persons, papers, and records to examine witnesses under oath in connection thereto.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion is reading May the 31st. Would the House agree to changing that to June the 1st?

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, again with leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake:

That a white paper on proposals for amendments to The Management Accountants Act tabled as a Sessional Paper no. 211 by the Hon. Mr. Andrew on June 1, 1984, be referred to the Special Committee on Regulations, and that the said committee shall have the powers to send for persons, papers, and records, to examine witnesses under oath in connection thereto.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I wonder if we could perhaps revert back to presenting reports by standing, select and special committees. As the member from Regina Centre is now here, we can deal with public accounts report.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, I want to apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, for the

inconvenience for being late this morning.

I think we want to deal with this this morning. At the end of my remarks, I will be moving a motion that the sixth report of the Standing Committee of Public Accounts be now concurred in. Before doing so, I want to make a couple of comments.

I want to begin by thanking all of the staff who worked with the Public Accounts Committee. I think I'm speaking on behalf of all members of the committee when I send a special note of appreciation to Willard Lutz, who is the Provincial Auditor. I think all members of the committee will want to join me in wishing Mr. Lutz a speedy recovery from his illness, as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I also want to congratulate all members of the committee. I have said both in the committee and out of the committee, Mr. Speaker, that this is an example of how all committees ought to operate. The attendance at the committee is as close to perfect as you're ever going to get. We had near perfect attendance from most members. All of the members took an active part in the deliberations. It was not easy to tell who was government and who was opposition; everybody was into it. I want to congratulate all members for having attended and taken an active part in the Public Accounts Committee. I think we will all strenuously attempt to resist making any comparison to any other committees.

I want to express one note of, one discordant note, and that was with respect to the position taken by the committee on the disclosure of certain information. The *Public Accounts* gave us the broad details of how much severance pay was paid out to dismissed public servants. Some of us felt that it was perfectly proper and appropriate that we should have the details of that. If the government had spent \$1.5 million building a bridge in Shellbrook, I don't think anyone would have denied us whatever detail we wanted.

But the government chose not to give us any detail on severance. They would only give us the broad amount which we had ourselves — we can add — and the number of people who were severed, but wouldn't break it down.

I think the committee, Mr. Speaker, got a taste of what we have experienced in this Assembly, and that is a government which refuses to practise what it once preached, and that is open government; a government which is prepared to disclose that which it believes is in its best interest, and is going to keep to itself that which it feels is not in its best interest about any consideration as to what is in the public's interest. And I was unhappy with that decision in the public accounts. I expressed that discordant note in public accounts and I'm still unhappy about it. And I would hope that another year we wouldn't have . . . Well, I hope another year there wouldn't be a problem with public servants still being dismissed. But if we should be so unfortunate as to still have that problem with us, I would hope another year we'd be able to get that information.

Another item which I think is probably an item of a disagreement is with respect to the whole issue of comprehensive auditing. I feel, and I continue to feel, that comprehensive auditing would play a useful role in ensuring efficient government. If the public are cynical about our role as elected members, and they clearly are, then I think a good part of that has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that they think that government is wasteful, takes a lot of their money, and they get very little in return. I think the public cynicism is not about the integrity of government; I think it's about the effectiveness and efficiency of government. And I think comprehensive auditing would go a good distance towards alleviating that cynicism. That cynicism and scepticism about our effectiveness and efficiency as their representatives makes our job much, much more

difficult than it would otherwise be.

I continue to believe that we should introduce comprehensive auditing in the province. I could read verbatim, and adopt as my own, the comments of the member from Kindersley when he was chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. It's a very long distance, it seems, from this side of the floor to that side of the floor, because the member from Kindersley underwent a remarkable conversion in that 20 or 30-foot step that he took.

I continue to urge the committee to adopt comprehensive auditing, and I continue to suggest to government members that whether or not it is in your best interests — you're in a better position to judge than I — but I think comprehensive auditing is clearly in the best interests of the public; will go a good distance towards making government seem . . . I will make government more effective and more efficient. What is every bit as important, it will make government seem to be more effective and efficient.

With that, let me discuss a couple of items. In my absence — and I don't want to complain about this too much, because I stepped out for an hour or so, gave the committee consent to proceed, and they did proceed with one item with respect to virements — the Provincial Auditor raised the issue of whether or not virements should be disclosed in the legislature, as special warrants are. I was impressed by his arguments. I missed the discussion from the Department of Finance. Other members of the committee felt that no need to disclose the information in virements, and I don't pursue that any further except to express the regret that I wasn't there, because I remain unconvinced. But I'm not in a position to complain very vociferously without having heard the other side of the story.

The committee received comments from the Provincial Auditor to the effect that the grants made by the arts board are being made without statutory authority. This is one of those technical problems which bedevil provincial auditors, and which bedevil public accounts committees, and which we are unable to interest anyone else in. No one suggests that the arts board should not be making grants.

I'm going to resist getting into the discussion of the bill that's presently before the House. That's a little movie. But no one suggests the arts board shouldn't be making grants, except that the legislation apparently does not give them the power to do so. And there needs to be an amendment to the act, and I continue to urge the government to do that. There's a bill before the legislature which is flawed in other respects, I may say to the minister.

The Western Development Museum and the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation both made rather brief loans. Both borrowed money to the extent of \$2 million and \$1 million. It happened rather briefly. They bought and sold land, and for a period of time owed moneys. They did so without any statutory authority. No great harm was done. The loans have, of course, long since been paid off.

It is, however, essential for the new administration of public affairs that borrowing authorities be strictly complied with. They were not in this case, and we simply bring that to their attention.

We continue to urge the Minister of health to amend, either amend the medical care insurance act, or provide more money to the Medical Care Insurance commission. They have no borrowing authority. They are unable to estimate their requirements with sufficient precision, and every year they overdraw their account. They've no statutory authority for doing so, and there is nothing that they can do about it except to request either an amendment to the legislation or more money.

We urge the government to provide an amendment to the legislation. We think the existing act is not realistic. It is pointless for us to berate the Western Development Museum and Sedco for exceeding borrowing authorities, when we apparently are prepared to tolerate it ourselves by

not passing amendments to the act. And this is an old movie, I continue to urge the Minister of Health, as I did last year, to amend the medical care insurance act to give them the power to overdraw their account at year end.

The Provincial Auditor noted that there was a \$50 million deficit in the Crown investments corporation, went on to note that more financial information could be provided by the Crown investments corporation, now the Crown Management Board, I think.

The Public Accounts Committee considered that, agreed that the additional information would be useful, and simply note in our report that we would hope that the additional information would be provided.

The committee noted another matter which is, in my view, a major problem with any government, and this one included, that is, that a large portion of what we take in in taxes we simply put a stamp on and send back out to somebody else. Over half of the revenue which comes into the provincial treasury is not spent by us, but simply given out in the form of grants.

In the view of the Provincial Auditor, and in the view of the committee, there is not, and has never been — it is not a problem that arose with this government particularly — there is not a proper monitoring system. There needs to be some follow-up to ensure that that money, which are very large sums of money, is properly spent for the purposes for which it was intended. Most grants are given for a special purpose. We need to develop a system for following up on those grants to make sure they are spent for what they were intended, that they were all spent, and that the money is properly used. We don't have that; we should develop it, and I would urge that upon the Department of Finance. And I think the committee urges that on the Department of Finance.

Just to show that we're not complete ogres, we noted one department which had, indeed, corrected a problem before we got there. Provincial Auditor noted the child care program was not being administered in the proper sense, in that there was insufficient checks being made to ensure that the expenses which were claimed were, in fact, incurred. The Department of Social Services had the problem corrected before we called them to Public Accounts, and we thought we . . . In a list of 11 items, it wouldn't kill us to add one bouquet in addition to all the brickbats.

I want to end on the note that I began on, and that's thanking our staff. We had, for the years I've been on Public Accounts, the able assistance of the Assistant Clerk, Gwenn Ronyk. We appreciated her help, and she was, indeed, the backbone of our committee. Almost all of us on that committee were new, and she guided us through those first couple of difficult years. This year she went on to Crown Corporations. I don't know that we'd call that a promotion, but I suppose one does what one's told to do, and she went on to Crown Corporations. We regretted her passing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's not her . . . We regretted her absence from the committee, and found ourselves, however, with the able assistance of Mr. James, who came to our committee, helped us, and filled a large pair of shoes very ably. And we carried on with as much help as we had before.

I want to thank the staff. I want to, again, express the note that Mr. Lutz might enjoy a speedy recovery, and thank all committee members for their assistance.

I will now move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member from Saskatoon Mayfair:

That the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be now concurred in.

Mr. Glauser: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before getting into my remarks, I understand there are some members that have some guests, and with leave, they can introduce them before I proceed.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my real pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 64 grade 4 students from Simpson School in Yorkton, Saskatchewan. They are seated in the west gallery. They're accompanied today by two of their teachers, Ian Obodovich and Marlene Trebish; chaperon, Mrs. Jeannette Wheeler, who also teaches at Simpson School.

I just want to wish them all a very interesting and informative day here in the Assembly and that you enjoy the other tours that you'll be going on to following leaving the Assembly. I know you have a full day ahead of you.

I have a bit of a soft spot in my heart for Simpson School, because my own children started their schooling at Simpson. So it brings back some memories. So I just ask the rest of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Myers: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure, on behalf of my colleague from Saskatoon Fairview, to introduce a group of 68 grade 7 students from Fairview school, or Fairhaven School, I'm sorry. Your MLA for your area is performing duties on behalf of the Minister of Education, and it is his request that I perform these duties for him.

I would like to welcome you and ask my fellow colleagues of the legislature to welcome you to the legislature, and hope your trip is informative and your journey back home is safe. And I will be meeting with you after you leave the Chamber.

So on behalf of the fellow colleagues here, I'd like to welcome you and ask for them to welcome you as well.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Public Accounts (continued)

Mr. Glauser: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join with the member from Regina Centre in extending the committee's appreciation to the Clerk of the Assembly, the Assistant Clerk who so ably filled in upon her retirement to Crown Corporations, also the comptroller and his staff, the auditor and his staff, and all those witnesses who appeared before the committee.

I also join the member from Regina Centre in extending our good wishes to Mr. Lutz for a speedy recovery.

My remarks will be somewhat brief and will be in keeping with the length of the auditor's report, as compared to 1982 when there were some 63 pages to the report, as opposed to the 49 of this past year. And I suppose that the report should also be compared in the quantitative manner as well as a qualitative manner as it compiled the items.

It seems to me, in comparing the years, that there are less serious problems in the year under review than what has been, and the concerns that had been expressed in the past.

And I think that it is indicative of the improvement and the productivity of the civil service, and I think that they are perhaps to be commended for the management that they are bringing to their positions. And I feel quite confident that we are seeing a great improvement in the way that the departments are being managed and control is being, is exemplified in most departments.

I listened to the member for Regina Centre talking about the expression of the auditor, and noted the dividend that had been paid by the Crown investments corporation, and as was discussed in this House yesterday under the Premier's estimates, where this was done at a time when the Crown investments corporation was in a deficit position. And I noted that there was a treasury order passed in late December of 1983, prohibiting such payments of any dividends when the corporation is realizing a deficit, and perhaps that is the quantitative part of the report that I am referring to.

The other part the member from Regina Centre alluded to was the concerns that the auditor expressed over the expenditures under the child care program. And on listening to the witnesses from that department, we did learn that the matter . . . When it had been brought to their attention, immediate steps were taken to correct the situation. And I think here is another example, Mr. Speaker, of what I was saying about the management that seems to be coming to bear in the various departments.

And that brings me, of course, to reply to also what the chairman said about comprehensive audit. And certainly, as we can read in the papers almost weekly about what the progress has been of the federal government who has had comprehensive audit for some time now, we have yet to see very much improvement in the manner in which we see moneys bandied about by the federal government. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have said this in this House before that comprehensive audit is certainly not the panacea, and that management before the fact is far more effective than trying to clean up something that has gone awry, and that is where I see effective management as being a tool to really controlling the taxpayers' money, and bringing some reasonable approach to managing the affairs of this province in a business-like manner.

Insofar as the member from Regina Centre, about his complaint about the severance pay: we felt that it was rightfully a question to be discussed in this Assembly. And certainly it was a policy that has been established in the past, and the opportunity is there to discuss that matter in this Assembly, and furthermore, there was no denial of the total sums that were involved in severance pay. So I really can't get too excited about his complaint in that regard.

I think with those brief remarks, I will say that I concur in the report, and again, want to thank the staff who so ably assisted us in our deliberations, and I, too, agree with the member, the chairman of that committee. The chairman did a fine job under somewhat duress at times, having to control or trying to control somewhat of an exuberant group, but he did a good job, and I feel all members made a fine contribution to the business of this Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Mr. Speaker: — Before orders of the day, I would like to lay on the table, according to section 222 of The Election Act, a report respecting the annual fiscal returns of registered political parties for the fiscal year 1983.

MOTIONS

Hours of Sitting

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, with leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake:

That notwithstanding rule 3, this Assembly shall, on Friday, June 1, 1984, sit from 10 o'clock a.m. to 12 o'clock p.m., and from 2 o'clock p.m. to 5 o'clock p.m., and from 7 o'clock p.m. to 10 o'clock p.m.

Leave not granted.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10

Item 1 (continued)

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 10 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10

Item 1

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, under the intergovernmental affairs, and possibly, Mr. Premier, I could have been asking this question under the main vote, but in your discussion last day I think you referred to 20 staff who were moved from intergovernmental affairs in a separate area into your department. I just wondered if whether or not you could confirm that, and the list and job description of those people who were moved. What I'm trying to find out is, in that transfer, how many vacancies there were at the time of the transfer, and the number of people who were actually moved, with names and job description and salaries attached to the people who actually moved.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, there were 21 positions that were moved. Well, I believe . . . Put it this way: before they were moved, there was 29 in intergovernmental affairs; 21 positions moved into intergovernmental affairs under Executive council, and we will be happy to provide all the names and their job descriptions, and the complete information that the hon. member would like.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Premier, on the 21 that moved, you will be sending me that list. That leaves eight that weren't transferred. Were those vacant positions at the time that the transfer took place?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, some were vacant, and some were positions that moved into other parts of government.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, would you get me a breakdown of those that were vacant, and the salaries that had been paid in those positions, and also when they were split off or shaved off into other areas? Can you get me the departments or wherever those people might have gone as well, and the salaries?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — We'll provide that information.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really should have asked these questions under subvote 1. I went to get my material; I assumed the member from North West had some more questions, given the vigour with which he was proceeding last night at 10, and by the time I got back, we were off subvote 1.

I have a question of the Premier. Mr. Premier, it has to do with the member from Thunder Creek. I want to put some questions to you. I'm going to read what I said last year. I could adopt all of the same comments again. I read this, and it has a remarkably timeless quality to it.

If I can find the appropriate place to being . . . I said as follows on March 9, 1983:

While the debate is at a reasonably high level (and I probably said that with tongue in cheek — while the debate is at a reasonably high level), I want to ask a question. I want to say by way of background that I am not muckraking by answering this question. I have known the member for Thunder Creek as a personal friend for many years. I have known his father (Mr. Premier) as a friend, and (we have both known him as a) neighbour. And I feel the tragedy that has beset him in a way, I think, as personal as anyone in the caucus.

And I repeat those comments again. They are as timeless now as they were then.

But then I went on to say — and this also has a timeless quality:

Having said that, this city is rife with rumours about his resignation, and I want to ask you a question, Mr. Premier, for the record . . .

And I repeat that again. I am asking these questions because the comments that are being made are being made almost universally when I leave this Chamber:

Will the Premier confirm for the record . . . the resignation of the Minister of Energy and Mines had absolutely nothing to do with any improprieties, financial or otherwise, with regard to the performance of his duties as a minister of the crown or as an elected representative?

That's the question I'm going to be putting to you again in a moment, but I want to repeat for your answer, Mr. Premier.

You then said as follows:

Well, I can only reiterate, Mr. Chairman, what I said at the time, I believe when I was in a new conference, with respect to the resignation of the cabinet minister. He and I had a conversation and we mutually agreed that given his financial and family responsibilities, it was best at this time that he stepped down from cabinet. And we agreed that that should be the case and that's exactly what happened.

I asked you again:

Will the Premier state clearly for the record that the resignation of the Minister of Energy and Mines had absolutely nothing to do with any improprieties, financial or otherwise, with regard to the performance of his duties as a minister of the crown, or as an elected representative?

And you said then, in, I think, an unequivocal fashion, you had nothing to do with any improprieties.

I repeat the question, Mr. Premier, because, (a) as I say, I cannot leave the Chamber without being asked what happened. And credence has been given to all these rumours by an article, I think, first appearing in *The Globe and Mail*, but which also appeared in the *Star-Phoenix*, to the effect that he was asked to resign because his expense accounts were a little rich, and I'm reading here verbatim. The story says . . . This is *Star-Phoenix*, May 11, 1984, quote. The story says, the background paragraph:

Thatcher, son of a former premier, Ross Thatcher, contended in an interview last month that the accounts dating back to '82 were settled a long time ago. But Southam News, citing official and independent sources, said the final settlement was only made after they began inquiring into the matter in March.

And then it goes on to say that his resignation was connected to these expense accounts.

I ask you again, Mr. Premier, as I asked you last year: were there any improprieties? Were any improprieties which the minister might have connected, might have committed in his capacity as an elected member, or as a member of the Executive Council, in any way involved in his resignation?

I ask you again, Mr. Premier, if you'd answer that question in an unequivocal fashion.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Absolutely none.

Mr. Shillington: — So you are denying in an equally unequivocal fashion the story which I think you admit appeared in both *The Globe and Mail* and the *Leader-Post* and the *Star-Phoenix*?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I can't comment on what may be in *The Globe and Mail*, or the *Leader-Post*, or whatever, and I'm not going to comment on those. I would just reiterate my position that the reasons were as I outlined, and had nothing to do with anything that the hon. member may be questioning.

Mr. Shillington: — Were you aware of any improprieties in his expense account at the time he left cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — No.

Mr. Shillington: — Are you aware of any now? Are you now aware of any improprieties with respect to the minister's expense accounts?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I'm aware that there may have been some irregularities. I'm also informed that they were resolved. And I've nothing else to add to it.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I'm not going to pursue this any further. I may contact your . . . I may send you a letter and ask for a report on this. It's an extremely delicate subject, given the fact that there's a court action now before the courts. And the public may see this and it may reflect upon the affairs.

I'm not going to pursue it any further. I may pursue it in a letter to you, and if the replies, I think,

are not fully candid, I may then pursue it in the subsequent estimates of another year. But I think I'm going to leave the subject for the moment; given the extreme delicacy of what we're doing.

I'm sure you will appreciate, though, that we, as members of the opposition, have a responsibility to ensure that expense accounts of members of your Executive Council are proper and are appropriately handled.

Mr. Premier, you gave us yesterday the permanent positions incumbent Executive Council, and you gave us a list of the positions. They're not numbered, but there were three pages of them. I think this is the list. We went through the orders in council and we found, we thought, 20 positions which . . . 20 persons which had been appointed by order in council to Executive Council which did not appear on those lists.

And I read the names to you, names that . . . Maybe they've resigned and maybe your staff have not been passing appropriate orders in council cancelling them, but there are 20 people who were appointed by order in council who don't ever seem to have left. They are . . . I'm reading them in alphabetical order:

Sharon Amyotte (I'd better spell that — A-M-Y-O-T-T-E;
Geraldine Barager (B-A-R-A-G-E-R).

This gets a little easier now:

Linda Bell, Kevin Booth, Shirley Dauvin, Ella Denzin, Sonja Dmuchowski, Barbara Dunn, Sharon Fritsch, Colleen Gagnon, Yvonne Gibson, Marilyn Hamilton, Linda Lee Hoskins, Christopher Isford, Dixie Kohut, Kevin Nagel, Beverly Pedersen, Brenda Seiferling, Karla Sommerfeld, John Munro.

The majority were appointed as typists and stenos, but a few may have been planning analysts and protocol officers. As I say, they do not appear to have been appointed by contract. They appear to have been appointed by order in council. No order in council appears having cancelled their appointment. We, therefore, assume that they're still employed in your office, but they didn't appear on these lists which you gave us yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that there may be a couple of reasons for these names. One is that the research that the hon. member's doing may not be quite accurate in that we do appoint temporary OCs, and those people can be employed for various lengths of time.

And secondly, I believe it's common practice that when people resign from OC appointments that there's no need to have another OC to say that they're gone. They can just move on. So in both cases it would be either whether they're temporary or they have moved and there wasn't a corresponding OC to say that they're gone. You may find that that's where you're coming up with these particular individuals.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Premier, I'm not sure how we would come up with that information. There's no way we have of finding that except by asking the question in estimates. I gathered from the Premier's response that you're not . . . That is your view at the moment but you're not sure, is the Premier saying that you are sure that those people are not on staff, or are you undertaking to reply at a later day, or what exactly are you saying?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member provides the names, and if they are those names that he read into the record, we'd be glad to provide him with the information of whether they are employed or not, or temporary, or their salaries, or whatever he'd like to have on them.

Mr. Shillington: — I want to raise another issue as well, Mr. Premier. You have said on a number of occasions that the top five positions in Executive Council under your administration are making a good deal less than the top five under the former administration, and will you admit, Mr. Premier, that you can only make that argument if you ignore those on contract? If you include people on contract, the top five people, the top five salaried people under your administration, are making a whole lot more than the top five people who worked under the former administration in Executive Council. Will you admit that you can only do that by ignoring the people on contract?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, if I go down through the corresponding lists of the top positions, from deputy minister right down through, of the top five of the previous administration and the top five of ours . . . And I will get into the personal service contracts. Under the previous administration, Mr. Derrick received \$79,608; Mr. Sinclair, deputy minister to the premier — sixty-nine, nine; Leeson — sixty-four, nine; Flo Wilkie, 62-something; and Mr. Weese, clerk of the Executive Council and assistant cabinet secretary, 62,000. And that averages 67,858.

And I go down through existing, two years later, and we have assistant deputy minister to the Premier and cabinet secretary, Mr. Smith-Windsor; Mr. Riddell, 70; Mr. Martin, 65; Mr. Spetz, 65; Mr. Tkachuk, 65. And that adds up to 67,000 — on average, \$560 — which is absolutely 0.4 per cent lower than it is in the previous administration. And I think it's fair to point out, two years later, given any kind of normal inflation rate, say, 7, 8, 9 per cent . . . So you're looking at . . . It's 15 per cent — any kind of real terms — lower than the previous administration.

Now, if we wanted to include, and the only other one that I think you could put in here that would affect the average would be Mr. Harrington. On a personal service contract of that capacity, it would have a marginal impact, on the average, and he would have to admit that, because it's in the neighbourhood of the 75-80,000, on the average. And it would certainly be much less than the previous administration, given the rate of inflation, and so forth. So for an absolute, fair to fair, it's lower any way you want to look at it.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Premier, that's just simply not the case. That's just simply not the case. Not only are they paid more, but there are more of them. Let me list for your benefit what, in my view, are the senior people in the former administration: Sinclair, \$69,408 — if you're going to copy them down, I'll give you time to write them down, if you so request — Wilkie, cabinet secretary, \$62,376; Weese, clerk of Executive Council, 62,000; Bill Knight, principal secretary to the Premier, \$59,000; Goertz, cabinet press secretary, 35,000 exactly. That comes to \$288,824.

The senior people now don't number five in number; they number nine: Smith-Windsor, \$72,288; Crosthwaite, \$57,612; Tkachuk, \$65,172; Fyffe, \$62,664; Spetz, \$62,172; Martin, \$62,172; Riddell, \$70,000. And then we're into the area of relative paupers here: Shorvoyce, \$51,276; Quinlan, \$55,008.

Mr. Premier, not only are they paid more, but there's more of them. You made these comments in the midst of a suggestion that you're running a leaner administration than the former. That is simply not the case. Not only are they paid more, but there's nine of them. The cost of Executive Council during your administration, in the senior people, costs a total of \$558,364. The cost of the senior people during the former administration was \$288,824, just a little over half as much.

Mr. Premier, we may argue about whether Executive Council is more effective now than it was before the election. I think you are going to find, after the next election, that your Executive Council is a good deal less effective than you think. But leaving that aside, you can't claim that Executive Council now costs less. It costs twice as much: \$558,364 versus \$288,824, cost half as much then as now.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member should at least include everybody that he wants to talk about. He missed Mel Derrick. Absolutely. I mean, Mel Derrick was the co-ordinator of executive programs in Executive Council, and he left him out altogether, and his salary was 80,000 — no — 79,608. I'll take the top 20 salaried positions, the top 15, the top 10, and the top 5, and we can make comparisons. I mean, now, let's take a good hard look at it. Then I'll go through the deputies. So let's make sure that the public understands what we're talking about.

In the top five, that is the most expensive — 79, 69, 64, 62, etc., right down the line — the previous administration's average was \$67,858. Ours is \$67,560; ours is 0.4 per cent less. Now we go on to the next, the top 10, which included: McPhee, Knight, Patriquin, Hinds, and Hawkes — 62, 59, 59, 58, 56 — and the average there is 63,553. Going on with the next five in ours, this is the top 10: Fyffe, Jonsson, Hinds, Emery, Letilley — 62, 62, 61, 60, 59 — the average is 64,326. We are 1.2 per cent higher, two years later. Right.

Now I'll go on to the top 15, and we're just adding them up in terms of rank. I mean, just check them off, the most expensive down to the 20th most expensive. In the 15, the average is 60,157. Our average is 61,997, a 3 per cent difference over two years. And that included your people Bailey, Sotropa, Jonsson, Sellers and Hodgkinson. In our case it includes Warren, Crosthwaite, Lampard, Sotropa and Larter.

Go down to the 20. You will include McMahon, Aldridge, Proctor, Bachiu and Dore — 52,000, 51, 51, 51 and 50, for 57,953; we include Quinlan, Bachiu, Cascadden, Shorvoyce, Theauvette — and the average is 59,642, for 2.9 per cent difference over two years.

So, if you add up the most expensive top 20 in your administration, the most expensive top 20 in our administration, and the top five were less and the top 10, 15, 20 were marginally, marginally more, a little bit more, like 2 per cent, 1 per cent, 3 per cent, after two years. So given inflation and real wages, we're significantly below the cost of the previous administration.

Now with respect to deputies, deputy minister s- all deputy ministers' salaries in the province of Saskatchewan today, on average, are 2.6 per cent above the previous administration two years ago. Again, after two years of inflation — and you pick a number: 7, 8, 9 per cent — that's at least 15 per cent, or ballpark 15 per cent below what the previous administration had giving all the deputies.

So if we want to go back and look at our administration, the cost at the top; your administration, any way you want to cut it, we are significantly less costly to the taxpayers than the previous government.

Mr. Shillington: — It is difficult to believe that someone with a doctorate of agriculture economics is having such immense difficulty with figures. Let me try something that is a little simpler, then, than listing off 10 salaries. Let's try the estimates which are included in the blue book.

In 1980-81, the estimated expenditures for Executive Council was 3.4 million. The actual expenditure was 3.9 million — that's the figures in *Estimates* and in *Public Accounts*. In '81-82, the estimate was 3.5 million — expenditures 4.6 million; '82-83, the estimate was 10.6 million — the expenditure was 10.5 million. Admittedly, that included the cost of the election. Take out the cost of the election, and you're up to 5.9 million. Estimated expenditure for '83-84 — we don't get at public accounts — estimated expenditure is 6.8 million. Estimated expenditure for '84-85 is 7.7.

Mr. Premier, the cost of Executive Council in estimates has doubled. How do you explain that? You have increased the size of the cabinet, but you haven't doubled it. I think the increase in costs is, by and large, in your staff, not in your cabinet. We, at a different time, have berated you

over the size of your cabinet. It is grossly in excess of what any provincial government should have. But that's not the issue that I'd ask you to address yourself right now. The doubling of the cost of Executive Council must, Mr. Premier, be a factor of staff. You've got more of them and you're paying them more. I'd ask you to 'fess up, admit it, and we'll go on.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can agree to disagree. As the hon. member knows, we have intergovernmental affairs in Executive Council, and that wasn't there before. Similarly, when we look in 1982, we had more people on staff because it was a transition year, and any administration will do that.

Now, if he wants to talk about four more cabinet ministers, four more than the previous administration . . . I believe the people in Saskatchewan want to see their MLAs working, and particularly in cabinet, and they're paying for it. Let's say it's cost another 25,000 or 20,000 for the cabinet minister. Let's say it's \$100,000 a year. As I pointed out yesterday, when you take thousands and thousands of fewer people in the bureaucracy, we're saving millions — millions. And you are complaining because there's four cabinet ministers more than you had in your administration, so let's, you know, let's compare.

This morning, we're sending cabinet ministers — there will be at least two for example — going into Foam Lake to look at the disaster with respect to the fire. And those cabinet ministers should be able to do that. And that's why they're there. People that elect MLAs want them in cabinet.

Mr. Chairman, intergovernmental affairs is in Executive Council; it wasn't before. And that just explains a significant difference. Clearly, we have had a transition period in 1982, and that explains a significant difference. And we have four more cabinet ministers — four in Executive Council — dealing with cabinet as opposed to just . . . The situation which was 21 cabinet ministers before. And those explain the differences.

When I look at the salaries, when you look at the costs, when you break it out any way you like, with the deputy ministers, top 15, top 10, top 5, we pay our people less than the previous administration, from deputy ministers to Executive Council, any way you want to cut it.

Mr. Shillington: — Since we're not going to get a straight answer out of you on the staff . . . And I may say, Mr. Premier, that you're partially right with respect to intergovernmental affairs. You included Mr. Leeson. He was not in Executive Council. He was the deputy minister at the time.

But, Mr. Premier, let's talk about your cabinet. It is expensive — the extra cabinet ministers are expensive — and the appearance is terrible. You are asking people to get along with less. You're asking those on social services, single unemployed employables, to use the phrase, to get along with 60 per cent as much as what they got along on before.

But, Mr. Minister, when it comes to the elected members, the trough is very, very large. The member from Regina North West suggested that you shouldn't fire someone — just make the trough a little bigger. Mr. Premier, the trough is going to have to be the size of Last Mountain Lake if it gets any bigger. What do you suggest that elected members are supposed to be doing?

I thought you had a member who represented the area of Foam Lake. I thought that was in the Kelvington-Wadena riding. I may be wrong, but that was my assumption. It was, the last time I looked at your provincial highways map. The last time I was in Foam Lake I think it was in Kelvington-Wadena. You've got an elected member in Kelvington-Wadena. You may have no confidence in him to report back to you but . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, he probably is. You may have no confidence in the elected member from Kelvington-Wadena, but the public did, because they elected him. They chose him over at least one other candidate. Why do you have to have two cabinet ministers? Why can't you leave it to your elected member to report to you on the admitted disaster in Foam Lake?

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that there isn't any more work to be done under this administration than under the last administration. You simply want to make a bigger pie, you want more people feeding at the trough, and they are. And it is a terrible example to be setting, to ask everyone to exercise restraint but yourselves.

Not only do you have a cabinet of 26, you've got virtually — what? — 15 legislative secretaries? — 12, is it? — 12 legislative secretaries. Apparently they aren't able to do anything either, because you need all these cabinet ministers. Mr. Premier, you've set a terrible example.

I would have expected that you would at least be consistent. If you've got a credibility problem, you don't mind some advice. It's not so much that you're too conservative or too liberal; you're just inconsistent. You say one thing and do another. There's a double standard in this area, as there's a double standard in some of the other areas. You've got one thing to say about many of these issues and you do another thing. But the double standard never had a higher profile, Mr. Premier, than it does with respect to legislative secretaries and cabinet ministers. It is a terrible example to be setting.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously the hon. member is still somewhat bitter about the poor performance of the previous administration. I mean, he just puts his finger on why they lost — because they weren't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They lost bitterly because they weren't listening to people, and they didn't have cabinet ministers all over the province, sensitive to the needs of the people.

Today in Foam Lake . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Hear me out. Today in Foam Lake the MLA, Sherwin Petersen, is there fighting fire, and he phoned in this morning and said that's why he wouldn't be here. Going out there this morning is the Minister of Urban Affairs, who's also in charge of EMO (emergency measures organization), and he's flying out, and he will be there to report to me. Later today, the Deputy Premier will be there today.

Now, the people of Saskatchewan elected MLAs. They elected MLAs to be working and responsible and having the time to run their departments well and to listen to people and to respond. If you want to go through the programs, if you want to go through the programs that each individual cabinet minister and legislative secretary and MLA has been working on in the last two years, it's a tremendous record. And you know that.

So if you want to say that there shouldn't be four more people in cabinet . . . For heaven's sakes, in terms of cabinet ministers per MLAs, we rank seventh. Manitoba's way ahead of us — 60 per cent of their MLAs are in cabinet — 60 per cent. In Saskatchewan, it's only 45. And the cost, Mr. Chairman . . . The hon. member knows that the cost . . . The cost in our administration for the top level is less, significantly less, than the previous administration. The cost of the bureaucracy is significantly less.

So if you want to look at the comparisons; in the province of Manitoba, over 60 per cent of the MLAs are in cabinet, and in the province of Saskatchewan, it's 45 per cent of the MLAs that are in the administration. Manitoba . . . Well, I'll go down the list. Let's start.

The highest is New Brunswick at 64 per cent — 64 per cent of the MLAs on the government side are in cabinet. Unfortunately, the opposition can't get into cabinet. Not yet. Mr. Chairman, obviously the opposition can't get into cabinet. They may like to, but they had to admit that that's the case. They can't get into cabinet. No. So when we look at cabinet members for government MLAs, we rank seventh in the country — seventh.

Mr. Chairman, our costs for our Executive Council, the cost for the MLAs, the cost for the deputy ministers is significantly lower — it's significantly lower than the previous administration. The deputies are 2.6 per cent higher after two years, and that, given inflation, means they're

significantly low.

Executive Council — the top 20 are lower, top 5, top 10, top 15 are lower, any way you want to do it, absolutely, or in a relative terms.

The people of Saskatchewan elected MLAs to work, and that's what they're doing. In the province of Saskatchewan, they are working as legislative secretaries, as caucus chairman, as cabinet ministers, all across the province, and that's exactly what they would like them to do.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I just want a very short line of questioning. The subject has been raised, and raised a number of times by my colleagues, particularly my colleague from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and from Quill Lakes, but I raise the question of the grant of your government to the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation — your whole approach to international aid.

And I ask you again whether or not you are prepared at least to look at a substantial change in your approach. This province had what I thought was a proud record of spending well over \$2 million a year in matching grants. You lowered that in your last budget to \$1 million. You've lowered that in the budget we now have before us to \$900,000.

You are, thereby, preventing a good number of Saskatchewan organizations, organizations like the Mennonite Central Committee, or the Lutheran World Relief Saskatchewan group, or the others — mostly church based, although not all church based — who have done an outstanding job on behalf of Saskatchewan and Canada in providing assistance to people who are less fortunate than ourselves, in other parts of the world . . . You have cut that back to well under one-half, and I ask you again whether or not you are prepared to consider a very substantial increase to organizations who have projects like the Mennonite Central Committee, who have recorded their dissent — as have almost every other church organization in Saskatchewan, including the United Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and a good number of other s- the dissent with the policy you have adopted.

Are you prepared to, by special warrant or otherwise, very substantially increase the amount of \$900,000 provided in this budget for a matching grant for the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we are always prepared to review the grants that we provide organizations. In this case, we want to make very sure that the grants are going towards agriculture and food production. That's what we want to make very sure that they are, and that we don't want to have grants, that are supposed to go to agriculture and food production, going to any form of interprovincial political warfare. We want to make sure that it's in agriculture and food for those people that need it, and when we are convinced that it is for agriculture and food, we have no problem with it. And we will continue to pay it or increase it. And we could quadruple it, if it's for agriculture and food and health and those kinds of things.

If it is for international propaganda, that's a different story. If they want to get into politics, then naturally, I'm a politician, sir, and so are you. If they want to get into agriculture and food and health care and water — those kinds of things — no problem at all.

So it's a question of what the money's for. If I am assured and the Minister of Agriculture is assured it's for agriculture, food, health — those kinds of things — I would review it today, tomorrow, or any time. Because I am very much in favour of that, particularly for thousands and millions of children who have no alternatives.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would you be apprehensive of the type of programs that might be mounted by, let us say, the Mennonite Central Committee or the Roman Catholic companion organization with respect to, let us say, training? You rightly pointed

out that in northern Saskatchewan, if we're to break welfare cycles, training is key. Many of those organizations — and I'll pick those two because they're probably the two biggest ones in programs, although I don't have the figures in my head — the Mennonites and the Roman Catholics probably have the most extensive programs.

Would you be apprehensive about what they might mount? Would you not have sufficient confidence that they would be mounting programs which were genuinely for the benefit of the people, and would not be in politics in an inappropriate way? Would you not have sufficient confidence to just say to them, "yes," if you approve of the project, knowing our priorities, knowing that we wish not to be involved in international politics? But you tell us that they meet your criteria. Would you not have sufficient confidence that they would properly select projects which would reflect the feeling of Saskatchewan people in their desire to help people across the world who are less well off than ourselves?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I said that I have no difficulty with respect to the provision of funds for foods, economic development, water, health, those kinds of things.

Now, when the hon. member talks about education, we have decided to spend an awful lot more on education in the province of Saskatchewan, as the member points out, particularly in northern Saskatchewan. We've got training programs and no end of people that need additional training. So we have to make a choice, and certainly the Minister of Finance has to make a choice. Do we send additional money internationally for education or do we send it for food and choice. Do we send additional money internationally for education or do we send it for food and health, and so forth, or do we also decide to provide education for underprivileged or uneducated or less than well-educated individuals, and particularly children, in the province of Saskatchewan?

The hon. member knows — and he has complained about the deficit — we have to make decisions. We have said we are going to spend more money on education in the province of Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan children. We will continue to spend money on food and health and so forth, internationally — internationally. And we have to make those choices and we have made it.

So we have said that, yes, we will spend more money on education in Saskatchewan. That may mean less money on education internationally, but we're quite prepared to spend money on health and food and so forth internationally because, given those types of timing in crisis situations, obviously they may need it today, tomorrow, the next day, the next month.

Education is a longer-run thing. Our commitment to Saskatchewan education is extremely important.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Premier, I would like you to tell me a percentage of the last \$2.1 million that SCIC's board, their projects review committee, approved for spending overseas — 2.1 million in the last year; when you took office that was in place . . . I would like you to tell me how much of that was not spent for food and health and people-related programs, just food, health, water — those kind of projects. How much of that was not spent for that?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information, but I'll try to provide it to the hon. member.

Mr. Engel: — Well, Mr. Premier, I will provide that information for you. Zero! Every dollar that the SCIC people approved for spending overseas was for food, health, agriculture-related problems, and water. I have yet to know of one educational project that is related to political education. Not one dollar in their matching grants program. Not one dollar, Mr. Premier, and you cut it from 2.1 million to \$900,000. You had \$1.3 million that you took from SCIC and give it to the oil companies. Nothing else.

And that money I'd like to tell \$1 - \$1 that was spend for something that wasn't related to supplying water projects. You denied the MCC, a project that was going to make wells, water projects, individual water projects, that was denied and turned down after SCIC approved it. That project didn't go.

You denied projects on water in Lesotho and different countries, and you did not do matching grants on those projects that were approved, where the people of Saskatchewan raised their share of the matching funds, the Mennonite Central Committee, the Catholic Council of Bishops, and the various groups, the Lutheran Laymen's' League. Those groups had projects that were ready to go. SCIC's approval committee approved them — and you denied them.

You denied them that money, but you gave it to the oil companies. You had over \$1.3 million extra for the oil companies, but you didn't have it for SCIC. And I'd like you to tell me \$1 that was spent for something that was political education that SCIC approved? I' like you to tell me \$1? Just give me one example of, not 100,000, not 10,000, but \$1?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we have made decisions to spend more money on education in the province of Saskatchewan than we have internationally. Now the hon. member's priorities may be different. We have decided, we have decided to spend more money on education, particularly of people in northern Saskatchewan, and that's extremely important.

Why he gets into a tirade about oil companies, or whatever, when he could just add up the educational dollars that is going into northern Saskatchewan — it's significantly more. Why doesn't he make those . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it is, and you can look at it. I went through it yesterday. So, I mean, we've decided to make those decisions to make sure education is a top priority in northern Saskatchewan, and we'll take all the assistance and matching grants from church organizations and volunteer organizations, or anybody else that is sincere about it and wants to help people in northern Saskatchewan with respect to education, and training, and careers, and so forth.

Now internationally, we said that we will help in terms of all kinds of things. When it comes to education in the province of Saskatchewan, we've made it the priority. That's our decision. You may not agree with it. That's the decision that's been made.

Mr. Engel: — You stood up in answer to the former premier of this province that you would quadruple the amount of your matching grant if the people would prove that those are projects that relate to food, and water, and health. You said you'd quadruple it.

I'm saying to you that the Mennonite Central Committee, the Lutheran Laymen's' League, the United Church group, and all these groups that make up the 27 member organizations in this province, have quadrupled their collection. They have projects totalling over \$4 million this year — this year. They have over 4.5 or \$4.8 million worth of projects that they're funding overseas. You said you'd quadruple it. I challenge you to not quadruple it. I challenge you to leave it where it was when you took office. Leave it where it was when you took office. I challenge you to double and a little bit more, and make it 2.2 million, like it was when you took over, and match at least \$2.2 million of that, that are strictly agricultural aided projects, that are strictly projects of . . .

In Ethiopia, for example, in a place called Nazareth, where they've got about 12 million acres that they could reclaim with a little funds and a little money — why don't you allow them to go ahead with that project so those people could feed themselves? Why don't you go ahead and let them do that? But no, you've cut that project. Those people expected to get that matching grant.

The collection program that I'm involved with, with the Mennonite's food bank, and the grain that's being contributed over quota deliveries that they can deliver and then was matched

formerly, is cut off. They're cut off. They're not getting it. Because instead of being \$4 million worth of matching grants, you are down to less than \$1 million. And those are food related projects.

I went and looked at them. I've assured myself that there's no money being wasted when it goes through an international voluntary organization. I'm satisfied that it is a very good delivery — a better delivery of program money than you'll ever get here in Saskatchewan because it's done with people that are there because they are committed to it. And they have a conviction and a conscience to do a good job, and they do it; and they do it. And you're saying that you" quadruple it if they do a good job. Why don't you leave it the same? Why give your fancy statements? Why didn't you leave it where it's at? Why don't you make it \$2.2 million?

Because I used the oil companies, Mr. Premier, for a reason, because the oil is there, the oil will be pumped, and the oil will come out, with your money or without it. The only difference is you've made some people around the world, oil companies from all over the world, you made them richer. You made them wealthier by \$300 million since you are in office. But because there's church groups and voluntary organizations, Unicef — you can name 27 of them — that are raising money in Saskatchewan, and that funding that's going overseas is over \$4 million — 4.8, 4.8. And those projects are good projects that are helping people to stay alive.

Have you seen a hungry child? Have you seen hundreds of hungry kids that haven't got anything to eat? Have you seen that? Do you know who you're denying that food? And then you get up with blatant sayings, if we'd be feeding them we'd quadruple it. Mr. Premier, I challenge you to do half as much as you say you're going to do, do half as much as you say. Give them 2.5 million. Tell me why you won't do that?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, we have made the decision to spend the money on education in Saskatchewan. Mr. Chairman, the amount of money going to training and education in northern Saskatchewan is up significantly. I went through it yesterday in detail, all the programs. It's a lot of money. Millions and millions of dollars. Now that's up over the previous administration, and we have made that decision. Now you may not agree with it. Fair enough. You may not agree with it, but that's the decision that was made. We have made that decision; the people of northern Saskatchewan are glad to see that. The point is you want the money spent on your organization. We've decided to spend the money on the people of northern Saskatchewan. And that's the difference.

Fair enough. We decided to do it there, the extra money, and you said you would do it some place else. Well, fair enough. But that's the decision that was made, because we think it's really important now to spend that kind of money on education in northern Saskatchewan.

And any organization that wants to collect volunteer money and spend it in Ethiopia or any place else, they can do that. I'm not stopping that. You're asking me to match that. I'm saying I'm using the money today for education in northern Saskatchewan, and that's a conscious decision. And I believe the people of northern Saskatchewan, particularly the native people of northern Saskatchewan, appreciate that money on education and training now more than anybody else that I can think of. And it's my responsibility to help the people of Saskatchewan. I can't stop other people from wanting to help people in Ethiopia. That's fair enough. And we are providing some — not as much, because we've decided to make the decision to spend it on education. You may spend it differently, but let's agree that your priorities may be different than mine. Mine are in education in northern Saskatchewan; yours may be with people in Ethiopia on different kinds of programs.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Premier, that is not the comparison. That is not the comparison. My comparison is that you have four or five friends that you've decided to give \$300 million to, in the oil companies. How much of that 300-and-some million dollars — I'll use 350 million — since you're in office how much of that \$350 million that you spent in the oil companies is staying in

Saskatchewan? How much of that \$350 million that you're spending on oil companies, extra, over and above what the previous administration did, is staying in Saskatchewan? That's the money I'm talking about.

The money you've got — the chintzy education plan you've got, and the money you moved from education and that you're moving in the North — that's great. No problem. No problem at all. We have no problem with that. And we think you're doing far too little for job creations in the North. That is no problem.

What we're saying is: the oil industry that you've enhanced, and all you've enhanced is people in Texas. Do you want to know where Nielson lives, that owns Husky Oil, that's involved with Husky Oil? In Wyoming. Do you want to know his address? I've been there. I've been there. You've enhanced his income.

Do you want to know where the fellows that own the trucking companies that make \$12,000 a year extra on the tax breaks on their trucks — do you want me to take you there and introduce you to him and have a coffee in his house? I've been there in Winnipeg; I've been there. And I know how much he makes on a truck, but I've also been in Africa and seen the little babies that you're starving, and that you've cut off by \$1.2 million since you've taken office. And that's where I'm saying you have your priorities all wrong, Mr. Premier.

You have money for those that don't need it, but you don't have money for those that the people of Saskatchewan say they are willing to help, and they are willing to feed. They're saying we're willing to share in a time of drought, in a time of depression, in a time of wet conditions in the North. The people of Saskatchewan have raised a million dollars more this year than last year for international aid — a million dollars more.

And what have you done? You're giving him a million and a half dollars less, and I think your priorities are not in keeping with the priorities of the people you represent. That's all I'm saying.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think that there was a question. Obviously the hon. member would spend his money different than we would.

With respect to the oil thing, we went through it yesterday at great length. There's no sense repeating it again today. We have a brand new co-op upgrader that we are building, and it's very popular. Co-ops all across the province are delighted with it. The first time in the history of the province, lots of jobs. The revenue coming in is being used for lots of it.

Mr. Sveinson: — Just to clarify the position of your government with respect to these matching grants. I would expect you to be aware that groups like the Mennonite Central Committee are involved in disasters — where they happen in Saskatchewan, when they happen, as soon as they happen — and will contribute manpower and moneys that are required to alleviate the cost to this government and other governments for this type of disaster. And there's many examples where this has happened.

And I heard you earlier say that the matching grants they've raised this year should be spent in northern Saskatchewan. I think, historically, that the churches likely opened the North, and the churches in this province are very active in the North, alleviating the poverty. And I'm sure that groups, such as those that we've discussed today, contribute to the training of Northerners, and have since the area was opened up.

Are you saying that northern Saskatchewan, under your administration, has become a Third World comparative situation? And that the donations from the church groups and other people in the province that would normally go into a situation like Zaire or other Third World situations for agriculture, for water, and for other developmental projects that are administered by people from Regina and are administered by people from Saskatchewan . . .

They are people that have donated their time or, in fact, they've donated their lives to that undertaking. And you're saying that the moneys that these church groups would identify for the Third World countries should be spent in an area of Saskatchewan that this provincial government denies and, in fact, has, I think, over the general budget, certainly cut out the input into the North with respect to funding. Maybe education is one area that you've decided to spend more money in, but I think you definitely and categorically you've reduced the input of funding into northern Saskatchewan. And I would just like to be clear on that particular aspect.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I don't believe that I can add much more. We are spending more money on education in northern Saskatchewan — it's been requested — more money on training.

I might add, for the general population of the province of Saskatchewan, we have cut taxes to the extent of well over \$100 million. And we find now that, as a result of that \$100 million, people can contribute to volunteer organizations, they can contribute to their churches, because it's \$100 million less in tax. And that money is going to all kinds of good causes, and we're delighted that it is.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, Mr. Premier, with all due respect, I think that commitment was your commitment as a government. I think the commitment from the Mennonite Central Committee and other church groups is a committee of the church group to be active in international affairs where they feel the moneys are required.

And what I hear from you is that you doubt their ability to, in fact, single out areas in this world that are in need and, in fact, that Saskatchewan people should be involved in those areas through the government. You're suggesting that these people should not get their matching grants unless the moneys are spent in another Third World situation like northern Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — What I am saying is that the province of Saskatchewan has the responsibility for the people of Saskatchewan. And I believe that it's an excellent idea that volunteer organizations or churches from Saskatchewan, across Canada, across the United States, can raise money for developing countries, for areas that are in famine, and so forth.

When it comes to deciding how much money we're going to spend in developing countries versus education in the province of Saskatchewan, we are going to put our priorities on education in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I've said we will contribute towards food and health and so forth internationally. Education is, even under the Canadian constitution, our responsibility, and we're going to make sure that there's sufficient funds and increasing amounts of money in education all across Saskatchewan, but particularly, as I mentioned yesterday in some detail, the training for people in northern Saskatchewan.

And they appreciate it very much. They hadn't had it for years — years and years and years. Obviously because the base is so low, they never got it. Now they're going to receive it, and they like it.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, basically what you're saying is that you don't choose to be involved in international affairs, even with programs that are under the auspices of local Saskatchewan groups. And, in fact, does that mean that we can expect you to eliminate those grants completely? The matching grants will not be available from this provincial government for these projects and these programs?

I'm sure the Mennonite people in the Rosthern constituency would certainly like to hear this — or in Saskatoon, or in Regina. You know, they'd like to know where they stand. They're not really sure.

Your government is saying that you should send bureaucrats around the world to make sure this money is spent properly. I say it's just a delay tactic. You don't want to be involved. You don't want to be involved, and I can . . . I think what you're saying here today, Mr. Premier, is that you're going to cut these matching grants completely.

I'm sure the member for Rosthern wouldn't agree with that. But I think that that's what you've said to the people of Saskatchewan and the groups that are involved internationally and have raised money and have raised agricultural products that they've actually sent to these Third World countries. And that the Third World situation that you've created, and certainly been part of in northern Saskatchewan, while they certainly relate to the problem, and I'm sure they're willing to help, they also have problems around the world they're willing to help in.

All they've requested you is to match the funds, and the funds aren't astronomical. You've cut over a million dollars out of the funding this year. And I suppose the question would be: are you going to cut more funds and, if so, how much more, and when will you reduce the funds to zero and expect the commitment to be from the people who are, in fact, administering these programs?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the hon. member knows that we all contribute to volunteer organizations; we contribute to churches. I contribute to our church for contributions. Members of this Assembly contribute to churches. They can do all kinds of very positive things, and we're happy with that.

I think in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman, the volunteer organizations are the best in the world. The Kinsmen's Telemiracle is the largest single accumulation of funds with a telephone, phone-in campaign any place per capita. It's great and, as Saskatchewan people, we're known for that.

We will continue to support that. I would encourage all hon. members to contribute to their churches, to donate to volunteer organizations, and to work with their church groups, whatever they may find to help people all over the world. I would encourage that. I do that; other members do that. I believe that's their function, and I give them full credit for it.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 10 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

LEGISLATION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 21 (continued)

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, while we're waiting for the Premier's staff to arrive, will you refresh my memory on which of these sub-votes have already been disposed of, because they went to the committee of internal economy, and which ones are to be voted?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I understand it's the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk's was not, and the Ombudsman is found in the *Estimates* at that time as well. That's under the responsibility of Provincial Secretary, which I will handle. So we would move with just the one, I believe, that has to be cleared, and that is Merrilee Rasmussen's department of Legislative Counsel.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, my note is unclear here. I'm going down now the items on the left side. My notes indicate that items 1 and 2 were not referred and

dealt with, and that's what the minister has said. Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 were, and I was uncertain about item 12, whether . . . Did that go to the . . . Item 12, expenses of committees of the legislature. I'm simply asking for my own clarification: does that need to be voted or did it go to the Board of Internal Economy?

Mr. Chairman: — It was done on April 17th of '84. It's all been done, in the Standing Committee on Estimates.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, Standing Committee on Estimates, Board of Internal Economy — right? So that we're left with one and two. We're left with Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk, and Ombudsman. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: — The item of business before the committee is going to be Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk. I'm just waiting for the officials. Would the opposition like to proceed with some questions?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, again for clarification, I'm looking at the supplementary estimates, and I'm looking at page 4 and legislation, and items 1, 2, and 3, and I take it they are all dealt with, and that we don't have any need to concern ourselves with them.

Mr. Chairman: — that is correct.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to Legislative counsel and Law Clerk, I think the only question I would have to ask there is: is it proposed to make any substantial changes in the structure of the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk in the forthcoming year, or is it proposed to have the office carry on in substantially the same way that it has?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — We will be dealing with the matter in the Board of Internal Economy. At this time I don't see any reason to see any significant changes, but certainly it will be dealt with there, so there'll be ample opportunity to discuss it and review it.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, as you indicate, there will be other opportunities to express our point of view, but with the facts that we now have available to us, we are attracted to the idea of leaving the system substantially as it is, and we make that point. There will be, as I say, another forum to argue it if changes are proposed.

Item 1

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I'd like to ask one or two questions which I suspect the minister will need assistance on, and basically about revisions of statutes, and whether or not the current system of loose-leafing and the like is working.

That's a kind of a technical question, and if the minister has no objection, I will simply direct that question to legislative counsel with a copy to the minister, and he can reply. It is not a question of policy, but only to see how the new system is working.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, the Ombudsman has, from time to time, pointed out that his work-load is growing. And I think it is a function of the times in which we live that the public seems to be less willing to accept, perhaps, the decisions made by government, all government, and that there is growing use of other avenues, other appeal routes, if I may put it that way. That's true of human rights commissions; I thin it is true of the Ombudsman as well.

In times of some social turmoil, which I believe we now live in, I believe these bodies provide a very excellent opportunity for citizens to at least feel that they are getting a redress in cases where they're entitled to it, and believe they had an extra kick at the can in cases where they weren't entitled.

Accordingly, I believe the work done by people like the Ombudsman is very valuable, and he obviously feels so too. He is suggesting that his staff is under a great deal of pressure, and judging from the number of matters which are referred, I am sure that's true. And the question, therefore, I direct to the minister is whether or not there are any proposals to augment the staff of the Ombudsman.

I note what amounts to a very small reduction this year, approximately the same staff — 16.4 person-years, as opposed to 16.8 person-years. In the fact of what is clearly a growing work-load, is the government giving any consideration to increasing the staff of the Ombudsman?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm not so sure, with regard to the question of increasing the staff. Last year's budget, we increased the allocation to the Ombudsman by 8 per cent. His report was rather critical of the Department of Finance because he had to come before the treasury board to justify his money.

He was, in fact, increased 8 per cent last year; and this year, I believe it's somewhere around 5 per cent, or in that neighbourhood. In any discussions that we have had with the Ombudsman they recognize, as well, that they compete with other departments, and I believe — and I could be wrong — that the Ombudsman's investigations in the most recent report were, in fact, down from last year, marginally.

The Ombudsman: clearly an established institution in this country — some provinces have moved to eliminate the Ombudsman altogether. We don't subscribe to that. I suppose it will continue as in the past, the same as legislative counsel, or Legislative Assembly, that we have to compete and try to adjust it reasonably as we can. So I can't say that I will give him more people. I think the job is, in fact, getting done, and if that pressure becomes too great, then obviously we have to look at it.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Minister. In respect to the Office of the Ombudsman, I want to ask you whether you are considering expanding the purview and the scope of its investigative capacity. Are there any plans to broaden the base of the investigation?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That proposal has been around for some time. I think it was in his report, if I — I'm recalling from memory — I believe he referred to wanting investigative powers of deputy ministers. He's been making that point for five to six years. We are, in fact, considering that, but that proposal was to come before the legislative review committee. Any movement on that would be next session of the legislature.

Mr. Koskie: — I think the minister, Mr. Chairman, puts it in the proper perspective. I'd only want to say that we had reviewed that same expansion of scope of investigation to include the deputy ministers, and we had resolved our position of accepting that. And there was legislation which, in fact, had been put in place. And I'm wondering: do you see any particular reasons for not having a move forward with the expansion of this here investigative capacity?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — From a personal point of view I have not been involved in that process, and I can't respond to that other than to say that it hasn't cleared the hoops of government policy yet with regard to that specific item and that legislative change.

Mr. Koskie: — Just on a further follow-up on that. Can the minister give any assurance

whether this matter has, in fact, been considered, and whether it's just a matter of bring in the legislation, and whether, in fact, we're likely to see expansion of the investigation capacity of the Ombudsman, say, in the next year? It seems to me that you have always campaigned on the basis of open government. And I am disturbed with your comments during the time that you were in opposition and your actions now when you become elected government.

We get lots of words about openness, and I have seen your government procrastinate and delay and stall on the Crown corporations where we were supposed to have them televised. And you have denied the members now who are in opposition of proceeding with that.

And here again you have an opportunity where the previous government was committed to more openness, more review for the benefit of the public, and again it seems to me what your government is doing is closing the doors of knowledge to the public, rather than enlarging them.

Another instance was the radio broadcasts which were excluded from the legislature, which reached many people across the province. And, more particularly, the televising of Crown corporations. That was urged by your in opposition. You were urging a further expansion in respect to the Office of the Ombudsman.

Now you are in government, and apparently you want to close the doors, and I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, why can't you be consistent with your position when you were in opposition, and now when you are in government?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, I think, as the hon. member knows, the question of televising the House was something that was arrived at, something that was arrived at by an all-party committee of this House, all-party committee of this House to deal with the question of television. That's not a whole lot to do with the Ombudsman. I think the Ombudsman has the authority to publicly state his views. I think he does that very well. I don't think the independence of the Ombudsman is really seriously in question by the hon. member. His independence, I think, is very clear, very established, and the funding for his office is appropriate.

I could read with regards to the — in the Ombudsman's report with regard to budget:

In my 1982 annual report I emphasized the threat to the integrity of my office's budget bureau recommendations had been accepted. Fortunately, the recommendations were not accepted. The funds for my office for fiscal year '83-84 were approved in the following amount: \$641,000

And goes to that, so I don't think that we could be accused of trying to muzzle the Ombudsman.

Mr. Koskie: — I wasn't alleging that there was any overt actions on behalf of the government to muzzle. I'm putting forward the position that you took, Mr. Minister, when you were in opposition, that if you formed the government that there would be an increase in openness and availability and access to the public. You have an opportunity here to demonstrate it. If you look across the other provinces, deputy ministers are included within the scope of many of the Ombudsman's in other provinces.

I ask you why you have delayed? Why have you delayed to expand a power which the Ombudsman has, indeed, been asking for for a number of years? I recognize he had asked when we were government, but I also acknowledge that we had, in fact, put in place legislation to, in fact, extend the scope of the powers of the Ombudsman.

Why are you sitting and closing the doors of further information? And this is evidenced not only in the Ombudsman, as I indicated, but in all the other areas which you supported in the past, to make available to the public more and more information, and you have closed the door to, as I say, the television of Crown corporation.

You were a great advocate, I remember, when you ran from the public accounts, took your sucker and ran home, resigned, and it was over opening up the public accounts to further review. And now you are in government, and you have taken really regressive steps as to the position that you took in the past.

And so I'm asking you, can you give any commitment here that you will, indeed, proceed with the expansion of the powers under the Ombudsman?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, the only commitment I can make is that it's in the process of determining where that legislative change should be made, and I suppose the commitment will be finalized when one sees the legislation on the table in this Legislative Assembly, as it was before.

With regards to the question that you raise of televising committees, the Board of Internal Economy is dealing with that question. The view is that by next session, the Crown Corporations Committee would, in fact, be sitting in this Assembly with the full view of television.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 21 agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I could perhaps clarify the intention to . . . as the order of proceeding — it's been back and forth — so that people would understand. It would be the intention on page 3 of the blues to call first, Adjourned Debates — Bill No. 84, Bill No. 87, Bill 98.

We would then move to Second Readings, on page 4 of the blues. I would advise the House that it would be the intention at this stage for the government to leave Bill No. 32, Bill No. 92, Bill No. 93, and Bill No. 96 on the order paper over adjournment.

We would then proceed with Bills 58, 100, 101, 102, and 103. That would take all bills then into the committee stage. That would be the intention of the way we would proceed.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Hepworth that Bill No. 87 — **An Act respecting Loan Guarantees for Feeder Associations** be now read a second time.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the members of the Assembly, I would . . . I think Bill 87, An Act respecting Loan Guarantees to Feeder Associations, and Bill 82, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I have some remarks; and by leave, if you would grant that I could relate my remarks to both of those bills, then I don't need to do it when Bill 82 comes along. Now is that possible that I can do that?

I'm going to give some general statements that I have the same concerns, I have the same concerns about Bill 82 as I do about Bill 87. Bill 87 is An Act respecting Loan Guarantees for Feeder Associations, and Bill 82 is An Act respecting Intensive Livestock Operations, and I believe that the general intent, and the overall emphasis and the direction this government is taking in agriculture, is shored up, or a crutch is being applied, with both of these bills.

And I think today we're at a crossroads here in Saskatchewan, that the Minister of Agriculture and his advisers — and I believe it's more his advisers than the minister himself — are leading and pointing the way, Mr. Speaker, to a crossroads in agriculture.

I think, in my riding, the short-grass area of Saskatchewan, the people put their cows out to pasture. If the pasture is good, and in a normal year we have a decent amount of rainfall, the cows have their calves; in fall they round them up; they're branded, and the calves are usually nice, heavy, well-grown calves. They're brought to the sales. They bulk of the calves that are raised in our ridings down there are sold at some local auction sale, Mankota or Maple Creek or Assiniboia, and are picked up by feeders, some of them in the area, some of them are moved out.

Generally, the feeding of cattle by the average farmer and that farmer farm operation is centred in areas where more cattle are grown. When I first got elected and I thought, from travelling my constituency extensively, and being the first New Democrat, or CCFer — that time it was even CCFer — to be elected in that area, I thought I represented the vast majority of cattlemen in Saskatchewan.

And there was a member sitting about where the member for Quill Lakes is sitting today, and he taught be a lesson on cattle that I will not soon forget. And Tommy Weatherald pointed out that in his constituency, which would fit onto one of my constituent's ranch . . . Now these are accurate figures, Mr. Speaker. I have one rancher that could cover all of the then Tommy Weatherald's riding, and Tommy Weatherald represented more cattle than I did.

Now that was an awakening for me, and with my travels around the country since that time I find that the smaller farms, the farmers with five, six quarters of land, keep some cattle — 20, 15, 20 cows — raise their calves, but to make the most out of that operation, they're the ones that picked up on our feeder assistance programs, and they're the ones that finished their cattle out.

Today I want to point out where this government is leading us and where they're going. In the United States, in all of the United States, they have a designation when they call a feedlot a commercial feeder operation, and that is when you can keep more than 500 head in one feedlot at one time. From there on over, the U.S. Department of Agriculture calls that a commercial feeder operation.

The United States, in all of continental U.S.A., there were, in 1982, 300 commercial feedlots — 300. 300. Now we feed out about 10 per cent of the cattle in Canada, compared to what the United States does. All of Canada feeds out about 10 per cent as many cattle as the United States does.

So if we compare that and transport that into Canadian terms, in all of Canada we'd need about 30 commercial feeders — 30 commercial feedlots in all of Canada. If by bringing that number down one more time and say what percentage of the cattle should be fed out in Saskatchewan compared to all of Canada, and if we would get our fair share by province, we'd have about 50 per cent, maybe 20 per cent of the cattle. So we'd have about room for four or five commercial feedlots.

Now I have one in Assiniboia that qualifies, that can keep 500 head at one time. I already have one. So consequently, as far as Saskatchewan is concerned, we are looking at legislation to support intensive feeder operations, and it frustrates me to think that we are promoting legislation here in Saskatchewan, we are promoting legislation to help set up and expand and promote more large commercial operations.

I'm not sure what that is going to do to the cattle industry. I'm not sure. But I think, and I'm so suspicious . . . and I'm normally not a suspicious person by nature. Anybody that knows me knows that I'm a wide open, straightforward, straight shooter. I call a spade a spade, and if I see something, I call it. And maybe a young fellow from Vanguard that has a law practice in

Saskatoon says I blow my horn.

But here we have a minister of agriculture, here we have a minister of agriculture that makes his living in my constituency, that has taken his training in my riding, that has served in a little 4-H group by the only person in my riding that qualifies with a commercial feedlot — has been his 4-H leader, has tried to teach this man the facts of life of the cattle business.

This man knows what a cow is like. You know, this deep in, as far as he can get his fingers in the mouth or whatever end he looks and feels, he knows cattle on the inside better than I do. I will admit that. I admit he knows cattle on the inside. He can cut them up and dissect them, and he can maybe even take two and sew them together and make one that's alive and will walk away from his table. I don't know if you're that good. But this man knows cattle.

But I also know that he takes advice, and he wants to fit into the crowd of the people that call themselves Tories. And he wants to prove to his group and his peers and the people sitting around him there . . . I am worthy to be the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan. So he's not taking it as advice from his former 4-H teacher who made a go of feeding cattle. In times that are tough in the last two years, he's still making it a go. He doesn't listen to people like that. He listens to people who are first-rate Tories and are telling him, "Look, buster, you come up with a program that is going to make us some money, and that's going to save us some money, or we're going to get you. You're not going to get that nomination back in a foreign constituency. We don't need foreigners representing us if you can't come up with something that works." And so he's come up with a little package, the entire agricultural package that's the icing today — the icing on it today.

First of all he come up with this thing, and the words he used, he said: \$25,000 in taxes can be saved if we get into this. Then he came up with a loan guarantee. And today we're looking at up to 25 per cent of the money can be guaranteed if you get into intensified livestock operations. After 25 per cent of guarantees, I'm not sure — I'm not sure how many of your kind of neighbours and your contemporaries and the young fellows that went to 4-H with you that are back in the riding; that came back during the progressive time in our history, during the '70s; and these young people came back with the hope that now we can make it in farming, now we've got a government that's going to give us a chance, now we've got a government that cares about us.

You're turning your back on your contemporaries, and your contemporaries are going to say to you, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, you had all the programs in place for the wealthy, you had all the programs in place to set up rich organizations, but you don't have anything for us. And this is the icing on the cake. This is the sad facts are really showing up where here we have an arrogant government willing to put up, and back up those that don't need it, those that don't need it, Mr. Speaker.

People that want to get into these massive intensified livestock operations don't need those loan guarantees. It's a program that's set up to help the wealthy get wealthier, and to get the tax breaks, and the tax credits. And besides that, now you get this other guarantee in there so they can get their working capital to buy up . . . It starts with a small amount, and as they build their thing, and as they go . . . I've yet to see a feedlot that was built and the whole 600 or 700 acres of feedlot was laid out at one time.

I belonged to a mutual feeders, Assiniboia Mutual Feeders. I was an original shareholder in that. I put up my dollars, and I put up my barley, and we tried to make it go during the last capitalist reign we had here in Saskatchewan during Ross Thatcher's day. And today, Mr. Speaker, one person owns that feedlot. That got into the hands of one.

These associations have a way of working themselves into the hands of one person, and if we're organizing and grouping and backing money for more of those . . . I tried that route. I've been

that road, Mr. Minister of Agriculture.

I'm not sure why you are putting all your marbles in the pockets of the rich. I don't know that. But that's your choice. That's your choice. Maybe there are some farmers that will get together and organize these associations and these co-ops and get into this intensified production. I hope there are. I hope there are because I'd like to see more of the cattle fed that are bought at the sales at Mankota, and the sales at Assiniboia, and at the sales at Maple Creek. I hope those cattle are bought and fed locally, but I don't know if we want it done on the commercial-type operations. I don't know where we would put a feedlot like Turlock or Tracy, California. I don't know which part of Saskatchewan one of those would fit into. I don't know that. I don't like to see that. That one feedlot could feed all the cattle we grow in Saskatchewan. That one feedlot could do them all, Mr. Speaker. That's as big as it is. A couple of million head a year run through there. I'm not sure what the minister's getting at. But these are the people he's supporting, and this is the kind of promotion he's doing.

With those few words I will say that we're reluctantly supporting another piece of legislation that's design-engineered, and the architectural work was done by those that have it. This isn't a program that came out of a small wheat pool committee that sat around a table and said, "We're going to look for a way to help us out." This isn't a program that was designed by a local farmers' union group that sat around in their meeting and talked about it, and said, "This is the answer, and here's the direction we're going to go to help the small farmer." This was a program designed . . . I bet you Boyd Roberts had a little say in this one. I'd make a little wager on that.

This was designed by people that said, "We've got to find a place where our investments can be guaranteed, where we can put up some bucks. We're going to get a 25 per cent guarantee over here, and we're going to get a \$25 tax credit over here. We'll get it coming, and we'll get it going. We've got it both ways. We can't lose on it." Those guys are laughing.

The young farmer that's farming up at Carrot River or Nipawin, he'll still wear his rubber boots, walk around his yard dejected and say, "Boy, I wish we'd have an NDP government in Saskatchewan. I wish we'd have somebody around that could help us." Those guys are still going to be in as depressed a mood as they ever were.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will be saying that it's too bad you couldn't come up with something good.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, hon. members. I'm not going to spend any great long time in closing debate, except to make two points. Number one, in so far as who designed this legislation and who believes in this legislation and who wanted it, I can tell you that the Saskatchewan Cattle Feeders Association are very much in favour of this legislation. They have looked at it; they have studied it. In fact, we took them along with us — at least, one of their executive — to Alberta where the program has been in place for some good many years, and I think it's played a part in fostering the livestock feeding industry over there. That's point number one I would like to make.

Number two, I think the kinds of programs we've put in place during this session — and there have been a good many of them from Agriculture's standpoint — the positive reception they're receiving, I think, as well is exemplified by a letter I received. And I'd like to read it — and it's very short, Mr. Speaker — to the members here because it exemplifies the kinds of reaction we're getting to this and other programs.

Dear Lorne: You are to be commended for the changes announced in the recent budget. I was extremely happy to see such an innovative idea such as the tax credit for cattle feeding. This is the biggest boost the cattle feeding industry has ever had in Saskatchewan. This program should greatly stimulate cattle feeding without any large outlay of cash from the government. But, most importantly, it should not

disrupt the basic herds or markets in the province. The tax credit, along with the various types of feeder financing programs (along with the various types of feeder financing programs, I should emphasize, Mr. Speaker), when combined with the beef stabilization program plan, have created a vastly changed climate in the cattle business.

That was from a young cattle feeder not that far out of Regina here. That is the general view out there, Mr. Speaker, and I think the pieces of legislation we've put together here, our overall package, is designed to foster livestock feeding in this province.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Folk that Bill No. 84 — **An Act to amend The Heritage Property Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Shillington: — I intend to express to the minister our concern about this legislation. We will be voting against the bill. It is our view, Mr. Minister — and I stand to be corrected; I would listen to any comments you have to address on the subject — but it is our view that this bill strengthens the hand of developers vis-à-vis those who want to preserve heritage buildings.

It is always a tension. There will always be a tension between the two groups. I don't know why, but developers don't want to refurbish old buildings. They want to tear them down and build new ones. I don't know why that is, but it is in the nature of every developer to want to tear down some beautiful old structures and put up glass and steel in their place . . .

An Hon. Member: — Cement.

Mr. Shillington: — And often cement, that's right.

The Saskatchewan Heritage Act was passed to redress the balance, and in my view, and in the view of our caucus, it has done that job admirably. That legislation has been the subject of favourable comments from a good many jurisdictions outside of Saskatchewan. The legislation has been viewed by other provinces as a model in striking a fair and reasonable balance between the developers, who want to tear everything down, and society as a whole, which has an interest in preserving our past.

It is essential, Mr. Speaker, that we preserve for the next generation something that they can see and touch. It is not sufficient to tell our great grandchildren and their grandchildren how we lived. They've got to be able to feel it and touch it. We have museums, Mr. Speaker, which preserve the artifacts: the ploughs, the tractors; but you can't put buildings in a museum; you've got to keep them, and this act was intended to preserve, for generations yet unborn, the built-up environment, as it's called. In our view, this legislation tips the balance. We think that's unfortunate.

Our society has not suffered, to put it mildly, from too much preservation of our heritage. If we have suffered at all, it is from too little. We haven't suffered yet because it's too recent. We can readily learn about the past because we can go to our fathers and our grandfathers, many of whom are still alive, and ask them. My children and my grandchildren aren't going to have that option. If we don't preserve something of our life for them, they will have nothing that they can see and touch and experience.

In our view, Mr. Minister, this tips the balance in favour of the developers. We think that's unfortunate. We think there is no call for that, apart from some developers, and we believe that the amendment should be withdrawn or left to stand on the order paper over the summer, during which time more people could make their views known.

I want to complain on this issue, as I have on others, about the manner in which this House proceeds with legislation. I don't think this is a new problem, Mr. Minister, and I don't think it's an emergency. I believe you knew about this last fall when a Regina developer, who I will not name, got himself involved in a celebrated dispute with city council. I think you knew about the problem then.

I think it is unfair, Mr. Minister, for you to bring in this legislation 10 days before the end of the session, and then ask to pass it. We can have a look at it, and have done that — and I don't like what I see — but my constituents haven't, and this is an issue for me as an MLA, because most of those heritage buildings are within the four corners of my riding, and it is in the nature of a down-town area that a goodly number of the people who want to preserve the buildings live in the down-town area as well. It's in the nature of those who are concerned about heritage.

Mr. Minister, I think it's unfair to the public to have brought this in and to want to pass it 10 days later. They simply don't have an opportunity to make their views known. I think if they did, Mr. Minister, I think you wouldn't like what you're going to hear. And I suspect one of the reasons you're ramming this thing through, rather than dealing with it in the fall, is that you don't want to hear what the public are going to say to you about it.

My suggestion to you is, Mr. Minister, that the bill not be proceeded with, be left to stand on the order paper. We will see during the summer who's right. And if I'm wrong, I'll tell you that I'll vote for it.

I don't think I am, Mr. Minister, and I ask you to let this bill stand so that, if you won't listen to reason, at least from me, at least the public will have an opportunity to make their views known. And you haven't done it. And I'll tell you, if you think this is a bill of no public interest, you haven't been where I've been. There is widespread interest in heritage matters.

So I say to you, Mr. Minister: let this bill stand. There is no emergency, no pressing necessity to pass it. Give the public an opportunity to express their views, and we'll see who's right.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I want to underline the words of my colleague, the member for Regina Centre, and I simply want to say a couple of things. This bill was patterned on the Ontario and Alberta bills. It has very few powers in it with respect to real property that were not in those bills.

The minister believes that the bill is now too harsh on property owners. What he is, in effect, saying is that the rules in Alberta and the rules in Ontario were too hard on developers. He's got to convince us that the Alberta government and the Ontario government were not sufficiently solicitous of the concerns of developers, and were too harsh.

I think that's going to be a difficult line of argument because I don't think it's true. I think very, very few people have suffered, if any, because of the provisions of this bill — the act as it now exists. If the minister can indicate who has been disadvantaged by the terms as they now exist, he should say so. Who has had their property wrongfully taken away from them without compensation? And I think he won't be able to name people who have.

Further, his colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs, made a strong point when he brought in the urban municipalities act, of saying that he wanted to increase the powers of city councils and town councils. He wanted to give them more power to regulate and legislate for their communities.

And that's something that we approved of and voted with the government. We now have a bill

which specifically takes away powers from municipal councils, which specifically goes in the other direction, which specifically removes from the city council of Regina or Saskatchewan some of the powers they now have with respect to heritage property.

I am unaware of any cases where the city of Regina or the city of Saskatoon have abused those powers. I'm referring to those two cities as examples. I am unaware of where they have abused those powers. I am unaware, therefore, of why those powers have to be removed from them. I think they have acted judiciously. I do not think they have been busy expropriating at every corner. It, furthermore, removes a particular power from the provincial government. That may not be too damaging because the provincial government may have the power under some other legislation, but not so the municipal governments.

How does the minister expect to protect heritage property which is privately owned? I know of no way that this bill adds to the protection of heritage property which is privately owned, or adds to the likelihood of heritage property being designated. I see many things here which are quite the reverse, which will mean that fewer properties will be designated.

Let us be clear, no one is suggesting that people who own heritage property should have it designated, and they should bear all the financial loss. No one is suggesting that. But we are suggesting that whether or not heritage property is designated is a decision which should be made by a public body, by the provincial government, or by the municipal government. And they should be able to act, once they've made up their mind. They shouldn't be able to do it at the cost of the citizen. Agreed. But they should have the right to do it.

We shouldn't expect private citizens to take on the responsibility of treating their own heritage property as heritage property and refraining from getting the best and most economic use from their property. If somebody owns an older house in down-town Regina, on property which could be developed commercially, you cannot expect that citizen to bear the loss of treating that as heritage property.

You must expect that if it's going to be heritage property, if it's going to be preserved, it will be a designation by the city, or by the province. The province, or the city, is going to have to put up the money. But having agreed to put up the money, they should have the right to make the decision.

It seems to me that the minister is taking away essential powers — particularly from the cities — in this bill. And I think that that is undesirable. He is also changing the nature of the appeal. He is saying to the city: you can make a decision, but your decision doesn't count for anything until it has gone to the heritage appeal board.

That's a pretty odd way to have an appeal. The city council's decision doesn't count for anything if it is appealed. It should be the other way around. The city council makes the decision. Someone certainly should have the right to appeal it, but the city council's decision should be operative until it is successfully appealed.

If you want to put in provisions for making it temporarily inoperative — what the lawyers call a stay of proceedings — that's one thing. But you're saying that the city's decision doesn't count for anything, as I read it, until it goes to the heritage appeal board. Accordingly, the property could be dealt with, as I read it, as if the city hadn't made its decision until the heritage appeal board acts. That's to make a nullity of the council's decision.

It may well be that I misread the act in this regard. If so, I know the minister will clear it up. But there's no doubt what the direction of this act is. It is to depart from the structure of the basic act, which was adopted from Ontario and Alberta — more from Ontario than Alberta.

It is to say that the city councils, who used to have powers, won't have those powers any more,

when there's no evidence that they've abused them. It is to say that the province will do less in the designation and the acquisition of heritage property. And it is to say that the decisions of city councils will be delayed, at best, in their operation by the fact that they are virtual nullities until they have been reviewed by a heritage appeal board.

So much for giving more autonomy to cities. So much for trusting the people we elect. The minister says no, the city council can decide, but their decision is as nothing until we get to this heritage appeal board, elected by nobody.

I think the bill is going in the wrong direction. We agree that private citizens whose property may be designated should have the right to full compensation and should have the right to appeal designation. But we don't need to go any farther and pull the teeth of city councils so they cannot make effective decisions on heritage sites in their cities. What I say of cities is equally true of towns and villages.

So, Mr. Minister, I think your bill is going in the wrong direction. I think it is quite contrary to what you said — you and your colleague said — about the urban municipalities act and the way you wanted to give authority, appropriate authority, to city councils. I think the bill is one which will be welcomed by developers and will be regretted by all groups who have interested themselves in the preservation of heritage properties.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In closing debate on second reading of Bill No. 84, I'd like to just address a few comments to the comments that were addressed by members of the opposition. Certainly they seemed to have a little bit of a hang-up about tension between groups, and apparently a great amount of authority being given to developers.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier in previous remarks on second reading, the intent of The Heritage Property Act is to have a smooth-running, very fair, heritage property act. The intentions of our amendments are to expedite that: an increased role of a review board that will not necessarily let properties be tied up in committee for a long time; let that area for review be open, to further solidify the rights of property owners to have their issue and heritage dealt with expediently and fairly.

That's certainly the intention of this bill, and certainly a lot of the conjecture that might be borne out by the members of the opposition, I'm sure we can resolve in committee. So, therefore, I'll hereby move second reading of Bill No. 84.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 26

Muller
McLeod
Andrew
Taylor
Katzman
McLaren
Smith (Swift Current)
Baker
Hepworth

Duncan
Currie
Klein
Maxwell
Young
Folk
Bacon
Hodgins
Parker

Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Rybchuk
Caswell
Hampton
Gerich
Schmidt
Tusa
Zazelenchuk

NAYS — 5

Blakeney
Engel

Lingenfelter
Koskie

Shillington

Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that Bill No. 98 — **An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983 (No. 3)** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend The Arts Board Act

Hon. Mr. Folk: — thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to give second reading to Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Arts Board Act.

This act is an important one to the future development of our artistic excellence in this province. We believe the arts board is an important catalyst and facilitator for the Saskatchewan arts community.

In the past, the arts board has served this province's artists well, and it has, over its history, endeavoured to meet the changing needs of our artists. To allow this valuable public support vehicle to respond more effectively to a dynamic and ever-changing rule, its mandate and powers must be updated to reflect the realities of the 1980s. That is, in essence, what these amendments will do.

I want to briefly outline some of the factors that have made the amendments long overdue.

First, the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations, with a membership of 25 cultural organizations, represents a dynamic force within our province. Much of their collective effort is aimed at assisting individuals and groups who engage in our arts. This was one of the mandates of the arts board four decades ago, and while there was still a role for the board to play here, much of its activity has appropriately shifted to aiding the production and preservation of the arts.

Second, I believe one of the legitimate functions of the arts board is to assist individuals to study the arts. The Saskatchewan School of the Arts, for example, has a tradition and is recognized across Canada as attracting top-quality faculties. This reputation has given young Saskatchewan artists, musicians, and writers a rare opportunity to learn more about their art form from some of the best teachers in North America. This type of initiative should be allowed to continue and expand. For example, the arts board could offer other art instruction opportunities directly, or it could assist arts organizations to mount workshops and aid artists in attending courses here or elsewhere.

Third, the arts board has a broad mandate to support excellence in artistic achievement. However, with the creation of a Department of Culture and Recreation, and a strong infrastructure of provincial arts organizations, we believe the arts board can legitimately begin to target its efforts towards developing professional artists and arts organizations.

Fourth, the arts board has had the foresight to obtain a representative collection of contemporary art. Not only does this provide support and recognition to Saskatchewan artists, but it ensures that future generations will have access to the artistic heritage. The board's effort in this area has not gone unnoticed, and we think their mandate should clearly include the authority to do so. I am pleased to note that in the past two years the board has endeavoured to ensure that these valued works of art are more accessible to the Saskatchewan public which has paid for them.

The fifth point I want to make is that the amendments will confirm the right of the board to make grants available to individuals and organizations. Mr. Speaker, that, very briefly, has been the situation under which the arts board has operated. The amendments before this Assembly today will correct this. I won't go into the amendments in detail at this point. We'll wait until we go into committee.

But I'll just add, Mr. Speaker, that there is no doubt that the Saskatchewan Arts Board has been the leader in the development and maintenance of high standards for arts activities in this province, and it has been instrumental in enhancing the employment and educational opportunities of Saskatchewan artists. I congratulate the arts board for having the ability to respond to the needs of the people it serves. These amendments will allow the arts board to maintain its role as an arm's-length agency of government, while also helping this government achieve its goal of encouraging Saskatchewan art by supporting Saskatchewan artists and arts organizations. Mr. Speaker, with that I move second reading of Bill No. 58.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, I want to again express a concern about the bill. I think we have no problems with the bill except for section 4, which sets out specific duties for the executive director. It is our view that that will weaken the authority of the arts board. It is our view that a reasonable interpretation of that legislation is that the executive director will no longer be accountable to the arts board for those duties which are set out in the statute. And that, indeed, will undermine the arts board and strengthen the administration of the government vis-à-vis the arts board.

It is vitally important to the arts community that the arts board be maintained, and that its independence be maintained. Any derogation from the independence of the arts board from the government is simply not acceptable to the arts community.

I have, Mr. Minister, received a number of complaints about the bill. I have received complaints from a number of arts groups. It is our view that the majority of arts groups are opposed to what you're doing — again with the same complaint that we saw this bill for the first time 10 days ago. You're now ramming it through, and the public really have not had an opportunity to see it, to discuss it with you, or to make their views known to you.

I again suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that this bill should be let stand over the summer. I suspect by the look that I'm getting from the minister that that's not going to happen. I think our position will be that we will vote for the bill. We'll not vote against the bill, but we will be moving an amendment in committee of the whole which seeks to delete section 4. If section 4 is deleted, I think we have no problems with the bill, but if you're going to strengthen the position of the executive director and weaken the arts board, man, that's just not negotiable. It's not negotiable with me, and it's not negotiable with any arts group out there.

So I say to you, Mr. Minister, that we will not be opposing the bill itself . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . On second reading, that's right. We will be hoping for a change, and you'll listen to reason, and that you will accept an amendment which deletes section 4. If that happens, we've no problems with the bill. But we have every problem with section 4.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to look at this bill. The arts board is a long-time Saskatchewan institution. It was set up, and I'm speaking from memory now, I

believe in 1947 . . . '48, the minister corrects me. It's been around a very long time. It was, I believe, the first in Canada of having an arm's length from government board that would promote the arts. There was at that time in Saskatchewan, and there still is in Saskatchewan, a belief that government have a role in promoting the arts but that they can best do that by getting people, good people in the community, to be a board and to operate at arm's length from the government in the promotion of artistic endeavour. That model was adopted in the mid-'50s when the Canada Council was set up, and the Canada Council is set up effectively the same way. You get people who can act independently of government, and they then promote the arts as they see it best can be promoted without day-to-day, or indeed week-to-week, direction by government.

And I think that's a good model, because we all accept the fact that the arts make a great contribution to our lives. We equally accept the fact that artistic endeavour is a matter of personal judgement and not a matter of political policy and that, by and large, politicians make poor directors of the arts, but good patrons, in the sense that the public can provide money. There are people who can do a much better job than can elected politicians in deciding in what directions the arts ought to be promoted.

Now the minister has outlined a number of the aspects of the bill and, by and large, they are housekeeping, except for section 4 — and I'll come back to that — housekeeping in the sense that they confirm in legislative form what the arts board has been doing, sometimes for decades, with apparently inadequate statutory basis. And the auditor has mentioned this. Others have mentioned it.

The arts board apparently does not have appropriate power to give grants. It's been giving grants for some decades, I would guess, and it should continue to give grants. The arts board has been promoting things like the Summer School of the Arts. It should continue to do so. If we need to change the act to clear that up, we should do so. The arts board has been awarding individual scholarships, or making loans and grants, for a goodly number of years. Someone has called into question their power to do that. We should clear that up and allow them to carry on as they have done.

A good number of very distinguished people in Saskatchewan have served on the arts board. I think there has been no party political hue to the arts board. I know for a fair number of years, a person from Weyburn, a Mr. Weir, was chairman of the arts board. If Mr. Weir was a supporter of our party, I would have been mildly surprised. I simply didn't know what his politics were. He was a businessman in Weyburn. Subsequently, someone from Swift Current was chairman. I don't know anything about his politics, and that has been the characteristic of the arts board. You went out and found people, people in the artistic community who frequently weren't very active in any political community, so you simply didn't know what their politics were and you didn't care. They had a particular perception of what should be done in the artistic community, and they carried it forward.

And that has been important, and the arts board has served well. The minister is right in saying that over the last 10 years we have seen a little bit of change of focus where the Department of Culture and Recreation, as it now is called, has promoted what might be called amateur or folk arts, and the arts board has tended to concentrate on the professional artistic community. And that division has sort of grown up, and it makes a fair amount of sense, and we should underline that. But all of this, particularly with respect to the professional artistic community — all of this can only work if the arts board is at arm's length, and seen to be at arm's length, from the government — which brings me to section 4.

The current section 4 says that the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint the executive director of the board, and thereafter the executive director shall take direction and do what the board says that he or she should do. And that's worked out fairly well. The government has a role in appointing the person. The arts board defines the duties; says what should be done; approves

of the hiring and firing of anyone else who may work for the arts board; generally directs the whole operations of the board, including the activities of the executive director.

Now that has been the pattern, and it has worked. And I have heard no argument which has been advanced as to why that should be changed. There is no reason for changing what has been a successful operation, and certainly no reason for changing it in the way that the minister suggests, which says that the minister shall appoint the executive director, or the Lieutenant Governor in Council can, his cabinet colleagues shall, and, thereafter, his appointee, the cabinet appointee, shall run the board — shall hire people; shall fire them; shall negotiate union contracts; shall do virtually everything that is effectively the effective decisions in the operations of the board; shall manage the day-to-day operations of the board.

Never mind what the board thinks. This person appointed by the cabinet shall manage the day-to-day operations of the board; shall conduct any contract negotiations which excludes the board from all of those endeavours — and it doesn't say union contracts — all contract negotiations, including contracts for the operation of, let us say, the Summer School of the Arts, the whole operation; shall manage all the staff, including all firings and all hirings; shall, in effect, have the total management of the board, and in addition shall do such things as the board recommends.

It, in effect, says that what has been an arm's-length operation, what has been an operation whereby the government's involvement was restricted to the appointing of the executive director and the providing of money, will be now an operation whereby the government will appoint the executive director, and the executive director will make all of the important decisions for the arts board. And that's a very, very different structure, one which at least undermines and, some might say, destroys the arm's-length relationship, and which will mean that the arts community will not be able to look to the arts board for the same level of independence from government that they've been able to look to for 30 years and more.

And that is unfortunate, and more important, it is unnecessary. No case has been advanced for this drastic change in the operations of the arts board, which, I think by any standard, has been a success in Saskatchewan for more than three decades. It has worked; it has worked under the existing legislation, particularly the existing relationship between the government and the board, and therefore, I find myself totally unable to agree with section 4.

I will be supporting the bill on second reading. I, or my colleagues, will be moving an amendment to delete section 4, and if it's not deleted, I will be voting against the bill on third reading.

I approve of the other provisions which, by and large, give statutory authority for what the board has been doing, what the board has been doing successfully, quietly, and effectively.

Accordingly, I am going to ask the minister to take a very hard look at section 4 to see whether or not he feels that that is necessary and will add anything to the operation of the arts board. And I would particularly ask him, when he closes this debate, to indicate what circumstances have induced him to have section 4 of the bill included, which, at least in my judgement, and, I think, in the judgement of everybody who reads it fairly, will change and change materially, markedly — I would say, drastically — the relationship between the arts board and its community, and the Government of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a few words to close debate on second reading; and, no, I will not withdraw the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to hear that the opposition is in basic agreement with this bill, and I'm very happy that they have said that the arts board has worked very well for, well, since 1948.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to bring a few things to the attention of the legislature today. The

Leader of the Opposition seems to intimate that I, as minister, or Executive Council, is going to be interfering with the operation of the arts board. Mr. Speaker, there could be nothing further from the truth. In numerous statements that I have made through to the arts community and, indeed, stated here again today, I fully endorse the arm's-length concept of the Saskatchewan Arts Board.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition have made reference to the number of years the arts board has been going on and, indeed, the dynamic changes that have taken place, not only in the arts community, but all across the province, and in organizations all across our country.

Mr. Speaker, let me just read section 4 to you right now:

The Executive Director is secretary to the board and shall:

manage the day-to-day affairs of the board;

conduct any contract negotiations with other organizations;

manage the staff of the board, including the selection, hiring and dismissal of the persons mentioned in section 10;

perform any other duties that may be assigned to him by the board.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that brings the role of the executive director in line with almost every organization that is conducted in our province and, indeed, across the country.

Mr. Speaker, one other point of clarification. The Leader of the Opposition was very correct when he said that the order in council appoints the executive director. He did not say, however, that the order in council also appoints the Saskatchewan Arts board, the 15 members that make that up. Mr. Speaker, that is nothing new. Ever since the arts board had an arts board and X number of members, they were appointed by order in council. And, Mr. Speaker, ever since there has been an executive director he or she has been appointed by order in council.

Mr. Speaker, I've stated my support for the arm's-length concept. I'm just saying that we're bringing it up to date with the legislation and organizations across the province. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that indeed this amendment to The Arts Board Act is going to allow the day-to-day operations of the arts board to run even more efficiently, because the arts board itself only meets for sometimes two times a year, and therefore the executive director is the person that operates it every day, and therefore should have her duties spelled out to her.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall move second reading of Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Arts Board Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

Bill No. 100 — An Act to amend The Limitation of Civil Rights Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with regard to second reading of The Limitation of Civil Rights Act, section no. 2 of The Limitation of Civil Rights Act provides that where land is sold by agreement for sale or mortgaged for the purpose of securing the purchase price of the same land, the vendor's or mortgagee's right to recover the balance due as a result of default is restricted to suing on the land, that is foreclosures of a mortgage or cancellation of agreement for sale. No action lies in a covenant or promise of payment contained in the mortgage or agreement for sale.

Thus, even though it would be more convenient, or possibly more in the financial interests of a

leader to sue for money unpaid on a mortgage, he is restricted to taking back ownership of the land. This basic protection has been in place in Saskatchewan since 1935. It continues to be significant protection to the mortgagor as . . . (inaudible) . . .

The Queen's Bench court judgement in Guaranty Trust versus Douglas, one of the critical aspects of the protection thought to exist in section 2 was found not to exist. The court rules that the protection against a suit on the covenant only applies to vendor-financed sales of land, but does not apply to lender-financed sales. In other words, banks or other mortgage lenders are able to sue on the covenant contained in the mortgage or agreement for sale, but a private vendor who finances a sale is limited to foreclosure or cancellation. We believe this is unacceptable, an illogical state for the law to be in, and it is by this amendment we reversed the finding of law made in Guaranty Trust versus Mr. Douglas.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of a bill to amend The Limitation of Civil Rights Act, 1984.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I've had an opportunity to review the amendment that is being put forward, and we are in agreement with it. It is putting forward a remedy, I think, as a result of a court decision in the Queen's Bench in 1982, and certainly it extends further protection to cover, not only the vendor mortgages and agreement for sales, but extends also the same protection to the mortgagor in respect to lenders, and restricting their rights to foreclosure and cancellation rather than suing on the covenant. We support the amendment.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

Bill No. 101 — An Act to repeal the Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on this. It's widely known and well-known by every member of the House, I'm sure, and by everybody in Saskatchewan, that it has been our policy to wind down and, in fact, realign the former department of northern Saskatchewan and approach the government administration in the North in a much different way. And with that, this bill will accomplish the repeal of the former department of northern Saskatchewan, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I will move second reading of An Act to repeal The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

Bill No. 102 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Northern Affairs Secretariat Act

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this act, as the title would indicate, are amendments that are consequential to the repeal of the department of northern Saskatchewan and to the realignment of many of the duties and government administration to the various departments of government. And as I said, it's self-explanatory, and I would, therefore, move second reading of An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Northern Affairs Secretariat Act.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention that on Bill 101, which we have just moved through second reading, and Bill 102 . . . As we are going to be doing the estimates of the Northern Affairs Secretariat in a few minutes here in the committee of finance, we will be leaving most of our criticism and questions on this issue till that time, and there are a good number of things that we will be raising.

When you have unemployment at 90 per cent, and when you have the Premier of the province

saying that we no longer have money to send to third world countries, and that money should be sent to northern Saskatchewan to help feed the starving people in northern Saskatchewan. I think that, Mr. Speaker, is an indication of how bad things are in northern Saskatchewan, by the Premier's own admission.

But I won't get into it right now, but we will give the minister fair warning that in the estimates that will come up shortly, we will have many relevant and pertinent questions to put to him.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

Bill No. 103 — An Act to amend The Coroners Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with regards to the amendment to The Coroners Act, as many members are aware, the Lion's eye bank of Saskatchewan has recently brought to the public's attention the critical shortage of cornea tissue available in Saskatchewan.

As a result of this shortage, many individuals whose sight could be improved or restored by a cornea transplant, may have to wait for up to 18 months to obtain a transplant in Saskatchewan, or even be forced to go outside the province or to the American states to have their sight restored.

In an attempt to increase the supply of cornea available for transplantation, the Lion's eye bank has mounted a major campaign to make the public aware of the critical shortage, and to encourage people to make voluntary donations of cornea tissue upon their death, or the death of their loved ones.

Amendments to The Human Tissue Gift Act was passed in this House one year ago to facilitate access to information about individuals who have expressed the desire to donate their cornea tissue on their death. While these measures were a big step in the right direction, they simply will not be adequate to provide the adequate supply of cornea in this province. Even if citizens of this province expressed during their lifetime an intention to donate their cornea or other parts of their body for transplant upon their death, in the trauma that inevitably surrounds death, these wishes often go unheeded by distraught relatives.

Physicians and other medical personnel are understandably reluctant to raise the topic of next of kin of the recent deceased patient. I'm also told the cornea tissue must be removed within eight hours of death to ensure that it will be suitable for transplantation. The first eight hours after death do not usually lend themselves to such unselfish considerate and caring about the aggrieved relatives.

Since 1979 The Coroners Act has permitted the removal of the pituitary gland from deceased persons with whom an autopsy is ordered by the coroner. This has led to a major increase in the availability of hormones for the treatment of individuals suffering from the growth hormone deficiencies.

The amendment proposed in this bill will have the same effect, same effect for individuals suffering from sight impairment. The new section 24.2 proposed by the bill will permit the removal of cornea tissue from a deceased person on whom an autopsy is ordered to be performed by a coroner. This does not mean that the cornea of all deceased persons will be removed, nor even the cornea of all persons with whom an autopsy is performed. In these cases, the ordinary consent provisions will continue to apply.

I hope that the effect of the eye bank and perhaps this bill will encourage individuals to make their wishes known to their next of kin if their wish is to donate their cornea or any other needed part of the body to another for transplantation upon their death, and encourage them to

complete the provided provisions of their driver's licence, or the donor card provided by the Lion's eye bank to make their wishes known.

The amendment before the House will permit a person performing an autopsy under The Coroners Act to remove the cornea of a deceased for the purpose of transplantation in limited circumstances.

First, the person performing the post-mortem must have no reason to believe that the deceased or his next of kin have expressed an objection to the removal of the cornea of the deceased.

Second, the cornea of the deceased must be expected to be suitable for transplantation. I am told that normally only the cornea of a person under the age of 55 are used for transplantation purposes.

Third, a recipient for the cornea tissue must be immediately available. It is the purpose of this clause to prevent removal of cornea in all cases and restrict it to those cases where there is a demonstrated need. Most patients are now on call, available for suitable donors, so that no change is anticipated for them except, of course, that they will have greatly reduced.

Fourth, the cornea of the deceased must be removed by a fully qualified ophthalmologist. This provision simply ensures that errors are not to be made that will delay transplantation procedures by having the most qualified physician available both for removal of the tissue and transplantation of the recipient.

I believe this amendment will go a long ways to providing aid to the unsighted. I encourage all members of this Assembly to support this particular type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, and with that I move second reading of the amendment to The Coroners Act.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want only to make brief comments in respect to the amendments to The Coroners Act. Obviously, what has been set forward here by the minister is one method of providing a necessary cornea. As set out in the act, it is the cornea of the individual during an autopsy can be removed, and without written consent of the deceased.

I think there is another option that I would have hoped that the government would have followed, and that is an education of the public in order to bring about a consciousness of the need and the worthwhileness of contributing a cornea from the deceased. And I think you could have really been able to get many people to voluntarily provide necessary cornea.

I'm surprised that the government has much money for massive advertising campaigns in support of their own political fortunes. I would have thought that we would have at least tried on a voluntary basis an educational approach, rather than one of mandatory right to remove the cornea. I'm a little disappointed that no mention was made that, in fact, the government made an effort to make the public conscious of the need to make this type of a donation on the death of an individual. And I think there would be many people in this province who, in fact, once they were more conscious of the need, would, in fact, on a voluntary basis be very positive in its approach. I may say some find it, for whatever reason, repulsive that the body of a deceased, that parts of the body can, in fact, be removed. I understand what the minister has said in respect to the pituitary gland, the other organ, and has been done in the past. I'm not making a large objection to the need of it and the worthwhileness of the contribution. I offer to the minister and to the government an alternate approach. And I would have liked to have seen them come forward with some concrete evidence that indeed they appealed to the public on a voluntary basis rather than mandatory.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

MOTIONS

Substitutions in Committees

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave of the Assembly:

That the name of W.M. Sveinson be substituted for that of S.H. Petersen on the list of members comprising the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 82 — An Act respecting Intensive Livestock Operations

Clause 1

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chairman, Bill 82, An Act respecting Intensive Livestock Operations — is this replacing any act, or is this a new act in the pollution control field, or what pollution controls were in place prior to this act?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well this is essentially a new act that replaces the one that was put in place in 1971, I believe. Essentially, the spirit and the principles are the same; it just does some streamlining. It has one department head manning it instead of three, if you like.

The 13 years of experience with the old act, I'm led to believe by my officials . . . They believe now there can be a very smooth process that will be quicker for the farmer and rancher, if you like, and yet safeguard the environment and the health aspects and all the rest of it. I think our 13 years of experience have brought us to the point where they felt it was time for a new act, and I agree with them.

Mr. Engel: — Other than the way the flow of control is going to be directed between having three people involved instead of one, is there any changes as far as the level of protection you're going to be granting the environment?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Only in that the scope of the act is broadened in so far as the number of species that are now under its purview. Goats and horses . . . The scope of the act was broadened to include goats and horses as well.

Mr. Engel: — Has there been any change, Mr. Minister, in determining and defining what an intensified livestock production unit is? Are you changing some of the regulations that are going to be affected by this act?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — No, relative to the . . . What was your question? I'll have to sit down and let you ask it again.

Mr. Engel: — Basically, what I'm concerned with, is this act going to redefine what an intensified unit is? And you said no to that. And then the second aspect is the regulations that you're planning on spelling out. It would be nice if the regulations would be tabled in third reading. I think, next time we have a change of government, and I'm minister of agriculture, I'll be making available, to someone that will be the critic, regulations along with it because it's going to be determined how effective this act is by what you're going to do in the regulations; and have you got some idea as to what regulation is going to, and how they're going to be spelled out.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Number one, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I think you know, as well as I do, the legislative process. And secondly, to answer your question more directly in so far as

the definition of intensive livestock . . . (inaudible) . . . The answer is no.

Mr. Engel: — I'm sorry, I hate to admit old age, but I didn't catch that last sentence. You're either speaking too softly, or you're mumbling in your teeth. I can't tell which.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, you asked if our definition of intensive livestock unit had changed, and I said no.

I suspect there'll be some changes about the wording and stuff, simply because of the act changes, but so far as the spirit, as I pointed out in my second reading speech — no significant changes.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, because I'm not convinced that if the province is going to be moving into more, by quantity, intensified units that your pollution control act . . . I have no question when a new unit was established. I know the ones that have been put in my area and the drainage and that whole structure . . . I think it was quite effective without being a severe penalty on them.

Where my concern is, I haven't seen a major thrust towards clean-up of some of the units, and maybe you could just take a second to identify where you draw the line between an ordinary farmer feeding some cattle and an intensified unit. I have some concern there, and I don't want to make it more difficult for my colleague in just feeding his cattle out on the back 40, but where do you determine that that feeding operation becomes an intensified unit? What kind of a guide-line are you using?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I think what you're asking is perhaps somewhat covered in clause 2 of the act where it defines intensive livestock operation.

Mr. Engel: — Do you have a simple short answer to indicate when one is considered a feedlot and when it's just a farmer's backyard?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I think the best indication I could give you would be with the word "confinement" in the act.

Mr. Engel: — Well, I have a place where I can find four horses. Is that an intensified unit?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes, I would suspect it could be. It may be irrelevant unless it's polluting something or causing a — jeopardizing health standards, for example.

Mr. Engel: — Now we're getting some place. Where you're reducing your people involved from three to one you suggested — the numbers you used — you weren't really specific on that. Are you saying you are centralizing it under one head, or are you eliminating two positions, or just how are you doing that? What's the process involved if a neighbour feels that his neighbour, with a confined cattle operation along a drainage bed, is creating some problem and some pollution? I've had a number of those examples drawn to my attention in my riding. What steps, or what is your department going to do, or what's the process involved relating to this new act that we'll be able to get at some of those problems?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, we would, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, under this new act we would be the lead agency, the lead department if you like. We would be the first contact. And as it relates to your example, if there was an environmental, pollution-type concern, then we would interface with the Department of Environment, which is essentially consistent with the spirit of the act before it, or if it was a health concern, that we would interface with the Department of health.

Mr. Engel: — But what are the steps involved? What I was really asking: what are the steps

involved to initiate a clean up or to initiate some control?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Contact the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture. That's the focal point.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Young: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of my colleague, Lloyd Sauder, the MLA for the Carrot River area, I'd like to introduce some Carrot River Elementary School children. They're grades 4 to 6. There's 21 of them in all. They are accompanied by their teacher, Ruth Smith and chaperons Paul Fowler, Jean Fowler, Dan Oakes, Mrs. Oakes, and Mrs. Hendrickson and Margaret Panyschyn. They're sitting in the Speaker's gallery, and I'd like to ask all members to join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 87 — An Act respecting Loan Guarantees for Feeder Associations

Clause 1

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, about how many feeder associations do you expect we'll be incorporating and forming through the co-op movement or through a regular incorporation in the next little while? You've suggested, and sent me an article that you have the association quite interested in it, and about what do you expect will be the take-up on this over the next period of years? A two-year period or so?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, I don't have an expectation in terms of 10, 20, 200, or 300. All I know is there are a goodly number of number one feeders out there right now. There are a goodly number of barley growers out there right now. And it may well be that some of those may choose to organize, either under the co-operatives act or business corporations, and form a feeder association.

This is not compulsory, it's voluntary. What we're saying to them is here is a tool that may be of some use to you. And certainly they have indicated that it's one they may well want to use. We're saying here's a tool you may want to use to assist you in livestock feeding, and we're prepared to put it in place for you.

Mr. Engel: — We're dealing with a major thrust here, Mr. Minister. Have you, in your travels around the province or your meetings with them . . . When we in the past have implemented programs, the legislation followed, rather than was a leader. There were . . . (inaudible) . . . in place. Now I, as one, belonged to, what I'd mentioned earlier in a second reading debate, Assiniboia Mutual Feeders. Is that the kind of organization or co-op? I think you're familiar with it because you have neighbours belonging to that. Is that the kind of association or organization you're thinking about?

And the difference today would be that Assiniboia Mutual Feeders — if it were still existing today and wouldn't be in the hands of one person — that group could now come in and make a 3 or \$4 million, loan and you would guarantee it up to 25 per cent. Is this basically what's

happening for purchasing cattle and feed and so on? Is that the purpose of this bill?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, there are some maximums, in fact, and it's spelled out in regulations. And what we have in mind, of course — and obviously they are not in place yet — but what we would have in mind, and what other jurisdictions have done, which we've modelled this after somewhat, is that for the first year individuals would be able to enjoy \$25,000. That is to say, the association would take up \$25,000 maximum per individual, in terms of worth of their calves.

And in so far as whether we've done any consultative process here or not, I would like to suggest to you that that's probably one of the reasons why this act will be successful is because, in fact, it is wanted. And you have seen the quotation attributed to Bill McQueen of Tessier, president of the Saskatchewan Cattle Feeders' Association, as reported in the *Star-Phoenix* May 31, '84, wherein he said, "What is the association wanting?" They were quoting him:

We were looking for this. Our group did a fair amount of groundwork in setting this up.

So I'm of the view that this reflects, not only the needs and the desires of the people out there, but certainly, to a to almost, what they think would be most useful.

Mr. Engel: — I tried to keep this at a practical, no-rhetoric, no-feedlot-type material questioning. And I was hoping the minister would respond the same way.

How many groups are organized in the province that will qualify under this program at the present time? Was the Assiniboia Mutual Feeders the only mutual feeders association around or are there other groups around that will qualify under this act now that are registered, organized, co-op-type group? Are there those kinds of feeders in place?

I believe, by reading this bill, if my memory serves me right, that six is the minimum that would belong to an association. Is that the right number? And are there those kinds of co-ops or groups or organizations registered in the province today that can expand and can use this loan guarantee program to get right in and get involved? Or are we starting from square one where we're looking for people to get together and start organizing? This is basically was what my question was.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, there are some out there now, for example, as I mentioned before, there is the Saskatchewan Cattle Feeders' Association, and I could see some of those members, perhaps within a given area, banding together to form a feeder association under the definition of this act. There may be, as well — and the minimum is six — six, eight, 10, farmer-ranchers, cow-to-calf operators, who are or are prepared to feed out their cattle, who may simply as individuals band together. It may well be that there's some partnerships that would band together. We leave it up to them. As I mentioned before, it's not mandatory; it's voluntary. It's a tool there for them to use if they so desire.

Mr. Engel: — I guess to get an answer I'll have to start from another base. How many commercial feedlots are there in the province?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'm not trying to avoid your question, except that what is your definition of a commercial feedlot? One with 50 head or more, or 200 head or more? We don't have a hard number for you, because one person's definition of the fact that he's a commercial feedlot may well be that he feeds out 100 head. Your definition of a commercial feedlot may well be that he feeds out 1,000 head. I couldn't tell you specifically.

Mr. Engel: — What I was going to do is, I was going to get a number and say that there are 70 feedlots that are operated commercially, that are not a family farm feedlot. That's the number I

was looking for. If there are 70 like that, how many of them are partnerships — and you must have some base number you can start with — or do you know what's happening in the cattle industry? I suppose you don't. Otherwise, I'll just have to say good luck with this piece of legislation.

I hope it works, and that some of the people that band together, because if it's just a little sign post you're putting on the side of the road of agriculture in a Tory scheme to the road to successful, money-making operations, I guess that's what it is. Because the minister doesn't seem to have done his homework, or his department hasn't gotten out there and made some logical, reasonable kind of surveys, and should know, should know how many people are feeding cattle. There's not that many. It's just barely into the three digits. There's not that many commercial feedlots and commercial operations that are not family farm run units in the province. There aren't — I know that. And if you don't know how many there are . . .

And I was just wondering how many are going to qualify, and how many doctors and lawyers are going to get together to hire these guys to run their thing to make that little additional money because they want to invest their money, but they want to make sure it's a guaranteed loan. So they're gong to apply under this bill and organize four or five of them — six, I suppose, is the minimum — and then they'll hire . . . (inaudible) . . .

Because the bill is even designed, and I'm not sure why your staff did this, but it looks to me as if it's even designed that if it's young farmers getting together, thinking: well, here's maybe a chance where we can get in and make something. If it's young farmers getting together, according to section 12, Mr. Chairman:

A feeder association may purchase cattle from a member feeder to be fed by that feeder if the price of the cattle does not exceed 75 per cent of the value of the cattle.

So they're even penalized by 25 per cent if they are using their own cattle, and I kind of think they would be better off removing themselves once from the organization and getting together with their doctor and banker friends and then applying under it so they can qualify for the maximum. I think the bill is so blatantly designed, Mr. Minister, the bill is so blatantly designed to help your friends that are wealthy, to help your friends that are wealthy.

Read the article from the *Star-Phoenix*. It's great you got a line. It's great. It's great. You should have been around, Mr. Minister, the way you like to laugh about legislation . . . (inaudible) . . . You should have been around in the past when farm legislation was improved and designed to help farmers, to help the general bulk — the people that are the ordinary small farmers, and you should have seen the line-ups of people and the quantity of material that came in requesting it.

And then the government moves in their direction, to put out a little flag post and to put out a little sign saying, boy, we're on the side of the farmer. We're going to pass bill 87 to prove that we believe in intensified livestock operations, and we believe in guaranteeing loans for feeder associations. I think when the people read the bills, when the people read the bill, and see where your intentions are, and see who the friends of the minister's are who he's trying to — what he's trying to do to hold his seat in Weyburn — it's really interesting.

You've got the co-operation of some of your staff to write a bill here to do that. I'm not sure it's going to do the job for you. I'm afraid you're still going to have to hustle to hold on to your own seat.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'll be very brief, and I just want to say that sincerely I believe that you and I have the same goals. We want to help encourage the small operator, the family farm holding out there to be able to participate in livestock feeding, and this may be a tool they'd want to use. But in so far as pegging down a number as to how many may be eligible, I'd suggest to you that statistics would say that there's about 30,000 farms out there

with livestock on them. It may well be that every one of those family farms might want to participate in an association that would give them a guarantee, a government-backed guarantee for a loan on their calves and at a better rate. And I would think that that is consistent with your objectives in this province as well as it is mine.

And I also would like to say this: that I would like to view this as part of an overall package to enhance the livestock industry in this province. By itself, it is only, as I said before, a tool. But coupled with the Ag Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan, the livestock investment tax credit, our irrigation measures, and now this feeder plan that has been — the loan guarantee plan that's been so welcomed by the feeders of Saskatchewan, I would ask you to view it as all part of a package and to enhance livestock feeding in this province.

Mr. Engel: — . . . (inaudible) . . . second to answer that one thing. Why are you penalizing the owners of cattle?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — It's just simply a matter of providing some protection, and so that there's isn't an abuse there. If we left it to the individual to value his own calves, he might put an inflated value on them. Do you understand what I'm saying? So we are going to say we will cover him up to 75 per cent of their value.

Mr. Engel: — Give me an example of that. If a feeder association would be made up of the five guys sitting across the front of the row there — one, two of you are anywheres close to being considered farmers. So brother George and the minister put their own cattle in, and the other three people are lawyers and businessmen and bureaucrats that have some money to put in. Are you not taking advantage of these fellows because they'd be better off going out and selling their calves to the neighbour who will then sell them to the association so they'd get full value for their cattle? Otherwise, they are subsidizing the bankers and the lawyers and the people with the money. How do you propose that this is going to be a workable solution and come up with a . . . I just feel that there are discrepancies there that are geared and designed to say to the farmer: you're a little bit of a crook, and you're a little bit dishonest.

I don't want to drag it out. I just feel that you're putting a little line in here saying that you're going to give the banker and the lawyer and the businessman and the guy on an \$80,000 a year salary some money, some chance to buy his cattle at wholesale from his partners. And I think it's foolish. I think it's foolish. I think you should let farmers trust each other. They're trustworthy people. Why tell them you're only going to give them 75 per cent of the value of their calves? They are going to sell their calves and turn around and buy somebody else's poorer stock to put in their feedlot so they can get full value for their cattle, Mr. Minister. That's a foolish item.

I think we should amend item 12, because I don't think farmers are basically honest, because they're going to make a deal amongst themselves to buy the cattle that they put into their feedlot. You are saying they are dishonest. You're saying here's the tool we need to make them sell their cattle at 74 per cent of the market value. I don't think any of your colleagues in the back row would appreciate having to join up with you in a feeder association so you can get their cattle at a discount. I think it's unfair, Mr. Minister, and you're not looking at it from a farmer's point of view. You're looking at it from a technocrat and from your business community banker friends, the bureaucrats, the car dealers that have money that are looking for your job.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, first of all let me assure you and this whole House that I, too, do agree that farmers are basically honest, sincere, genuine people. But as well, I believe there may well be instances where, if people were taking a "cash advance" on their own calves, they might inflate the value, if you like. And/or if they were, say, going to say: you buy my calves, I'll buy your calves, you might get an inflated value put on them. This is a safety mechanism, a safety mechanism to prevent that. And certainly, in 99.99 per cent of the cases it may well not be needed. But as well we have a responsibility to the public purse here.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Pages 2 and 3 agreed to.

Page 4

Mr. Engel: — All I'm saying is that I don't agree with section 12 on page 4. If the majority of you agree with it, fine. I'm just registering an objection to section 12.

Page 4 agreed to.

Pages 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. members, I move the committee report the bill, and, while I'm on my feet, I'd like to thank my officials for their help with this bill and the previous one.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 85 — An Act to establish the Northern Affairs Secretariat

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, I have on my right Mr. Peter van Es, who has been the deputy minister of northern Saskatchewan and will be the permanent head of the new Northern Affairs Secretariat.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned to the minister when we were doing second reading on the elimination of DNS, and now this bill in second reading, and now in committee, I have mentioned to him that in doing the estimates which we will be doing, I imagine, within the hour, that I had wanted to be asking many pointed questions on the statements and news coming out of northern Saskatchewan, and the reports being brought from the member from Athabasca and Cumberland that there is a situation up there that is desperate, where we have whole towns of people who are unemployed.

The Premier yesterday in his estimates, talked about SCIC (Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation) should change their emphasis from third world countries to northern Saskatchewan to help those people who are now faced with poverty. And I think, Mr. Minister, we will get into that in estimates. As we go through this . . . My colleagues may have the odd question as we go through, but basically we'll be doing most of this in the estimates under your department.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 7

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I look at clause 7 and clause 8 and I see an agency which is not overburdened with serious responsibilities.

It's going to "obtain information." That shouldn't tax anyone too much (that's the minister). He can "enter into agreements." That may be actually something.

Then as we go down to the secretariat, it can “develop . . . a data base.” That shouldn’t overtax them particularly. They can receive briefs, they can review issues, they can “bring to the attention of the minister,” matters. Frankly, I wouldn’t have thought we needed any legislative authority for an agency to bring to the attention of the minister, matters, but any port in a storm, and if you have to pad out this act to try to figure out what this agency is going to do, then I suppose you can solemnly state in the legislation that they can bring matters to the attention of the minister. I think we might have assumed that without it being in the act, but so be it.

They can “work in concert with other public and private agencies . . . to achieve measures.” I wonder why that needs legislative approval, but so be it. And they can “act as an advocate”, and they can “generally serve as a forum.”

And it’s pretty clear that this is a talk shop, and information gathering shop, and little else. Perhaps that’s what any secretariat which is supposedly exercising or co-ordinating a role is doing. I just want to underline the fact that any agency which gathers in data, receives briefs and gives information to the minister, while it may well be an important function, one wonders why we need to have a special agency of government set up to give information to the minister. If it weren’t this particular minister, I would say it had no particular merit whatever, but anything that may bring information to this minister perhaps performs an important public function, and accordingly, I won’t oppose on that basis, but just note the very highly-restricted nature of the functions, duties, and powers of the agency.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well just a very short response, Mr. Chairman. The Leader of the Opposition has identified — I’m not sure that I agree with everything that he said and, in fact, I don’t, but certainly the role of the secretariat, as we have stated and as the legislation will show, is certainly a focal point for northern people to approach government through, and that’s important. We think it is important. That was a role that the former department of northern Saskatchewan had. One role, but one of the things that we took great exception to, in terms of the former approach, was because it was a delivery agent. We don’t believe that the department or agency should be a delivery agent. This certainly is not that.

I appreciate the Hon. Leader of the Opposition’s concern for information coming my way. As a minister of the Crown, I appreciate information coming from any direction and from everywhere in Saskatchewan, including from the Leader of the Opposition. So I’ll just say it and stop at that.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 102 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Northern Affairs Secretariat Act

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 4

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, I could ask this on almost any subclause, but I ask: are there any substantive changes in this bill or . . . I note the title is that they’re consequential, and ordinarily this means that there’s nothing there other than the correction of other acts. Occasionally something else gets put in. Can you give us the assurance there’s nothing else there?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No, Mr. Chairman, I will give that assurance. They’re all consequential to the demise of The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act, and they relate to the the

realignment of that department and the . . . So we're replacing references to the northern . . . well, for example, references to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan and replacing it with Minister of health or Minister of Urban Affairs or Minister of Tourism and Small Business, as the case may be. So no substantive changes.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I wanted to ask the minister, there's a fairly lengthy provision with respect to the northern Saskatchewan economic development revolving fund. It's on page 2 and 3 of the bill. And I take it that's simply a restating of it with all the names right, the new names correct, and it doesn't change the nature of the revolving fund in any way.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, I am informed that that is the case. It's a restating with the various names changed, as I've indicated before. I believe that's the case.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, as far as consequential amendments are concerned, we have a complaint of a person that was north of Waterhen Lake. It rained, and he couldn't get back out because there was no highway equipment. Is that a consequential amendment to this bill? There was no highway. They had to get him out by helicopter. This is serious. And it really is consequential to this department and what you're doing as minister. I'm not sure if I'm in completely in order. If the minister could try answering that one, I think it would solve a lot of problems.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, I'm not aware of the case, Mr. Chairman, but I could say this: I'm very surprised that there would be anyone in the vicinity of Waterhen Lake, because that is in my constituency, that would even have any occasion whatever to phone anybody in the NDP party. I'm very surprised if there's one person in there, in that area, that's of the NDP persuasion. I'm really surprised at that. But I could look into your case . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Engel: — I didn't say that. I didn't say . . . And I'm never political when I'm serious. This is not a political question. The consequential facts are that it rained while our friends — and if you want, my colleague will join in on this — but it rained while my friends were up there fishing. The rain disrupted the track on the road that was there. It messed it up with rain, like we wish . . . We don't know what rain is. I have heard of a story this morning where a frog is seven years old, and he doesn't know how to swim, in our country . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not trying to be funny. But it rained, and this person couldn't get out because there was no highway equipment available to patch up the road. And I think that's a consequential part of disrupting the department . . . Consequential because of your sale that day that we could even get in to the auction sale, I suppose, but . . .

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously it has had no effect on this particular bill that we're discussing. It is not consequential at all, the issue that the member raises, certainly. My only comment with regard to that, I could make it another time to the member, and I will undertake to do that if you like. But my only comment would be that there is a good deal of highway equipment in the Meadow Lake area, certainly. And for the first time, in the last few years, the first time they've ever seen any in our area, as a matter of fact, when there was another government in this province, and they never did know that there was any highway equipment in Saskatchewan — private sector or public.

Mr. Engel: — How long does it take that highway equipment to get from Meadow Lake up north to relieve these people? Their vehicle, I believe, is still up there, isn't it? They were stranded there.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Oh, I'm sure it wouldn't take long, and I'll undertake to check it with the Department of Highways for the member. I know it's not related to this bill, but in the spirit of co-operation, which I've been practising here today, and you have as well, we will undertake to find out a solution to your problem.

Mr. Shillington: — In the same spirit, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I received a telephone call — I don't have the names with me, but I have them at home — and a road was washed out. They were delayed in their journey home from . . . by a fair while, and it was universally believed by those who were delayed, and there was a fair number, that it was because there was no highway equipment left in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, I suspect you might find the odd New Democrat in Meadow Lake but, I tell you, you can find some in Regina Centre. These people were from Regina Centre, actually vacationing up there.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 101 — An Act to repeal The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 74 — An Act continuing the Department of the Environment

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

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. On my left is Alan Carr, the deputy minister of Environment; on my right is Bill Howard, executive director of environment metal protection service; and immediately behind Mr. Howard is Rick Knoll, the director of administration in the Department of Environment.

Clauses 1 to 19 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 75 — An Act respecting the Management and protection of the Environment

Clause 1

Mr. Shillington: — I gather that the Minister of Supply and Services is going to deal with the environment act. Is this right?

Mr. Minister, I, for one, do not understand how to his effort is supposed to be credible. The government of which you are a member has chopped, chopped, chopped, chopped, chopped at the staff in the Department of the Environment. I suspect . . . It is our suspicion that you're bringing this in as window-dressing to try and cover for a performance in your department, which frankly is incredible, Mr. Minister.

One of our serious complaints about this government — we have many complaints, but one of the ones I think we feel more strongly about is the Department of the Environment and the extent to which the responsibilities of this department appear to have been neglected.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, why it makes sense to cut staff and money as you have over the last two years, and now bring in a piece of legislation which is supposed to usher in a new era. I would have thought the money and the people would have been more important than the legislation. And it doesn't seem to me that you're being consistent.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, the member would have us believe that we have reduced the emphasis on the protection of the environment. And, in fact, the exact opposite is the case.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is basically as a result of the establishment of the water Crown. And the Water Crown Corporation has been received across this province by the public of the province and, in fact, if I remember the comments of your colleagues — I'm not sure if even the hon. member from Regina Centre wasn't part of it — but I remember the comments of your colleagues in terms of saying that the water Crown was a good concept, one-stop shopping in dealing with water concerns in this province.

Certainly as the hon. member will know — I'm sure he will know — that a good deal of the dealing with water in the past has been done in the Department of Environment. With the advent of the water Crown there needed to be a tightening up of the . . . or a redrawing of The Department of Environment Act.

And so what this act does, if the member will look very carefully at the act, he will see that this re-emphasizes and, in fact, (well re-emphasize is the proper term there), the protection of the environment and our concern for the protection of the environment, and this government's concern, and this department's concern for the protection of the environment.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, this legislation — this is Bill No. 75 — it must have been introduced in the House in the last two weeks. The last two weeks have seen the last 20 bills introduced. And I suspect it's a good deal less than two weeks.

I want to complain, Mr. Minister, about this bill, as I think I've complained about all of the others, and that is the process. It is simply not satisfactory to introduce this legislation in the middle of May. And I think that's being generous to you. It is not satisfactory to introduce this legislation in the middle of May and then push it through with a bulldozer thereafter, Mr. Minister.

A bill of this importance deserves public comment and, more important, public scrutiny and public input. And that's lacking when you deal with legislation as you have. I don't know what it's going to take to get this government to organize its legislative program in a competent fashion.

But, Mr. Minister, this is just simply not satisfactory. I believe that the environmentalists have the same legitimate complaint as the arts community do about the act brought in by the member from . . . the minister of culture and youth. Or the same complaint to do about The Urban Affairs Act. These bills should be introduced . . . These bills should have been introduced early, and there should have been lots of time for public scrutiny.

The member from Lakeview says that we had The Urban Affairs Act for two years. To some extent there's a modest bit of truth to that, in that there was draft legislation around. We knew it was coming. Everybody was waiting and ready for it. This, to put it mildly, wasn't your best advertised government program. This legislation you've got right here, this was not well advertised or well circulated ahead of time.

Mr. Minister, I don't want you to advertise it; I want you to introduce the stuff in March and not in May, so that we can send it out to the environmentalists. We can send it out to those who are interested. We can get their comments and deliver their comments to you. Many of the public will want to make their comments directly, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, I want to ask you a series of questions then. Let me say, with respect to the Water Crown Corporation — this is skirting close to the edge of what's relevant to the bill, but let me just say with respect to the Water Crown Corporation — you've got up a lot of hopes. That's

what you've got, is high hopes.

I can say, Mr. Minister, you'd better be able to meet them. You haven't to date. You haven't to date. To date you have . . . It has been a pattern of this government to raise everybody's hopes and then dash them. Mr. Minister, if you do it on this bill, you're going to experience a degree of anger that I don't know what it would take to match.

Mr. Minister, you're not telling me that this bill deals only with environmental matters relating to water. This runs the entire gamut of your . . . the protection of the environment, does it not?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No, I'm not saying that all it deals with the entire gamut — air, land, and water quality. There's no question about that. Quality of water.

The reason for the new act, though, is because so much of what was in the former act, (this would be its equivalent in the past), is now removed and is in the legislation dealing with the water corporation. And that's the reason. And in developing the water corporation, certainly then you must clean up the other acts that are left as a consequence of the water corporation coming into being.

So this act is a very . . . It will be well received. I have every confidence that it'll be well received. I have every confidence it'll be well received by the people across the province who are concerned of environment, as we are concerned for the environment. And I notice that the hon. member's colleague, the member from Athabasca, who was carrying the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no, it's not a cheap shot at all. Don't put words in my mouth. Your member from Athabasca indicted in second reading debate that your caucus would be supporting this bill and he was carrying the bill on behalf of your other colleague, the member for Cumberland, who is your environment critic, as I understand it.

So — and he said that they would be supporting the bill, and we fully expect that you will be and I don't know if you're indicating that you won't be supporting the bill today or not, but I will give you the assurance, the hon. member from Regina Centre, I'll give you the assurance that the bill is very concerned with the environment, with the quality of water, with air, and so on, and I think that you will certainly not find this bill wanting.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, would the minister provide a somewhat more detailed explanation? I sympathize with the difficulty that the Minister of Supply and Services have because it isn't your bill. What I would . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I've got the same problem. I'm not the critic either. But what I would like, Mr. Minister, is a more complete explanation as to why you needed a new bill because we have the Water Crown Corporation. You say we've got to have a new bill because we've got the water Crown. I guess my question is: why did the presence of a water Crown, Sask Water, as it's called, why did that result with the necessity for a new bill?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — This bill, just to get into a little more complete explanation, and the most important event that caused this to take place as it was as I stated, the advent of the water Crown. This bill takes into these various aspects that were in other acts: the regulatory aspects from the Department of Environment — that means the departmental act itself, The Department of Environment Act — takes in water quality, reservoir development, spill control, hazardous waste legislation — all of that legislation from former pieces of legislation are all brought together in this act, namely, this act respecting the management and protection of the environment. So all of those aspects are brought together into this new act, but in all of those cases there is legislation that was elsewhere that is now brought together into one more all-encompassing act.

Mr. Shillington: — I suppose the minister is up pailing water in Foam Lake. He may be one of the ministers who has gone, I suppose. I don't know. Mr. Minister, does this legislation deal

with the inquiries held when a new concern or development is taking place? Does this deal with the need for inquiries, both public inquiries and simply departmental inquiries? Does it cover that?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No. This bill does not deal with that aspect.

Mr. Shillington: — What changes are made to the department's power to control unauthorized discharges — CPR dumping mercury out on the rail bed, and so on? What is the power . . . has the power of the department been changed with respect to unauthorized discharges if I might put it that way?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No, those powers are not changed. They are exactly as they were.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I have had discussions with the Minister of the Environment about agricultural drainage — a problem that not many governments have been successful in solving. Does this bill deal with agricultural drainage and the power to control that and regulate it and so on?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No, it doesn't. That aspect is in the water corporation.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, okay. What changes are made then, to the department's control over water pollution? What are the changes made? I'm trying to figure out what the bill does that hasn't been done previously. That's really what I'm aiming at. If you could give me that in 50, or even 500, I suppose I'd sit through it. If you could give me that in a few words, I think we could go on. What I don't know is what this bill does differently.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I'm informed that the powers of the government are unchanged in these regulatory things. It depends sometimes of where they might rest. For example, industry, mining . . . Those kinds of concerns would come directly to the Department of Environment, would be dealing directly with the Department of Environment.

Municipalities, for example, would deal with the water Crown, but the water Crown would then come to the Department of Environment if there was a concern — there was an environmental concern. In fact, they have to, by their legislation. They must come through the Department of Environment.

So municipalities — in keeping with the one-stop sort of shopping dealing with water concerns and so on — the municipality, the city of Regina, or the town of Craik, would come to the water Crown, who would then carry the concerns to the Department of Environment.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chairman, I noted when your Crown corporation was instituted, and we talked with the minister in charge about the potential for building reservoirs, and what amounts were going to be built, and yet I see a section here on page 17 that deals with reservoir land use.

Is it the Department of Environment's role that is going to just affect the shore line, and what's from the water-line up, or close to, or are you going to have an overlap there that there's some regulation that you're going to be involved in as far as actually creating and building the reservoir?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that that's a land use planning function which deals with the . . . So it's . . . And land use, by the name, would indicate it's shore line . . . (inaudible) . . . just means how the land is used around the reservoir. It's the same legislation, the same powers that have been there for about 17 or 18 years. It's exactly the same. That's unchanged.

Mr. Engel: — My concern was the overlapping responsibility, and what responsibility the

water Crown will have of, say, a new installation. Can you take me through the steps that might happen should that reservoir north of Gravelbourg go ahead? It shows that been a lot of feedback both ways, and now, as the minister well knows.

But let's say the farmers would change their mind — they decide to make a reservoir there, just for sake of an argument. Will the Department of the Environment be involved in assimilating the land, and controlling how this reservoir is put in, and the land use from there on up afterwards and before? Or does the water Crown do the application, buy up the land, and put the dam in from there on up? What are . . . Take me through the steps that have to be fulfilled in order to put in a reservoir there.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — The process the hon. member indicates would be that the owner would acquire the land necessary. Okay, the owner, whoever, would acquire the lands necessary. Then there would be a zoning process undertaken by probably the R.M. And the R.M., through these regulations, would be required to come to the Department of Environment for approval for the use of the land around, and so on, in that zoning process. But that's the same process that's been in place, I'm informed, and it's for 17 or 18 years.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I'm having immense difficulty figuring out why you need this legislation — why what you're doing under this legislation you can't do under the previous legislation. Under The Department of the Environment Act, you have broad powers to protect the environment.

Mr. Minister, the record of this government in dealing with environmental matters stinks, if you don't mind me saying so. Mr. Minister, it is our suspicion that this legislation is not intended to strengthen the Department of Environment. We'd support it wholeheartedly if it did. Our suspicion is that this thing is a public relations exercise intended to salvage a ruined reputation, having got soggy in the Key lake spill and a few others, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, I think it is regrettable that you choose the cosmetics instead of the substance. And it is regrettable that your time horizons are so short. It is like The Heritage Act. We are speaking, not on behalf of the present generation, but generations yet unborn, in protecting the environment. If it were to last another 10 years, that's all this government seems to care about.

Mr. Minister, this is a piece of legislation for which we speak on behalf of our children, or children's children, and our children's children's children.

Mr. Minister, I really wish you would give us a capsule why you need this. We're not going to oppose it, but we just wish that there was some substance to what you're doing. Mr. Minister, I'd ask you to deal with that and then I have another question.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, I explained that. With the advent of the water Crown, the old act, which was called The Water Resources Management Act was rescinded.

The member has asked me for a question, Mr. Chairman, but he doesn't seem all that interested in the answer, and I know he'll ask me the question again . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I just want to give it to you very clearly.

The Water Resources Management Act, which a good deal of this legislation was a part of, has been rescinded as a result of the advent of the water Crown. And other portions of this act — this one that's before us now — other portions of it came from The Department of the Environment Act, the old Department of the Environment Act. I'm not sure if that was the right title — Department of the Environment Act. So all of the department acts across government — and you've seen many of them through last session and some this session as well — have been developed along the model department acts, so we took some of the legislation out of there, put it here.

The Water Resources Management Act has been rescinded because of the water Crown, and that's why I gave you the initial explanation for this act. It's as a result of the water Crown, and in essence, that's the case. So to get into more detail, it's because that management act has been rescinded and this act will take its place. It's much title legislation; it's all in one place; and it's much easier to administer for the people in the department. And, as I've said on several occasions, the provisions of the act are the same protective provisions that have been in other acts, so the government has not lost protective powers in terms of protecting the environment.

Mr. Shillington: — Will Sask Water have a responsibility for environmental protection? Will some of the responsibility of this department now be transferred to Sask Water? Did I understand you to say that?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I can say, "No," to that. The environmental protection as it relates to water will remain with the Department of Environment, where it should. The Sask Water Corporation is . . . How would you say that? It's the window on water in this province.

Mr. Shillington: — I caught the minister's poetry, but I regret to say I missed the substance of your answer. My attention was distracted. Could you repeat your answer?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — The substance of the answer was that the protection of the environment remains with the Department of Environment as it relates to water, and the water Crown will not have environmental protection authority. The environmental protection authority will remain with the Department of Environment.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you have, in this legislation, given the government the power by order in council to assign responsibility for environmental protection to other agencies of the Crown. I wonder, Mr. Minister, why you would have included that.

The concept of the Department of the Environment was that responsibility for environmental protection . . .

An Hon. Member: — Which clause is that? Where have you got that? . . . (inaudible) . . . It's in the other act. It's in the other act, is it not?

Mr. Shillington: — I don't think it is; no, I don't think it is. No. I believe it is in the environmental management protection act . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I have my notes here, but I didn't make a note of the clause that it is. I don't know if I can give you that with great ease. I would expect it would be the regulation section — section 38(1). Yes, it must have been 38(1). It must have been section 38.

If you believe that's not the effect of the legislation, I would be interested to hear that, but that was my reading of it initially, was that you could assign responsibility for environmental protection. But the philosophy behind the department was that there would be one department responsible for environmental protection, and a responsibility was therefore assignable. When there was a spill at Key Lake — to pick an example out of the air — you know who's responsible for it. It's the Department of the Environment.

Under the old system we used to have, with no department of the environment, the monkey was never on anyone's back; it was always somebody else's responsibility. And everybody butterflied around avoiding responsibility.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, I just would ask the member to clarify exactly the clause that he's referring to here, and I'll just give him a minute or two to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the only clause of this bill that I can see would remotely relate to what the hon.

member is raising is section 38. Well, on the top of page 25, in any case — on top of page 25, down to the third paragraph, where it says subsection (2), where it says:

The minister may delegate to a municipality the administration of any regulations enacted pursuant . . .

And etc., etc. Now that's a delegation to a municipality, as it relates to the storage of hazardous substances within the boundaries of that municipality, but that's a delegation to a municipality. But I don't believe there's any other reference to delegation of the powers of the Department of the Environment to anyone else.

Mr. Shillington: — Is it your position, Mr. Minister, that there is no intention to assign to any other branch or to any other department agency of the Crown, responsibility and no power to do so? I frankly can't find the section again. I'll be honest. But is that your position, is that it is not the intention of the government and that there is no legislative power to do so, under the act? Is that your position?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I would say it is not the intention of the government to assign to others, except that, you know . . . And there are cases that have been going on for some time and will continue. In the case of Energy and Mines, for example, in the oil and gas fields, there are certain functions that that department carries out on behalf of, let's say, the Department of the Environment, or whatever, but ultimate responsibility in that case will rest with the Department of the Environment, as it should.

Another example of that might be the Agriculture department might carry out some of those functions as it relates to intensive livestock operations — that sort of thing — but the ultimate responsibility, once again, would lay with the Department of the Environment.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, it is particularly important, Mr. Minister, that . . . You have mentioned the two examples that I think we would not want to see. Agriculture is a service department, there to service the agricultural community, obviously; to regulate the agricultural industry in the best interests of society. But it's, by and large, a service department. So is, to a larger extent, the Department of Energy. It's, by and large, a department there intended to serve mining and oil. And I think it is particularly important that you not assign to those departments, which were supposed to serve the public, this responsibility for regulating them. So we would want that to be crystal clear.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, I'll clarify that. I'll make it very crystal clear for the member, as far as that's possible. The powers that I referred to, or the functions carried out by the Energy and Mines in the example that I referred to, and by Agriculture in the example that I referred to, are the same as have gone on.

So I will reiterate once again: this legislation does not change the powers of the Department of the Environment, or does not in any way weaken the Department of the Environment, as it relates to that. And in those cases, while your concern is valid, I will give you the assurance that it's the same powers in those two departments as were there prior to this act.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the minister, under this act and under the previous act, have very broad powers. We don't argue with that. We think there is really no other way that you can handle it, but the powers are very, very broad.

To the extent that it was reasonably possible, there was an appeal procedure set up to our court of appeal and the Queen's Bench. Is there any changes in those appeal procedures?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — In the order process, Mr. Chairman, the appeal process still applies as it did.

Mr. Shillington: — Okay, and there's been no changes in that?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I think we can perhaps move on, off clause 1.

I want to end on the note I began on, and that is the issue is not the legislation. The issue is the abysmal record of this government with respect to environmental matters. There is every reason to believe, having spent 40 minutes in committee of the whole and not having got anything that approaches a succinct explanation for the necessity of the bill, is every reason to believe that the bill is more cosmetic than one of substance. And that's understandable, because you've got an abysmal record in environmental matters.

Mr. Minister, I think we would have hoped . . . Let me just end by expressing the hope that the minister, when he introduced this legislation to the press, was right: that it's the beginning of a new day with the environment and that the Department of the Environment will henceforth discharge its responsibilities with a degree of competence and effectiveness that it has not done in the past.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I obviously . . . The member will . . . I don't know how succinct one needs to be for the member to understand when I'm saying that the powers that rest with the government and with the Department of Environment, as it relates to the protection of air and the land and water quality in this province, have not changed.

So I'm saying that to the member, so that if he's trying to suggest to anyone that the act is watered down in any way and that it is weakening the powers of the Department of the Environment, is simply not true — simply not true. And I have explained that and given that assurance in this House today.

So I guess if the member wants to persist in that sort of belief that he seems to have, or at least that he would suggest that he has, that's fine. We'll have to agree to disagree. But I'll give the people of Saskatchewan the assurance here today, Mr. Chairman, that the powers of the Department of the Environment, the concerns of this government in terms of protection of air and water quality and land, are intact and will remain so. And the concern is ours, as I'm sure the concern is the hon. member's opposite.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I'm just going to end up on a comment, Mr. Minister. I think this bill is here because you think you're hurting on environmental matters. It is simply our hope that, indeed, this does represent a recognition that your record in the environment is not satisfactory in the public of Saskatchewan. If it represents that, and if it does represent this government turning over a new leaf and enforcing environmental legislation in an effective and efficient fashion, then we fully support the legislation and what you're doing. It's simply our hope that your minister meant what he said when he suggested this was a new and better day that was dawning.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I will assure you that Minister of the Environment meant what he said; that I today mean what I say. All of our colleagues mean what we say when we say that we are concerned about the environment and we will continue to show the same concern about the environment we have since the day we took over. And, Mr. Chairman, I'll leave it at that.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 10

Mr. Chairman: — In section 10 of the printed bill there's a House amendment:

To amend subsection 10(2) of the printed bill by adding “or age” after section 7 in the second line.

Is it the desire of the committee to pass the amendment?

Clause 10 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 11 and 12 agreed to.

Clause 13

Mr. Chairman: — In section 13 of the printed bill there's a House amendment:

Amend clause 13(1)(c) of the printed bill by striking out “or use of” and substituting “of use or”.

Is it the desire to pass the amendment?

Mr. Shillington: — Oh, I'm not sure I understand that. I might understand it if I had a copy of the amendment. Does the Clerk have an extra copy that she could send to me? Let me just have a look at it. That's fine, Mr. Chairman; I see.

Mr. Chairman: — Is it the desire to pass the amendment?

Clause 13 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 31 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 32

Mr. Chairman: — In section 32 of the printed bill there's a House amendment:

Amendment to subsection 32(8) of the printed bill by striking out “reservoir development area of” and substituting “reservoir development area or”.

Is it the desire of the committee to adopt the amendment?

Clause 32 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 33 to 41 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 42

Mr. Chairman: — There is a House amendment to section 42 of the printed bill:

Amend the second section 42 of the printed bill by renumbering it section 43.

Oh, I see. There are two sections numbered 42. The amendment is to change the numbering of the second one to section 43. Is that agreed?

Clause 43 as amended agreed to.

Clause 43 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

The committee reported progress.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 82 — An Act respecting Intensive Livestock Operations

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. 87 — An Act respecting Loan Guarantees for Feeder Associations

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. 85 — An Act to establish the Northern Affairs Secretariat

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — 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. 102 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Northern Affairs Secretariat Act

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — 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. 101 — An Act to repeal The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 74 — An Act continuing the Department of the Environment

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 75 — An Act respecting the Management and Protection of the Environment

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, with leave, I move the amendment be read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 3:35 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following bills:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bill No. 56 — An Act respecting Medical Radiation Technologists

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Commissioners for Oath Act

Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act

Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend the Statute Law (No. 2)

Bill No. 57 — An Act respecting Lotteries

Bill No. 59 — An Act to amend The Department of Finance Act, 1983

Bill No. 63 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from amendments to The Department of Finance Act, 1984

Bill No. 70 — An Act respecting Urban Municipalities

Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act

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

Bill No. 88 — An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act, 1983

Bill No. 90 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 94 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act

Bill No. 95 — An Act respecting the Consequential amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment to The Urban Municipality Act, 1984

Bill No. 97 — An Act to promote Regulatory Reform in Saskatchewan by repealing Certain Obsolete Statutes (No. 1)

Bill No. 74 — An Act continuing the Department of the Environment

Bill No. 75 — An Act respecting the Management and protection of the Environment

Bill No. 82 — An Act respecting Intensive Livestock Operations

Bill No. 85 — An Act to establish the Northern Affairs Secretariat

Bill No. 87 — An Act respecting Loan Guarantees for Feeder Associations

Bill No. 101 — An Act to repeal The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act

Bill No. 102 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Northern Affairs Secretariat Act

His Honour then retired from the Chamber at 3:39 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

Clause 1

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

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No, I'll just introduce the officials. It will take a little time. I'd like to introduce, on my right, Lyle Lensen, the assistant deputy minister of the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources; and on my left, Dennis Sherratt, the supervisor of wildlife in that department.

Mr. Shillington: — I have no objection to the short title, but I did have some questions on other areas. Mr. Minister, section 3 gives you the power to designate critical wildlife habitats other than those listed in the schedule. Are there any intention to designate any others under the regulations?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Yes, it would be our intention to designate others, and it's just a matter of cataloguing other lands that would be eligible for designation. And there will be other lands designated, as time goes on.

Mr. Shillington: — Do you have a list now that you could supply to us? Can you give us that list now?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — There are some incomplete lists around, and the department has been working very diligently on developing a list for this. So, as I said, there will be other lands designated. Issues that need to be resolved before putting other lands into this act . . . The issues that need to be resolved with regard to those lands, potential designated lands . . . We have to gather more information. The land may have been cleared since last inventoried, or lands may be better left off the list for humanitarian reasons — a small parcel of Crown land, for example, on which buildings are desirable; lands may have previously proposed commitments, such as for parks, recreation areas, or communication corridors — those kinds of reasons.

But that inventory of lands that could potentially be designated are being checked very carefully, and it is our intention to designate other lands.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, in section 4 you say:

Subject for the other provisions of this Act, the minister shall administer critical wildlife habitat lands as provincial lands in accordance with *The Provincial Lands Act* . . .

What relationship is there between land held under The Provincial Lands Act and now with this new bill, the Crown lands protection and management act of the Crown lands? Can you give us some specific there?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I'm informed that the lands that may be designated . . . This may still be designated by the Department of Agriculture under the lands act. What designation in this act would do is give them further protection, so that it would keep someone from breaking up some land, say, that is administered by the Department of Agriculture. But there may well be other uses for the land, but it just would . . . It could possibly keep the lessee, if there was a lessee on the land, from some type of land use that wouldn't be compatible with wildlife. Let's say that.

Mr. Engel: — We were into quite a debate on this, six, 12 months, maybe 14 months ago — maybe the minister remembers — and there was some concern that I was having as far as your program on the sale of lease land and opening it up, and you weren't designating some of the parcels that I was concerned with down South. And I particularly wanted a designation in there that a land block that is over a certain size you wouldn't break up and put up for sale. And you made the argument that the farmers were protected.

Well, in my travels around that part of my riding, I see that, in spite of the drought conditions and in spite of the low returns for farmers, there's still a lot of land being broken up, and more so on publicly owned land.

Are you going to take a long time deciding what lands are going to be designated out of there, or could you give us a time frame, how soon you will set up this map? The minister shared with us a number of maps, over the last couple of days, that were marked off with this little 80-some sections of land, but that's a far cry from the bragging he's been doing, saying there's two hundred-and-some thousand acres that he's going to protect. And I think it's almost into the category of boloney, you know, when you throw in the 84,000 acres protected, and you're telling the public that you're protecting close to a quarter of a million acres.

So I'm concerned with what your concerns are there. And before I sit down, I only have one other question or concern, and some of my colleagues are going to be getting into this in more detail.

What about parcels of land that this group that is buying up land for wildlife protection — Ducks Unlimited — and they're talking about quite a decent sized block of land in the Chaplin area, and I'm all enthused about it and in favour of that. We had a Ducks Unlimited organizational banquet down in the Gravelbourg area, and they raised close to \$20,000, I think, and I think that's great for the first meeting in the area.

And they're concerned about not only land that's designated wildlife protection, but they're also creating the kind of environment that wildlife will do real well on. And I'm wondering: is that land that they are bringing into protection areas — and I know they'll be protecting it — but will that land, as well, come under the protection of this act? Have you got an agreement with them to include that in the management and maintenance of wildlife land? Okay. Those two questions.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Okay. First of all, the Ducks Unlimited as an entity cannot buy land. They are not buying this land. You're thinking of the Heritage March Program, and so on.

The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, in conjunction with Ducks Unlimited, buys that land, or the wildlife development . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm just making that a . . . just to clarify this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I know, but I'm just giving you that little clarification. But eventually that land will come under this act, the designation in this act. That's what I'm informed that that will be the case.

Now, as far as you are concerned about the time frame, and so on, I can't give you . . . It will be rather soon. I hesitate to give you an exact date, like, say, one year from this date or something, in case it's a short time later than that, and I'm held to it, or we're held to that. But it's our intention . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and as the member knows, I've kept every promise I've

ever given him. So that's why I'm very hesitant to put an exact date on it. But it is our intention to very quickly catalogue all of these lands and to designate substantially more in the near future.

Now, the member made mention of — I don't have an acreage here — but the member made mention of something like 200,000 acres. I can assure the member, because he has expressed a concern in wildlife habitat, and so on, that it will be more than 200,000 acres that will be designated.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I assume when we're talking about habitat, we are basically talking about ducks and geese — water-fowl. Can you tell us, then, what wildlife habitat . . . What are the range of species that you're trying to protect the habitat for?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — It's not true that we're primarily talking about ducks and geese. We're talking about upland game; we're talking about moose and white-tailed deer, and so on; mule deer, and so on.

Mr. Shillington: — Well I take it, Mr. Minister, that with respect to . . . Did you mention mule deer?

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Mr. Shillington: — I take it that . . . Well, mule deer would certainly be in the southern part of the province. I take it, then, that some of the habitat for the white-tail would also then be in the southern part of the province, would it?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, it certainly would be in the southern part of the province, and certainly the most critical . . . The reason that we have to talk about critical wildlife habitat is because of the circumstance in, primarily, the southern part of the province. There's no question about that.

The habitat has been diminishing much more rapidly in the South than anywhere else, and we just want to be sure that, as a government, we're on top of that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor?

I want to ask the minister: in respect to the bill here, how many acres have been designated?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — 87,000.

Mr. Koskie: — And you indicated that other acres would be added. Approximately, in the inventory of Crown land, how many more acres are you looking at as being designated as wildlife habitat?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, the member's colleague was asking, and was talking in terms of 2 or 300,000 acres before, and I gave the answer just prior to that, that it would be substantially more than that, well over that, but I can't really give you a number until this cataloguing is done.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I just want to draw to the attention of the minister who is filling in for the minister who is missing, that you have a capacity of coming in here and doing one thing, and then when you go to the press, you go out and double or triple the magnitude of what you're doing. Let me read:

Proposal unveiled for wildlife habitat: "About 2 million acres of Crown land will be set aside as wildlife habitat," Parks and Renewable Resource Minister Bob Pickering said Monday.

And this is his big announcement, and yet you go around in a sleazy way deceiving the public of the magnitude of what you're undertaking. Here you come with a bill with 86,000 acres . . .

An Hon. Member: — 87.

Mr. Koskie: — 87, and your minister goes out and deceives the public with the impression of giving over 2 million acres. I'd like to . . . I know the minister didn't make this announcement, but is this 2 million acres . . . Is that the ballpark figure of what you're looking at? Because when I asked you, you had seemed to not have any idea other than there would be more.

So can you set the record straight? Under this act, what you are really doing is 87,000 acres, not the 2 million as boasted by the minister. What are you trying to do, deceive the public? I'd like you to do an accounting of this.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd be very pleased to give an accounting of this to the hon. member from the former government that was in power for 11 years and did substantially nothing to protect wildlife in a very critical period of time for the wildlife of our province. So I get on to that.

As far as the number that the hon. member quotes — I believe he quoted the number "2 million acres" — certainly that would be the goal. I know that the wildlife federation, which has more than 33,000 members in Saskatchewan, is working in conjunction with my colleague, the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources, and his officials. They are working in close concert with each other. They're very — the wildlife federation, now, I'm speaking of — is very, very pleased with the actions taken by the minister to date in introducing this bill and showing our intentions. They are working very closely with the minister in terms of looking at the catalogued land as the cataloguing goes on.

Your colleague said something in the order of 2 or 300,000 acres, and I responded to that very, very truthfully. And I said it would be substantially more than that, and I'll stand by that. And it will be substantially more than that, as far as to say it will be 2 million acres, or 1.8 million acres, or 1.9 million acres, or maybe 2.1 million — any of those numbers. It's very hard to know until the cataloguing is done.

But we have no problem, Mr. Chairman, or certainly this administration certainly has nothing to apologize for, as it relates to the protection of wildlife habitat in this province, and our concern for the heritage of not only this generation, but of generations to come, as it relates to the wildlife heritage of this province.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, I'm not against the concept. Don't try to indicate in any way that we have not agreed with the concept. What I am indicating to you is the overall method of operation of this government. Facts are not important to this government. It was demonstrated in the Premier's estimates . . . guesswork is better. And that's what we have here, is what I would term a pretty sleazy presentation — 2 million acres, they tell the public. You get the minister before the committee, and it's 87,000. And so this is the point that we're making.

So what's really very clear is that outside the House one message is given, and when the substance of the bill is taken a look at it's not even . . . It's just a very, very small percentage of what the announcement is. I'll leave that at that stage, but I think you should adopt your ways and not be deceiving the public.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No, Mr. Chairman, just to . . . Certainly, 87,000 acres as the minister has indicated, as I will once again reiterate here, is certainly just a start in a new program. There's no question about that. But at least the introduction of this bill shows the commitment of this government to just the concept of wildlife preservation and habitat preservation in the province.

You want to talk about this government and the way that we deal with facts. I would suggest to you, sir, and through you, Mr. Chairman, that it's because we are concerned with having facts to present to this House, is that we're going to do the cataloguing and have our homework done before designating the lands, rather than designating lands that may well have been broken up before and the habitat is gone.

So we're dealing directly with facts. We have a new program under way, a very well received program by the wildlife federation and by the people of the province: 87,000 acres is a respectable start to that, and there will be more acreage, as I've indicated before.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I'm sorry that we got on this 200,000-acre bit instead of 2 million. I have to apologize for my short-sightedness.

I looked at the maps that the minister was kind enough to show to us, and just a little black speck here and there on the maps — 87,000 acres in Saskatchewan isn't a good start or attempt. I believe a bill is a good start.

I think it's a good idea to say that basically we have categorized and already reserved this amount, but when do you intend to add the book to the backside of this map? When do you intend to start building on it? Do you feel that you'll be about a half a million acres by the end of this year? How many people have you got working on it, and what kind of timetable does your staff have in mind to get to a place where you have at least a respectable amount of land in conservation?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll give the member the assurance, as I've given to his colleague, that our goal is a year — about a year or thereabouts — as I said to the member, but I don't think it would be reasonable or fair to hold me to the letter of that thing — one year — but very, very close to that. It certainly is a top priority in the department, and the cataloguing is under way. And our goal is that, about a year from now, in that neighbourhood.

Mr. Engel: — Do you have to move amendments to the act to make the additions of it? Will there be amendments coming forth as sessions come along? Or can you make additions without an amendment to the act?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No, the reason that they're designated and in the act is just to show the importance of the designation. That means it's part of legislation. And yes, there will be amendments to add the new lands to the act.

Mr. Engel: — So you can make an assurance that, if we're sitting this fall, by this fall session you'll be coming in with some land numbers that will likely make this page look very thin.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I'm informed that the intention would be to come in probably a couple of stages, so with the year as the goal, it may well be that somewhere we could be under way with some designation. But I once again wouldn't want you to hold me to that, if the decision is made to bring it in one cataloguing at some later date — next year, say.

Mr. Engel: — All we'll be doing is we'll be holding you to a commitment, not saying that in this House, and we'll read from you, and saying that I did this. What we will be saying to you is that every year they're ploughing up that much more. If you don't get at it, it's going to be too late. And I think the time for breaking up land is usually in mid-summer and fall, and if you can assure me that there's a freeze on, or notice has gone out on certain amounts of Crown land that there will not be any cultivating taking place, then we know that you have some intentions in mind. But we expect many pages of this in the next session, when we come back together here this fall.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I will give the member the assurance. The land in question that's being

catalogued will be protected in the interim by regulation, so no development can take place without approval and so on. So it's being protected in the interim. And you say you expect pages, and you will receive pages.

Mr. Engel: — Can you tell me just roughly how big a project Ducks Unlimited have in that Chaplin area? Do you have that information with you?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I'm told that the whole project is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2,000 acres, and it can expand and contract depending on what development they can undertake. But it's about the 2,000 acres.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — Is the committee agreed to go page by page? Agreed.

Pages 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 84 — An Act to amend The Heritage Property Act

Mr. Chairman: — Is the minister ready to proceed?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Ready, Mr. Chairman. Do you want me to introduce my officials at this time? I have with me the deputy minister, Mr. Bill Clarke; and behind me, Mr. Dick Clarke.

Clause 1

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, we expressed our concern about this earlier. I don't intend to repeat my remarks. I do intend we considered making some amendments to the legislation. Frankly, the amendments would have been so extensive that we determined that it was not appropriate.

An Hon. Member: — We would have had to rewrite the act.

Mr. Shillington: — That's right, we would have had to rewrite the acct. We determined that we were simply going to vote against the legislation. I therefore don't intend to spend a long time on it. But I can tell you, Mr. Minister, that I'm going to be getting copies of the *Hansard* today, and copies of the *Journals* with the votes in it, and I'm going to be mailing this out to a fair number of people, Mr. Minister.

What you are doing is in the best interests of a small group of self-serving people that is contrary to the best interests of society as a whole. It is irresponsible of us to be weakening the protection given to the built environment — the buildings. That's what you are doing. There is no particular rallying cry for that except from developers.

There is no need for this legislation, and I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that what you are doing is really quite inappropriate. The legislation which we passed, circulated, I would say, for five years before we passed it. I remember running one act after another around the province, and it was a long, frustrating process, but when it was done, everybody had had a chance. Everybody . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I say to the member from Swift current, it took several years with one act . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Oh, yes, I was — the minister of culture and youth for three and one-half years, and virtually all of that time we had one act or another running around the province.

At least, Mr. Minister, when we were done everybody had had a say. Everybody's views had

been expressed, and the bill which was passed met the needs and met the, I think, met the aspirations of almost everyone, with the possible exception of some property owners, who, I think, are very self-centred.

I say, Mr. Minister, we will be voting against this. I don't intend to get into a quarrel with each section. Certainly, quarrelling with the bill . . . We're not happy with it. I think you'd find the public would be most unhappy with it, if you'd given them an opportunity to express their views. Mr. Minister, you haven't given them an opportunity to express their views.

The bill is . . . I can't see the number of the bill just at the moment, but I know it is 84 or something like that. Whatever the number of the bill is, it is such that we know it's come in in the last 10 days. And that is just not an appropriate way to deal with legislation. That is just not appropriate.

I know, by dint of hard experience, there are a lot of people interested in this legislation. They haven't found out about it, and they're not going to, until after it's too late.

Mr. Minister, this is a poor way to run a government. It's not fair to the opposition; it is not fair to the public. And I'll tell you, it's not in your own best interest to sneak things past through the legislature. You may avoid a bit of a dust-up when the legislature's in session, but I'll tell you, you reap a bitter harvest afterwards. And if you think you're not going to hear about this from the historical societies in Regina, I think you're wrong. I think the like of . . . To pick a couple of prominent people from the Regina Historical Society, Mark Hanley and Ross Keith, I think, are going to be darned angry when they find out what you're doing.

Mr. Minister, this is a bad way to run a government. You ought to let that legislation stand until fall. Give the public an opportunity to see it, if you had brought it in in March instead of May, I think we could have lived with that, but this process is bad. The legislation is bad; the process is bad, and . . . Mr. Minister, in the short run, you're going to pay for it at the polls, but in the long run, I'm afraid to say, society and generations yet unborn are going to pay for it.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, just a brief response to the member opposite. I certainly appreciate his lecture on how to run a bill through, and how everything goes.

I would challenge the member opposite. He's making some very grandiose statements about what he conceives to be the intent of the act. I would ask him to substantiate them. We are prepared to answer any questions on it. If he can at all be accurate on any of the statements he's made, then please do.

The amendments that are before us are in response to an act that's been going for quite some time. We've been talking to people, to groups, and what we're doing is we're making the act a lot more faciliatory. Property rights are brought in more. The review process is brought in more. And earlier it was alleged that, indeed, the power of the cities are going to be taken away — indeed, that's not the case. Provisions are made for a review process that makes recommendations. Those powers are still within the city or the municipality or the government.

The one that might be there is the power of expropriation, which has always been held by a designated council or a designating province. Indeed, that's a hammer that was held across all the time; a hammer that was always held, never used. Therefore, why should that be there?

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill on division.

Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend The Arts Board Act

Mr. Chairman: — Is the minister ready to proceed?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, and my officials are the same as they were for the previous bill.

Clause 1

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, before we get into section 4, which is the object of my concern, as I think I said earlier, in a informal exchange earlier, in the report of the Public Accounts Committee, I expressed the concern of the Provincial Auditor that the arts board did not have statutory authority for making its grants. You indicated that you felt that this bill resolved that concern. And I'd ask you, Mr. Minister, to run me through it. I read through the bill, and I didn't see how you'd solved it. Perhaps you can tell me how you've done that.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the member's question, those are outlined in section 11(1), and in particular in section 11(2)(b), where it says, and I'll quote:

subject to the regulations, award scholarships or make loans or grants to any individual ordinarily resident in Saskatchewan for the purpose of assisting him in conducting research, working at his art or studying any art form;

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is right. I think you have met the concern. That was the section I couldn't see.

Mr. Minister, I really have no other comments. As I say, we're going to have some words on section 4, but the rest of the bill, I have, at this point in time, see no reason to quarrel with. So I will let her go until we get to section 4, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

Mr. Chairman: — Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Arts Board Act, amendment to section 4:

Strike out section 4 of the printed bill, and re-number section 5 and 6 of the printed bill to:

sections 4 and 5 (respectively).

Mr. Shillington: — I wish to speak on the amendment, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I know you have received expressions of concern about this section, because they've also contacted me. Mr. Minister, they struck me as being a pretty broadly representative group of artists. The craft council, the writers' guild, are two that I know from memory that I have permission to use their names as being people who are concerned about this section.

Mr. Minister, you seem to indicate you don't like being lectured. I regret to say you seem to need it, Mr. Minister. Let me treat you to a lecture about the arts board and its relationship to the artist, because you really seem to need it, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, the arts board was set up in 1945. It was the Liberal government of Ross Thatcher, to be fair, which gave it its present stature. I think that's fair to say. But it has survived a number of changes in administration. The independence of the arts board is sacrosanct to the artists. That is simply not negotiable, and it is important, essential, to artists that the arts board remain paramount, the

paramount authority for giving grants.

The rationale, Mr. Minister, is very simple: cultural things go to men's minds — what they think, how they perceive their world. It is of the utmost importance that that not reflect the faith of any political party in office. Artists feel very strongly about it, as well they should. They believe it goes to the root of a society's ability to function as a democracy, and I agree with them.

Mr. Minister, they're concerned — and I think their concern is accurate — they're concerned that section 4 weakens the arts board and strengthens the position of the executive director. And that wouldn't be such a serious problem, except that . . . It would be a serious problem, but it's aggravated by the fact that the executive director is an order in council appointment, and, indeed, I believe you took the opportunity of the last election to change the executive director.

What this does, Mr. Minister, is significantly strengthen the administration at the expense of the arts board. That is not acceptable to the arts community. It's not acceptable to the opposition.

You'd know that if you weren't trying to ram this bill through. If you allowed the normal process, Mr. Minister, you would know that. I'm surprised you don't, because I'm aware of the expressions of concern which have been made to you. Mr. Minister, I would ask you to respond to those expressions of concern because they're shared by this opposition.

If you have an explanation which you've clearly concealed from everyone to date, and you offer it to us, we'd vote for it. But if you've got an explanation for this, you've very cleverly concealed it, because no one else has figured it out either. They have met with you and your officials and come away even more concerned than they were when they walked through your door.

Mr. Minister, I ask you to leave . . . If you haven't got enough courage and integrity to admit you've made a mistake, then at least let the bill stand over till fall. Hear those concerns. I think you'll get them in spades if you leave this thing till fall . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Minister of Health, if you did everything Ned did, what you'd get is . . . Yes, you might well get defeated. It's going to happen, anyway.

Mr. Minister, if you did everything Ned did, you know what would happen? You'd have an opportunity to listen to the public of Saskatchewan. This is the fourth bill in a row that that I have asked to stand over till fall because I don't think you've heard the voice of the people. I don't think they like what you're doing with heritage in the arts. I think if you gave them an opportunity, they'd say so — and you haven't given them an opportunity.

So I say to you, Mr. Minister, if you haven't got the integrity to admit you've made a mistake, and you haven't got that kind of courage, at least let the thing stand till fall. Listen to the expressions of opinion which you get, and if I'm wrong, we'll pass it, and we'll all vote for it. But I assume, if you know you're wrong, you won't go ahead with it.

Mr. Minister, I ask you to take the opportunity to find out whether you're right or wrong.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Member, the member's made quite a few comments, and to tell you the truth, quite a few of them I agree with — a lot of his perceptions about the arts community, and the importance of the arts board, and the functioning of the arts board.

And as I stated earlier in second reading, I have mentioned on numerous occasions that I'm a proponent of the arm's-length concept. And groups that have contacted me in the last few days, the last week, about this particular section . . . When it has been explained to them exactly what is going on, they are in support of it.

Mr. Chairman, I think the member opposite is trying to read a lot into it, perhaps with political

interference into it. In fact, the executive director has always been appointed by Executive Council. The arts board has always been appointed by Executive Council.

And I believe at one time the member from Regina Centre alluded that we got rid of the previous executive director. That, in fact, is not true. The previous executive director resigned. The new one was chosen, I believe, in October of '82. I believe that's about right. And people that were on that selection committee were a member of the Public Service Commission, the chairman of the arts board — and, if I'm not mistaken, that was the chairman of the arts board that was appointed under the previous administration — and also the deputy minister of Culture and Recreation. So, therefore, I think the process was very fair. We have a very competent person in as executive director, and as I mentioned earlier, once again in second reading speech, that the duties of the executive director in a lot of cases are already there.

I look back to section 9(1) which says:

All contracts, agreements, orders, rules and other documents shall be signed by the chairman or by the executive director.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the duties are there. And if there is any one of those clauses that are part of section 4, whether it's (a), (b), (c), or (d), that was giving the member opposite some concern, I'll be glad to discuss them. But as it is right now, I would look upon the amendment, and I would ask all hon. members to join with me in defeating that amendment.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you say I am reading in political interference. My friend, it has left tracks over your face. It jumps out at you. So there is political interference in this.

Mr. Minister, you appointed . . . You wouldn't have such a problem with credibility if you hadn't appointed the wife of a former, and now present, Conservative candidate as executive director. That was not an appropriate appointment. And I make no comments on the personality or the integrity or the ability of the appointment, but the appearance is simply not appropriate — to be supporting the wife of a Conservative candidate here as executive director.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that you have a credibility problem, I think, with the arts community. And you've created it in two years because you came into office with the arts community. I think, with a reservoir of good will. I think they welcomes this administration. I think with equal enthusiasm they will welcome your passing, Mr. Minister. You've spent what credibility and good will you had. I suggest in your own best interests, Mr. Minister, that you let this bill stand over, or accept the amendment.

Mr. Minister, I don't understand why you're doing it. The section which is there now, and I will read it for you if you want — I will get it in a moment — but, Mr. . . . Perhaps I can have one of the pages for a moment. I need the first volume of the statutes.

Mr. Minister, the executive director shall perform such duties as are assigned to him by the arts board. That is a common and traditional paragraph. It means what it says. Obviously the executive director hires staff that performs the administrative duties, but you're always answerable to the arts board. You're always answerable to the arts board.

Your problem with this section, Mr. Minister, is that the executive director is now no longer answerable to the arts board with respect to these sections. That concern has been expressed. I have read it. I agree with it. You know, the minister, for the sake of appearances, is going to quarrel with that interpretation, but I don't think your executive director is going to quarrel with that interpretation when she's dealing with the arts board. I think the arts board are going to get told to get lost when it comes to asking her to be responsible to the arts board with respect to the items you've enumerated here.

Mr. Minister, your section is out of keeping with the tradition of the arts board — and it has worked very well. It's a concept of which every successive minister of culture and recreation is proud. It's a Saskatchewan concept. It's spread to other areas. It's spread to other areas. It's worked well, Mr. Minister, and I suggest you leave it alone. And I suggest at this point in time you start to cut some of your losses, and drop this bill.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in response, the member opposite just lightly touched on the fact that, indeed, the executive director is related to the PC candidate. I'm not sure what he was quite getting at, but certainly, in October of '82, she was not. And indeed, the previous executive director that did resign, indeed, went to the province of Manitoba to become, I believe, an associate deputy of the department of culture with the Manitoba government.

And if you're questioning the capabilities of the executive director, I could gladly go through her resume — such things as her education, the degrees that she has: Master of Music, Bachelor of Music. She has diplomas such as the Associate of the Royal Conservatory of Toronto; Associate of Music, University of Saskatchewan; Associate of Arts, Regina College; high school senior matriculation, Qu'Appelle Diocesan School in Regina.

Employment: Banff School of Fine Arts, active adjudicator; Western Board of Music, examiner; the Banff Centre; CKIT Regina, classical music writer; University of Regina, sessional lecturer; Saskatchewan Music Festival Association, executive director for about five years; Saskatchewan Music Festival Association, assistant director; Moose Jaw Board of Education, music specialist; Regina Conservatory of Music, faculty member; University of Regina, full-time special lecturer in the department of music, and lecturer in the department. Then I could go on with her community involvements and her memberships, etc. So I believe we do have a very competent person in there with the executive director of the arts board.

And once again, like I mentioned in second reading speech, Mr. Chairman, I'll go over section 2 and I'll read it into the record once more.

(2) The Executive Director is secretary to the board and shall:

(a) manage the day-to-day affairs of the board;

Most executive directors manage the day-to-day affairs of the board, especially when a board, in some cases for the arts board, only meets twice a year. They need somebody to manage the day-to-day affairs of the board:

(b) conduct any contract negotiations with other organizations;

(c) manage the staff of the board, including the selection, hiring and dismissal of the persons mentioned in section 10;

Once again, she's the overseer of the day-to-day operations of the Saskatchewan Arts Board; and, (d), the one the member opposite obviously missed:

(d) perform any other duties that may be assigned to him by the board.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the justification is here, and indeed, like I mentioned earlier, the groups that have expressed some concern to me, when explained to them, they are in favour of it. Therefore, I will be voting against the amendment.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 5

Engel
Lingenfelter

Koskie
Shillington

Sveinson

Nays — 24

Devine
McLeod
Andrew
Taylor
Katzman
McLaren
Smith (Swift Current)
Baker

Duncan
Currie
Klein
Maxwell
Young
Folk
Bacon
Hodgins

Parker
Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Rybachuk
Hampton
Gerich
Schmidt
Tusa
Zazelenchuk

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill on division.

Bill No. 98 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983 (No. 3)

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — ... (inaudible) ... the Department of Justice, and Ken Schultz from the Highway Traffic Board.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I think it's fair to say that people across Canada, as across North America, are believing that the rights of individuals driving on the highways have to be protected, and that people who drink while driving should be and are punished, and I believe that the punishment for drinking while driving should be severe.

I think the irony, and I suppose the hypocrisy of this government, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we have, for the first time, TV ads expounding on the beauty of drinking — young people, healthy people, drinking and carrying on — while at the same time we have a government that encourages that type of advertising then coming out and beating up on the people who they have just moments before encouraged to drink.

And I think the irony and hypocrisy, as I mentioned, is not going unnoticed by schools, by universities, teachers, by driving groups. Driving Without Impairment groups, church groups.

And I just want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that while we'll be supporting this bill, I think there are many people in this province who wonder about the true intent of this government, whether they are really sincere in their idea of attempting to get people to not drink and drive, when at the other hand they are encouraging people to drink more and more.

And we have listed out any number of ways that you have done that. You talk of having alcoholic beverages at sporting events, liquor advertising on TV. Mr. Chairman, you'll be well aware of the statements that my colleague has made from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I just wanted to point that out from my point of view I find it ironical that we would be doing both at the same time. I think if we were just encouraging people not to drink, having severe penalties for those that chose to drink and drive, it would be

understandable. But when you're doing both, I think especially for the young people, it's very confusing to see TV ads in the one minute that show young people drinking, or beer at their disposal after every sporting events, and then two minutes later having ads on TV that show young people in an operating room with blood coming out of their chest. It's very confusing, the society that you are creating here in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I just wanted to point that out, Mr. Chairman, that we find it difficult to understand where we're heading in Saskatchewan on this whole issue of consumption of alcohol and drinking and driving.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, I think with regard to the bill, what I hear the member saying is that he supports basically the thrust of the bill. Any of the features of the bill, choose to argue, and I suppose an issue that is argued in the province as to whether or not it's appropriate to advertise beer and wines on television. That has been debated in this House on many occasions. I'm sure I'm not going to add a great deal to the debate that's new.

The reality of it is that most people are having cable television beamed in. That TV is being watched by people. And I suppose we could go on with the debate again, but I doubt very much we'd add a whole lot new.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, I just want to make a few brief comments, Mr. Chairman. And I join with my colleague from Shaunavon to express our concern at the hypocrisy of the approach.

And this is a concern throughout this province. I have here, from the Grenfell Apostolic Church, a petition asking the Premier to reverse the advertising of alcoholic beverages. I think that what I would like also in conjunction with this, is a further continuation and expansion of the educational awareness to young people.

I know some is going on in the educational system. Young people can be impressed and can be educated very well, and it worked especially well in the introduction of seat belts. It was the young people who had taken driver training at high schools, and so forth, where the use of the seat belt was used as part of the safety of driving instruction. And when we introduced the safety belts, young people across the province did not have any problems with it.

And so what I ask, as the Grenfell Apostolic Church, I think that if there is irrevocable that advertising of liquor is going to continue, then I think you have a heavy obligation placed on your shoulder to see that young people in this province are indeed aware of the consequences of it, because the two thrusts are really counter-productive.

I agree with the thrust of making sure that our highways are safe and the stiffer enforcement of regulations and rules of road, in so far as drinking is concerned, because the tragedy and the death and the carnage on the highways has been substantial. And, therefore, we will be supporting the amendments. We would urge the government to certainly increase the awareness among all people and to increase the thrust of education awareness.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I appreciate the government's concern in the highway traffic, in the highway safety field. I think that it's time we start taking some action and implementing some laws and regulations that will be a deterrent — a deterrent particularly to our young people.

The year I lost a son in a car accident, three — three — families lost their children within 12, 15 miles from my place, that were teenagers of driving age. Ours happened on a Sunday on the way home from church. I can't and I don't blame alcohol in that case. But I think that alcohol-related accidents, and the lives that could be avoided, and the lives that could be spared, and those that are partially maimed, or maimed for life, or those that are confined to a bed and are vegetables . . . I'm familiar with many cases like that, so I've had a strong concern.

When we first implemented the seat belt legislation, and I visited a classroom down in Rockglen . . . it was a busy time of the year and I had been doing a lot of driving. I took my son along — the one we still have — to drive down there, and the kid said, “Why would you implement legislation that forces us to do things?”

I remember hearing those kind of words when 17 people were sitting over on this side: “Why would you be implementing legislation that forces, that forces us to do things, like the seat belt legislation?” And I said, “Now, maybe you don’t . . .” This is Rockglen country, you know, where there’s a lot of cowboys, and I said, “Now, maybe you don’t need a seat belt on a horse. That I’ll buy, but if I would have had a son wearing a seat belt, I would have a son.”

And I know that, because of the condition of the car. It was a four-door hardtop, a ’98 Olds. He fell out, and the car rolled on him and crushed him. It was just the kind of an accident that a kid should have never got involved in. But if he had been wearing a seat belt . . . If he had been wearing seat belt, he’d have been buckled in behind the wheel, and his life could likely, or possibly, been spared. We have no control of fate.

So, I’m concerned that your government, and particularly . . . I’m pleased the Minister of Finance is handling this bill, because I feel you have more compassion and more concern than some of your colleagues do. And I think the one area that you should really be using your influence and your weight on is try and avoid being hypocritical. Why would you, on one hand, encourage the consumption of alcohol, and on the other hand, you’re getting tough to try and regulate it? And I think this is where the irony of it comes in. This is where people can’t see it. And don’t shake your head and say it can’t be done, because I know of five states in the United States that have banned liquor advertising on TV, on satellite, and a total ban on the television of advertising liquor. That can be done. If there’s a will, there can be a way to do that.

I definitely believe that the slick ads, the advertising, is increasing consumption amongst our young teens, the teens when they’re at such an impressionable age. I think to spell out and underline the argument that I’m trying to make, I want to read into the record a letter I received from Dalmeny Bible Church in Dalmeny, Saskatchewan. And it’s very short, and he says:

On behalf of the Dalmeny Bible Church, I would like to express our regret that the government of this province, by lifting the ban on liquor advertising, is promoting the increased consumption of alcohol in Saskatchewan. When I see liquor ads on TV (the pastor goes on to say), I sense no warm feeling of pride that we as a province have come of age.

He goes on to say:

It gives me no pleasure or glow of satisfaction to realize that Saskatchewan is getting into step with the times, and that more alcohol will be consumed in our province. Somebody else’s brother will be crippled or killed in an alcohol-related accident. Somebody else’s family will break up because of alcohol.

How did I miss seeing in the newspapers or on television some indicating that people of Saskatchewan rose up and pressured our government into lifting the ban which for 58 years has gone virtually unchanged? We wish you every success in your efforts to see the government reverse this dangerous and crafty decision.

I’m afraid they’re going to have to wait two years till the next election. I don’t think your government cares. I don’t think your people care about people. I don’t think you care about the impression on their young lives. I think you care about the money you’re getting from the advertising of liquor. I think you care about the money you’re getting from breweries more than you do about lives.

You're hypocritically passing an act today which I endorse 100 per cent. But on one hand, you say you're going to get tough and, on the other hand, you're pushing it, and you're pushers. You know what the law is for prosecuting pushers.

The member from Maple Creek seems awful sensitive. I have an axe to grind in this issue. I feel it's gone the wrong direction, and I really wish the minister would use his influence in cabinet and in his caucus to lead an assault against this deadly thing that would promote more liquor and promote more consumption of liquor in this province. I think that's something you as a minister could do. You could lead an assault against some of these people and say, "Look, we can get enough money another way. We can raise the funds from some other sources. We will take a stand and try and reverse the consumption of alcohol." You could be a first there; you could . . . I challenge you to do it. If you don't do it, I know a crowd that will do it two years from now.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, there's a couple of things I think that are worthy to point out. And as I indicate, I didn't want to get into the total debate, but the population of Saskatchewan, you know, you indicated had no advertising over the last 58 years. Okay? No advertising in Saskatchewan, you indicated, for liquor, over the last 58 years — and yet the per capita consumption of hard liquor in Saskatchewan is the highest per capita of any province in the country — the highest per capita. Now, what's that tell us? It wasn't the advertising that made us the highest per capita consumers of hard liquor in all of Canada. That's not what made it.

Now let's look at the . . . If you want to look at the dollars, okay. The per capita consumption of alcohol in the last two years has, in fact, gone down. The number of alcohol-related accidents over the last two years has, in fact, gone down. The number of deaths attributed to automobile accidents associated with liquor has, in fact, gone down. Those are the statistics.

Now, I think what the hon. member is really talking about or getting towards, and I think a lot of the, or still, some people in this province perhaps are getting to, is really what they're saying in disguise is that they are against the consumption of alcohol — period. And there's a fair group in the population are basically saying that.

Now, that was tried across North America in the '20s. Now, you know, we can talk about that. That's really, if you get down to it, a lot of the discussion that they were talking about is the consumption. I'm sure the hon. member, many of the people in the churches that he is associated with, are to that view, that there shouldn't be consumption of alcohol — period.

That, I don't think, works in society, and the 1920s told us it wouldn't work in society . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, but I mean, you can talk simply advertising. Advertising is not going to swing the issue one way or the other. If you look at the numbers, they're going down, the number of . . . And the reason that consumption is going down . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Not true. Not true.

And the reason, the reason that consumption has gone down, the thing that impacts more than anything on the consumption of alcohol, is the price increases. And the price increases in the last two years of our administration, along with the federal government, have increased five times. Five times in two years the price of booze has gone up, and that, more than anything else, impacts on consumption. That is what, in fact, brings it down.

The reality is that we've argued this point many times. We're not going to resolve it here. We're going to resolve it out on the hustings. We all know that. You're going to advance your position. We will advance our position. I think it'd make it clear. I suppose, in the final analysis is that I would hope that you would not use it as "our party" when you go out and say, "Our party, the NDP, does not support advertising," because your party in British Columbia, when they were in office, condoned advertising of liquor. The province of Manitoba, that now has an NDP government, allows liquor advertising on TV, as they do here, in fact, perhaps even more broadly

than they . . . (inaudible) . . .

So let's not tie this into a political party saying yes, we stand for this on the side of good with regard to advertising. I recognize your record in government. I doubt that we will resolve anything on extending this debate that much further.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, in your own document, in the *Estimates*, on page 8, you know that your revenue has gone from 110 million to 130 million from consumption. Don't give me the line on that.

What I'm saying is that fancy, slick ads don't affect me and won't affect an old guy like the real George — won't affect people like that. But you know and I know that the sensitive age, the 15, 14, 16-year-olds that are watching those slick, fancy TV ads, those sportsman-like, healthy, young people with the liquor in their hands . . . Sure, they're not drinking it, but it's the beer ads that are the ones that are bombarding us, and it's the beer that has increased in consumption, and it's the beer that young people are drinking.

If you've got teen-age kids at your place, you're not worried about them having a rum and coke or a hard liquor. You're not worried about that. The concern you have is how many beers are they having or who's buying beers for them. That's the concern. That's the concern, Mr. Minister.

I think, parallel to this kind of legislation where you have tough legislation, where you have tough legislation for people that are consuming alcohol, where you have tough legislation for people that are consuming alcohol, you should parallel that with abstinence. I think your formula that you have on moderation and moderate use of alcohol . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I'm having some competition here, and as much from my side as across the way.

But the concerns that I have, and that people like from the Dalmeny Bible Church are sharing with me, is that your advertisements that you're condoning and that you are saying are the mandatory ones that are showing moderation is okay are the ones that are giving our teenagers the licence to drink and are encouraging our teenagers to have a beer and to be with the in-set and the jet set that is using it. I am strongly opposed to that.

I think when you people relate your ads that advertise in moderation, I think you should take a leaf out of the old Aware ads that had the big X on and that basically started with the premise that any amount of the consumption is a start for a teenager. And I don't know of anybody that's been an alcoholic that didn't start with that first drink in moderation. And I think this is the area of concern that I think your whole advertising campaign should be about, is that you don't make a nice, slick ad that says it's okay to have a beer, or just one beer, and that looks like it's in moderation. That's the one that is getting the young people started. And those are the ones that are so subtly introducing them to this deadly drug, this deadly, deadly drug.

And with that I'm going to close, Mr. Minister.

I feel that the legislation, the legislation I can support, but . . . Why be a hypocrite, why be a hypocrite, and say we're getting tougher and tougher and tougher over here? We're jabbing instead of . . . (inaudible) . . . We're doing this and doing this and still you're encouraging them to consume alcohol, even with your ads that are supposed to be, the ones that are supposed to be the negative ones. Moderation isn't okay in my books, because it starts with a moderation drink that makes the young person think he should have a drink.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I suppose, in closing, what I would simply say is that various societies across the world consume alcohol socially, otherwise, in different ways, whether they're Americans, the French, the Canadians, the . . . Whatever they are, and advertising hasn't influenced that very, very significant, if at all.

The reality of it is societies set standards that we happen to follow in generations and future generations. That's the reality of it, and that's the reality of the world. Everybody's against abuse of alcohol in this Assembly, particularly as it relates to driving. That's what this bill is about. What we are dealing with, Mr. Chairman, is a bill that will make stiffer penalties for that, and that's what we're voting on in this particular Assembly, and that's what we're dealing with.

Mr. Engel: — Just one final comment, Mr. Chairman, and the point I want to make is that 15, 20 years ago, it might have been acceptable, it might have been acceptable to have a moderated use of alcohol, and still drive. Today, it is a different kind of society, and I think to lay the line down, our young people will respond if you would come on with the same price campaign that you have a positive campaign and say, "You can live a better life; you can make better grades; and you can do a better job with no consumption, and make that the kind of society that's the image you're going to live up to." You'd have people responding, and the young people would pick up the challenge. And you'd get ahead with it, and you'd have a thing that would be pretty hard to beat. Mr. Chairman, you would have an organization that'd be pretty hard to beat.

But if you come on as the ones that are promoting a little booze, you're going to go down as people that supported this rush. I really think you are, and I think it's pretty serious. And you're making a very grave mistake in this one.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The Assembly recessed until 5:30 p.m.