

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

June 19, 1985

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. WEIMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce to you, and to the members of the legislature, as well as to the visitors here this afternoon, a group of 86 students who come from a school in constituency. It's the fourth visit schools have had this spring, and the total . . . I haven't this spring already. And I point that out to indicate that that's only four out of the 10 schools that I have, and also to indicate that not only is it a new constituency but it's a very young constituency and constantly growing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you very much — a young MLA also.

I do want to welcome you here. I know that you will find it informative. As I stated, they are from Confederation Park School, and I'm positive and sure that you will be disregarding any childish antics of colleagues behind me for the next half hour.

I will look forward to meeting you after the tour of the legislative Building. We will have refreshments together, and I'm sure your behaviour and questions will be of a higher calibre than what you will be witnessing.

Will you please welcome my students with me.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I also have a group of 26 students in the west gallery. They are from the Clavet Elementary School. They are here with us to watch the proceedings of the House, and I wish to welcome them and hope they have a good trip back home as well as an educational day.

And I wish to tell them I'll be with them Saturday evening in their community to be opening up the new hall and giving out the trophy, the Ralph Katzman Trophy, for those individuals who give of themselves for the betterment of the community.

I hope you'll all welcome them.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### **Bill No. 103 — An Act to repeal Certain Acts respecting the Payment of Grants or Rebates of Property Taxes**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the minister introduce his officials.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. With me today is Ron Davis from Urban Affairs. The minister is presently on tour in northern Saskatchewan; I'll be leading this Bill in committee.

#### **Clause 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would you explain how this Bill operates with respect to the home quarter educational rebate? The home quarter education tax rebate, as I recall it last year, was introduced with such fanfare as a huge tax cut. I'm curious to know whether this Bill will eliminate the home quarter education tax rebate and accordingly be a huge tax cut, or the reverse of a huge tax cut, which will make it a huge tax increase.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The hon. member's question is: does this Bill eliminate the home quarter tax rebate? No, it does not.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, is the reason for that because the home quarter tax rebate is going to be eliminated by order in council and does not need legislation, or is it because the home quarter tax rebate is removed by other legislation?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — It's because it is under regulations and was dealt with in the Agriculture subvotes, and that's where it was last year, and it was shown as not this year within the budget. And it's covered by regulation. It was brought in by regulations, I understand, and therefore is gone by regulation.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — What you're saying then is that it's gone and killed, but not by this particular axe.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — This morning, Mr. Minister, we had the experience of discussing The Income Tax Act, and how you indicated that everyone was better off. And what I want to do is turn to the property improvement grant, which had . . . It's been in effect for a long number of years. And I'd like to ask you, by in fact repealing the property improvement grants, which was of great benefit to the farmers — they got \$375 under the property improvement grant; the home owners got \$230; business men got \$250. It was a way of using some of our resource revenue to take the burden of taxation off of the property owners — the business community, the farmers, and the home owners.

What I want to know is, everybody, you say is going to be better off. I'd like to ask you in respect to the property improvement grant: what is the total annual amount that had previously been paid out under the property improvement grant and went to all of the business men, farmers, and home owners?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The property improvement grant was \$49 million; the seniors' rebate was 28; the renters' rebate was \$8.2 million; and the home quarter was 15.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — So in respect to the property improvement grant, what you're doing is taking from every business man, farmer, home owners, \$102 million — \$102 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 120? No, \$102 million. Yes, \$102 million — benefits that were going directly to farmers, business men, and home owners across this province. You're extracting \$102 million.

We listened to the Premier in his estimates saying that the reasons that there's deficits and so on and we can't balance the budget is that the farmers are very depressed.

And I am saying to you, at a time when there is distress among our small-business community and our farmers, who are having a difficult time, do you think it reasonable to in fact extract \$102 million benefits in property improvement grants, senior citizens' grants, and the renters' rebate? How do you find that consistent with any economic sense, to have extracted 106 million with a surtax, and now take another 102 million from the people of Saskatchewan at a time when you say the agricultural community is in stress, the small business is in stress, because the retail sales are down substantially?

Go across this province; down the highway; go into the towns; and you'll see machine shops that have been closed, and other businesses. And the business community and the farmers. I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, cannot afford to have the property improvement grant repealed at this time.

I'll tell you, it's the wrong direction. One hundred and six new tax and 102 you're taking away in two pieces of legislation. How do you justify that in a time of economic difficulties by the

farmers and the small-business men which make up the really economic generators of this province?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, the cost is not 100, Mr. Chairman. It's 55 when you look at the benefits that are left on for senior citizens or enriched for senior citizens.

And the member opposite asks: what possible reason could you have for this? The one reason, Mr. Chairman, is that the dollars that were taken from the property improvement grant went totally, totally to our school systems for a better education program for the children of this province in the K to 12 system, and to the university system.

Now the member asks: what is the logic of that? When I toured the province, when my colleagues toured the province, what people were saying, Mr. Chairman, is this: put your money into the education system. For a variety of reasons, Mr. Chairman, if you are going to provide anything for your students, for your children, it is build them and develop for them a better education system so that they in their futures will have a better chance in a tough world out there.

That's what people told me and that's what we did. That's what we did on this program and people said, if you're going to do something, one area you might look at is the property improvement grant. And it's worthwhile I think, to go back and look at the history of the property improvement grant.

Property improvement grants were first invented in the province of British Columbia by W.A.C. Bennett, and he started the program out, \$50 back to the people of B.C. And he was criticized at that time, and I think rightly so, Mr. Chairman, as a \$50 payment to buy a vote.

That was brought in in Saskatchewan in 1964-65, and I stand to be corrected on that, with the Ross Thatcher government. And at that point in time it was criticized, and I suggest legitimately criticized by the Leader of the Opposition who was then in this Assembly as an opposition member — criticized because it was dollars being sent out to buy people's vote, to buy people's vote when the money would more appropriately have been spent in education. That criticism was valid in 1964 and before that. That criticism is valid today.

What we have in government too often is turn around and tax people on the one hand, and then turn around and give it back to them on the other hand, Mr. Chairman. And what people told us, quite frankly, is it's time to move in that direction and time to put that money into the education system.

You ask people: is it better to give that up, and in so giving it up we can provide a better school system for our children? And I submit to you that the people will accept it. The members opposite will laugh.

No province in this country has made the commitment to education; no province has made the commitment to education as we have in the province of Saskatchewan this year. And we're proud of that. That will pay dividends for us, Mr. Speaker. That will pay dividends for the economy of the province. But more importantly, that will pay dividends for the young people that we see here today and all the other young people of this province today and tomorrow and well into the future.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you give your story about property improvement grants and you stop nearly 20 years ago. Why didn't you say that it was a major issue in the 1971 campaign? Why didn't you say . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He was giving 1966. Presumably if his memory goes back to '66, it's go back to '71.

Why doesn't he say what his colleague from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden knows, since he fought in that campaign? Why doesn't he say that at that time farmers said, we should not bear as much of school tax as we now bear? Why doesn't he say that farmers said, look, we pay far more per capita in supporting schools than do other people in this province? Wouldn't it be fair to lower the amount of school costs borne on property taxes and increase the amount that comes from the public purse at Regina?

And at that time what was done was to say that we would lower property taxes for school purposes to 25 mills. That was the promise, and that was what was delivered. That was what was delivered in 1971 and '72. And property improvement grants were instituted in order to lower property taxes for school purposes because our party believed, and still believes, that it is wrong to finance half the costs of schools on property taxes. You obviously believe otherwise.

The combination of school grants and property improvement grants and all the other property tax rebates paid about 70 per cent of school costs. You are now reducing that, reducing it to around 50. And I say, I say, Mr. Minister, you are going in the wrong direction. You should be financing schools more on taxes based upon ability to pay and less on property taxes, and you are going on the wrong way. There is no necessary relationship between owning property, at least at the level that farmers are talking about, and having an income.

(1415)

Mr. . . . I'll just wait for a moment, Mr. Chairman. I know that the member for Rosemont is going to mount an effective argument in rebuttal, and my bet is that he will not. My bet is that his courage stops when his knees straighten. That's what I think about the member for Rosemont.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is very, very clear that members opposite believe that a greater share of school costs should be borne with property taxes. That is not the view of our party. There is no necessary relationship in this day and age between owning property, farm property, and having a high income. It is not necessarily true that if you have to raise more money for schools and universities, as you say you do, you should be taking 650, 675 or \$700 from a farmer, and \$250 from Central Canada Potash, which is what you have done. And that, I think, is not fair. That, I think, is not reasonable. It's not fair, Mr. Minister — not fair, Mr. Minister — to take \$250 from Ipsco, which you have done, and to take \$230 from my constituent who has an income of 16 or \$18,000 a year. That's what you've done.

You have said, yes, we want to spend more money on schools and universities. With that we agree. We wish you would have decided on that last year. But I say this: if you want to spend \$100 million more on schools and universities — and it's hard to find it in the budget, I may say; there's not \$100 million more in all of those budgets. But we'll leave that aside. We'll leave that aside. We'll not talking about what you're going to spend five years hence. The minister will not be a member of this House five years hence.

But I am saying in this year you have decided, decided we're going to get more money for universities and schools. We're going to take \$250 from Ipsco and \$675 from the farm beside Ipsco, and that you put forward as fair taxation. There's not a thing fair about it.

Furthermore, you are moving your tax system in a regressive way by saying you're going to finance more of the costs from property taxes. If you needed \$100 million more, there are income taxes and corporation taxes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and oil companies, which are better able to pay and which would be fairer.

Your Premier never stops talking about how we should get money through the income tax system, and that will be fair. Well why aren't you doing it then? Why are you taking \$230 from my constituent who has an income of \$18,000 a year, and \$230 from Ipsco, and \$675 from a

farmer in the constituency of the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg?

Mr. Minister, given that you want to spend more money on education, with which we agree, why are you deciding to take it in those proportions from those people and not from taxes based upon ability to pay?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, I think a couple of things. The Leader of the Opposition likes to go back to history. So we go back to the 1971 campaign, and again only as a student of history. The NDP, as I understand — and I stand to be corrected because, as many of my colleagues, we were high school students in those days — but going back to that time, Mr. Chairman, I understand, I'm led to believe that the campaign of the Leader of the Opposition was that: elect us and we'll eliminate the school tax off property. Now that's what they say; that's what they say at the doors, and this type of thing.

Now the only thing I recall is back in the 1982 campaign. In the dying days of the '82 campaign they went through their program. It didn't fly. And they started inventing new eyeglasses and new teeth for people. In the last week they were saying: elect us and we will take the school tax off of property. Remember? We'll take the school tax off of property. That was their argument.

But, Mr. Chairman, go back and look at the record of 11 years of the Blakeney government. Go back and look at the 11 years of the previous government in this province. And what do you find? Did you find property taxes going down? Did you find property tax of education going down on the farmers of this province, on the home owners of this province, and the small businesses of this province? Not very likely. The exact opposite in fact took place.

The members opposite would cover the costs perhaps up to the negotiated settlement with the teachers, not the increments, and year after year after year property taxes went higher and higher and higher and higher.

Now the Leader of the Opposition now would have us believe that during his 11 years he did nothing but lower that school tax. That is balderdash, Mr. Chairman, and people know it is balderdash.

This year, for the first time, for the first time in a good many years, what we are seeing is mill rates around this province being frozen — zero increases. And that is what is in fact happening. And that's a far cry from 10 and 15 and 12 and 13 per cent mill rate increases year after year after year. That's the reality, Mr. Chairman.

That's the reality, Mr. Chairman. The member opposite makes the argument, attempts to make the argument to people that somehow he kept property taxes down during his administration. That is not so. That is not believable, and I don't believe the people of Saskatchewan will buy it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you want to talk about anything but the Bill, and my question to you is very simple: you propose to add \$100 million in taxes by taking away this range of property tax rebates, and if you want to reduce it by 25 because you say you're going to pay out some time in never, never land some money to the seniors, it doesn't matter. The figures are a matter of record.

What I am saying to you, Mr. Minister, is: why did you decide to do it this way? When you decide to do it this way, you raise the effective property tax on the Southland Mall in Regina by one-half of 1 per cent, and you raise the effective property tax on my constituent of 25 per cent — indeed, a good deal more than that, but I'm picking a fairly affluent constituent. Indeed, most of my constituents pay 5 or \$600 in education tax on their property and you're taking 230 of it. They used to pay, let's say, 530 or less 230 or \$300. They now are paying 530. You have moved it up from \$300 to 530, and effective, fast increase, and you have, at the same time, raised the effective property tax for the Southland Mall, or I could use Ipsco or anyone else, by half of 1 per cent, a

quarter of 1 per cent.

Now, my simple question is this: where is the fairness? Where is the fairness in raising your \$100 million by raising the effective property tax for educational purposes on householders by 25, 30, or 50 per cent, and raising it on the Southland Mall and Ipsco by a half of 1 per cent? And that's what you've done. How do you defend that on the basis of fairness?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — As I indicated to the member from Quill Lakes, is: (a) the reality of where we must move is this: is that the property tax rebate is not the type of system — the (a) get the money in from a taxpayer, and then (b) redistribute it back, and that's the theory you're looking at. What you must look at is taking dollars that people indicate, and they didn't see the property improvement grant as something to deal with the dollars back off their property tax. They saw property tax and they saw the rebate, and that's exactly how you sold it, is: look what I'm doing for you. I got \$230, go spend it on your vacation, and the member from Cumberland made reference to that on an ongoing basis. This is my vacation money; this is like my family allowance cheque. And that's the way it was seen and that's the way you promoted it.

The fairness of it is this. The fairness of it is this: is that it's not \$100 million in this year or the particular year that we're dealing with. It's \$55 million. The fairness of the system is this: is that those dollars are allocated totally, and those dollars are being used totally to assist, to build a better education system for our province. That's where it's going.

Now you could say, well should you not have opted for the Manitoba model? And what Manitoba did, Mr. Chairman, is give 1 per cent, or 1.5 per cent increase in grants to schools. One per cent, and kept in place whatever property improvement grant that they have, and I think it's based on a tax credit system or something like that.

Our view is this: is that people were prepared to contribute to build a better education system, and that was the way in which it would go. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, the percentage of funding to school has, in fact, increased by this government. Has increased, that we are paying a larger share than was the case before, like 3 or 4 per cent larger share of the education budget. But that's just part of it. That's the transfer directly out to the schools. But what that money will additionally do is build systems whereby we can bring computer facilities and new computer technology into our K to 12 system, into our other programs, into our school systems, that will make our students, make our children . . . give them a better opportunity for a better quality education, a stronger quality education.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the quality of education in this province relative to the rest of this country will improve because of this program, \$400 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Assiniboia says the school system can't get any worse than it's been. I don't believe that. I have great deal of faith in our school system, and I believe 400 million additional dollars into that school system will even make it stronger, Mr. Chairman. That is the reason for it. That is the fairness for it.

Now the member opposite, in the last three years in this Assembly, your focus has been, don't change what we have. Well don't reform this and don't reform that and don't reform the next. Stay at the status quo. The people in 1982 did not vote for the status quo. They voted for change; they voted for new ideas. And I believe the school systems in this province are appreciative of that. And I believe that the university systems in this province are appreciative of that. And I believe that is the way to go with regards to the program, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you persist in arguing that if this money didn't come from property improvement grants to improve the schools and universities, it couldn't come from anywhere, because if you didn't take it from property improvement grants, it couldn't come from anywhere and therefore the schools wouldn't have any money.

Now that is the sort of argument which is simply not acceptable from a Minister of Finance. He's got a whole range of tax options. What I'm asking you is: why this option? Why this option to take, in your terms, \$55 million? Why this option to raise the money you said you needed? We'll concede that. Let's not argue about whether or not more money should be spent on schools. Let's argue on where the money should come from.

(1430)

And you're defending it as the right place to take it from is home owners, farmers, and small-business people, and renters. That's where you're saying. And I am saying there are fairer ways to raise \$55 million, or \$102 million if we're talking about the whole range. And I ask you, Mr. Minister: why do you say this was the fairer way, fairer than getting some more money through the income tax system, the corporate tax system, or the resource royalty system? And we just say that you're wrong. We just say that there are fairer ways to raise money that take \$230 from the poorest home owner in the province, and \$230 from the richest home owner in the province.

It's a straight per capita levy on home owners, and that is rarely a fair tax. It has nothing to do with ability to pay. You have taken it from the poorest in exactly the same number of dollars you've taken it from the richest home owner. Now why is that fair as opposed to raising money through the income tax system or other systems available to you?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The member opposite would, if it was raised through the income tax system, would say, well that's not fair either, because too many people are getting away without paying their tax. And you're back into that old question of a fair tax system.

If you talk about the big corporations, we have raised the tax on large corporations to the highest rate of any province in Canada. With regards to the corporate capital tax on banks, we have raised the corporate capital tax to the highest rate of any province in Canada. With regard to the tax on railroads, we have raised our tax to far in excess of the highest in this country. With regard to oil revenues, they're paying 25 per cent of the entire programs of government. The industry is working; the revenues are increasing to the province some \$200 million. And we've debated that in these estimates and in this Bill, and every other Bill for some time. Now I submit that we have in fact put that to the larger corporations, and we're also doing it across the board in a way that the dollar's going to education. And that, I believe, is proper.

I think the hon. member, when he gets into his question, might ask more legitimately the question of where governments are going with regards to (a) a transfer system, when there is many transfers by government, many transfers by government. Then there is a taxing system, call it an income tax system or a sales tax system or whatever you like. What has developed in this country, unfortunately, is there is a transfer system over here that is no way tied to an income tax system over here. And that is the findings of the Quebec white paper on tax reform, and an area that they suggest that this country must move towards. And I agree that I believe that there is a fair degree of intelligence to that whole approach of how we deal with our transfers out on the one hand, and our taxes in on the other hand. The reality of what was happening and the reality of the property improvement grant is that people believed, and I think with a fair degree of credibility, that you tax me out of one pocket X number of dollars; and then you give it back to me through the other pocket. You in the other process hire 100 bureaucrats to fix up how you're going to do that. And you probably keep some into your own self in the process through.

And they say, what is the wisdom of that? Isn't there a way of doing it in a different way? I don't mind paying tax, they say, provided it's fair and provided I have an idea of where it's going. -Mr. Chairman, I think we must move to a question of blending together our transfers, tying it in with our tax system, and showing people where it's going.

The property improvement grant is in fact going to the school system — \$400 million. And the

member opposite does not agree with that kind of dollar going into education. I think it's important that it goes into education. That is where it's going.

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from North West is back talking about lies again. I'm glad to see him back.

But that is where the dollars are going, Mr. Chairman. That is where it is going. That is where the money is going, Mr. Chairman, and that is the theory by which that program will work.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I don't think it's worthwhile to listen to the minister's speech on what Jacques Parizeau would think would be nice. We know that no Conservative government in Canada is going to reform the tax system to make it fairer. We'll just await the government at Ottawa and all their changes to make it fairer. They started out, and there is not a bond dealer in Canada who say it isn't a great budget. And you can't find a senior citizens' organization that says it is, and so on.

So I don't want to get into this too far, Mr. Chairman. I'm just saying, this chaff by the minister saying what we must do after three years of his budgets and after one budget of this colleagues in Ottawa moving us all in the other direction are very interesting, but they're not in the real world and he knows it.

So I think we've made our points on this Bill and he knows that this Bill is moving in the wrong direction. He knows that this makes the tax system less fair; he knows that it's taking much more from people with low incomes than high incomes; he knows it flies in the face of everything the Premier's been saying about taxing the rich and looking after the people who are on the low end of the income scale. He knows that this Bill goes in exactly the opposite direction — exactly the opposite direction, exactly the opposite direction, and therefore I will certainly be opposing this Bill as it will be evident as we consider it here in committee.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Chairman, I can only say this: that we will reform the tax system . . . (inaudible) . . .

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

## Clause 5

(1445)

Clause 5 agreed to on the following recorded division.

## YEAS —32

Birkbeck	McLeod	Andrew
Lane	Taylor	Duncan
Katzman	Hardy	Garner
Smith (Swift Current)	Baker	Schoenhals
Dirks	Klein	Dutchak
Klein	Dutchak	Martens
Folk	Petersen	Parker
Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Myers	Rybchuk
Caswell	Hampton	Gerich
Hampton	Gerich	Meagher
Glauser	Zazelenchuk	Johnson
Weiman	Swenson	Morin



**NAYS —8**

Blakeney  
Koskie  
Yew

Engel  
Lusney  
Sveinson

Lingenfelter  
Shillington

The committee agreed to report the Bill on division.

**Bill No. 49 — An Act respecting Interest prior to Judgement**

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

**Clause 8**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Sorry. Mistake of the Chair. Moving back to clause 8, proposed amendment by the Attorney General:

Amend section 8 of the printed Bill by striking out “July 1, 1985” and substituting:

the day on which the Act comes into force.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

**Clause 9**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Proposed House amendment by the Attorney General:

To amend section 9 of the printed Bill by striking out “July 1, 1985” and substituting:

a date to be fixed by the proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor.

Clause 9 as amended agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

**Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Queen’s Bench Act**

Clause 1 agreed to.

**Clause 2**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Proposed House amendment moved by the Attorney General:

That section 2 of the printed Bill amend section 47(1) of the Act as being enacted by section 2 of the printed Bill by striking out “July 1, 1985” and substituting:

the day on which this section comes into force.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

**Clause 3**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Proposed House amendment moved by the Attorney General:

To amend section 3 of the printed Bill by striking out “July 1, 1985” and substituting:

the day on which The Pre-Judgment Interest Act comes into force.

Clause 3 as amended agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

### **Bill No. 83 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act**

#### **Clause 1**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I just have a couple questions for the Minister of Justice, and I could ask them and we can proceed rapidly, or could wait for the particular sections, but they’re just minor questions.

In section 5 on the second page, Mr. Minister, you will note the “. . . serve notice of appeal on the chief judge.” I was wondering whether or not that would be more difficult for the individual to serve it on the chief judge if in fact it was handled by a judge in the local district that was serving it, the local magistrate. I note that any appeal had to be served on the chief judge. And I just ask you whether there’s any concern there has been raised that it might be.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No, we believe that it’s by mail, and so it will allow for a better co-ordination of the notices. And secondly, then he will designate the judge to hear the matter, which will be back at the convenient location.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — And you’re confident that the people at the local level will know the judicial system well enough to be able to, or will there be instructions from the local magistrate or local provincial court judge or from the . . . Well I guess it’s initially heard before a justice of the peace, and whether or not in advising the individual that if he wishes to appeal he has to send it to the chief judge, the notice of the appeal; and whether that information would be known by the individual who wanted to appeal.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — We are assuming, to try and keep this as informal as possible, that the local clerk, the clerk of the court, would notify them as to how to appeal, and to simply send the letter to the chief judge.

The difficulty we have, if you could send it to any of the magistrates, is trying to collect it and make sure that the appeal process is co-ordinated; that you’ve got a handle on it; where they allocation of the case-load and everything else. It’s a small price to pay, in our view, for the simplified procedure.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well I note that the chief judge then can designate the particular justice of the provincial court to handle it. I would hope then that some convenience to the person that is appealing — in other words, that it can not be moved a great distance from the particular area in which the individual, where the cause of action arose. What I’m saying is that I wouldn’t want the chief judge designating in Regina if the action, the initial action was in Prince Albert, for instance, and he would have to, for instance, he designated that a provincial court judge in Regina was going to handle it, rather than back in Prince Albert. And that’s the concern that I have here.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I suppose if that ever developed I would share the concerns. We do not expect it to happen, and we expect that the chief judge will simply designate the judge back in the community for convenience, if I can use that. We are looking to simplify the procedure here,

not to complicate it, and we expect that the chief judge will simply designate the most convenient judge.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — And if you go just down that section, Mr. Minister, it indicates that there is no appeal from the decision of the judge of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan, made pursuant to the section. In other words, you can cut off at an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, and you deny the particular person, and I know you're dealing with particular summary conviction, but it cuts it off at the Queen's Bench.

There is no recourse to the court of appeal or, indeed, to the Supreme Court. And it seems to me that if you were to do a case study, that you would find that some of the rather minor issues have, in fact, before gone through the whole court system and have, you know, resolved a basic law by having the privilege of going through the court systems.

I guess the concern here is, why do you cut it off, not the right . . . I don't think the court of appeal would be inundated by the number of appeals. I don't think the Supreme Court would be inundated. Why have you cut it off at the Queens' Bench level?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well you should recall that there in effect are two appeals here. We've got to the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Hear me out. Hear me out . . . from the J.P. to the provincial court to the Court of Queen's Bench on a question of law.

Now this is exactly the same procedure that we use in the question of the traffic court judges, and we believe that it's worked well in that area. We're dealing with the question of by-laws that, I suppose, if we ever got to the point where it became a significant matter in the question of local government by-laws, it would be before this Assembly with amendments to the appropriate municipal legislation. So it's the same limitations as in the traffic court. It seems to have worked well, and we expect it to work as well here.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — On page 3, on section 6, I guess — section 9 is repealed — down at 3(c) if I can just turn your attention there, and it says:

prescribing the form of ticket for use pursuant to this section and providing that different tickets may be used in different areas of Saskatchewan.

And I guess my question is: why would you have different tickets in respect to summary conviction in different parts of the province? I just don't know the rationale of it.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, the justification for it is exactly the same as the justification in the original Act because there's no change in that provision. It's just the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No. What the original justification: we don't have the information, but we gather just in case there was a need for it. There's been no need; it's not been done. I can't myself foresee a need for different tickets, but I suppose we would have to go back to the original justification for that section. There's no change in that specific provision.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — And one final on the section 8, if I may, and that deals with the mandatory number of days of confinement where he fails to make a payment of a fine. It says:

- (a) where the fine imposed is \$75 or less, for three days; or
- (b) where the fine imposed exceeds \$75, for one day for each \$25, or portion thereof, of the fine.

I'm wondering why are you putting a specific number associated per dollar value? I would have assumed that . . . Is it for the consistency? Was it not in fact left more at the discretion

previously? And have you had problems with that?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — It still is discretionary, obviously. It's when the criteria are not met that this comes into operation.

As I indicated in my second reading remarks, it will go, in our view, a long way providing equality of treatment of those who are incarcerated for failing to pay a fine. At present, unless incarceration is specifically provided for, the judge has the discretion to order imprisonment in default of a fine for any period up to 90 days. This will lead to uniformity and consistency.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Clause 5**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Proposed House amendment, moved by the Attorney General:

Amend section 3.1(8) of the Act as being enacted by section 5 of the printed Bill by striking out "and subsections (2) to (7) and (10) and (11) apply *mutatis mutandis* to such an appeal."

Clause 5 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 9 inclusive agreed to

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

### **Bill NO. 100 — An Act to Facilitate the Enforcement of Maintenance Orders and to Establish the Maintenance Enforcement Office**

#### **Clause 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, this Bill in effect provides that people who are the beneficiaries of maintenance orders can assign them to a Crown agency and the Crown will collect. And the Crown will use the powers that the Crown may have to seek out the person, whether it be in Quebec or B.C. or wherever.

I have had a couple of points raised with me. I don't want to quarrel with the direction of the Bill. People have said to me this: fair enough, I should pay my maintenance payments; here is the maintenance order or the divorce decree or whatever; I'm to pay and I have visiting rights; and I have certain rights to have the children.

And what they're saying is: if I pay, then that's fair enough, but will the crown help me to enforce my rights of visitation and the rest? Is there any reciprocation or is it strictly a matter of seeing that the money flows? And some of the estranged husbands that I have met have said, say, think I'm getting the raw end of this stick — I send my money every month or whatever the periodic payments, and I am really shut out from visitation; the wife has taken the kids and they're away, and she doesn't want me to come; she feels I am not a good influence — and all the rest. I don't need to give you all that, but I think you . . . I've made the point and wonder whether you have a comment to make.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, they are separate rights, and the Act deals strictly with the financial obligations. The individual does have the power to go to the court to have that second — the other rights, non-monetary, enforced. This deals with a social problem, and that is the number of unpaid . . . number of people not paying the maintenance.

Secondly, the ability of individuals to leave a jurisdiction. And just to clarify the point about using the powers of the state to enforce, it's little more than that. It does allow co-ordination between the provinces. This is a uniform Act that we're trying to get the other provinces . . . many of the other provinces are implementing.

The federal government has announced complementary legislation, the Minister of Justice, whereby access to data banks — that will still be negotiated as to what information will be available.

But it's strictly to deal with the right of maintenance, and the enforcement of maintenance. It isn't to deal with the other rights which may come up, and they may be on far more beyond, as the hon. member knows, the question of access or custody. And at least to date, they are properly left in the judicial system, in my view.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Chairman, if it would assist in going through this, we would be prepared to go by part, because we have no problems with the Bill, rather than section, or we some time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . by page is fine.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There's amendments to clause 32 and 42.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Just so the hon. members know, two typing errors that we've corrected by the House amendment, one in section 32(3) and the other in 42. They won't affect discussion in any way, but they are strictly typing corrections.

Pages 3 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Clause 32**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Clause 32 of the printed Bill, proposed House amendment moved by the Attorney General:

Amend subsection 32(3) of the printed Bill by striking out "this" in the third line and substituting "that"

Clause 32 as amended agreed to.

Pages 15 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Clause 42**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Proposed House amendment moved by the Attorney General:

Amend section 42 of the printed Bill by striking out "other" in the eighth line.

Pages 18 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Chairman, if we may revert to 42, just on reviewing that, I notice that the word "other" appears twice in that line, and we'll have to . . . it will read, "and may make any order," rather than "any other order."

So we'll strike out the word "other" where it occurs for the second time, or the last time, in the eighth line . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The eighth line. Yes, you'll notice the eighth line, the second last line, the word "other" appears twice, and for clarification it's the second "other" that will be coming out.

So the amendment, if I may:

Amend section 42 of the printed Bill by striking out the word “other” in the eighth line where it occurs for the last time.

Clause 42 as amended agreed to.

Page 23, clause 60 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

**Bill 109 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act**

**Page 1**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Also, Mr. Chairman, we are in agreement with it; we have no problem with it; and accordingly we could take it by page if that’s satisfactory.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I believe the hon. member has a copy of the House amendment, and that House amendment simply ensures that lump sum garnishments that are in effect when the Bill comes into force will continue, as the Bill provides specifically for continuing garnishments. We just want to make sure out of abundant caution that the lump sum garnishments are also continued.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Proposed House amendment to clause 2. Will you take the amendment as read? Agreed.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Page 1 as amended agreed to.

Pages 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

**Clause 8**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There’s a proposed amendment to section 8 of the printed Bill, moved by the Attorney General:

Amend clause 130(6)(b) of The Land Titles Act as being enacted by clause 8(3)(d) of the printed Bill by striking out “orders.”

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Pages 6 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Chairman, if I may, we didn’t get a chance to introduce the officials, if I may, and thank them at the same time as we move rather rapidly. Ron Hewitt, familiar to members; Betty Ann Pottruff; Susan Amrud; Magdalene Hollman; and Lorelle Schoenfeld from the Department of Justice. I thank them.

(1515)

**Bill No. 94 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendment be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill with amendments be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time on division.

**Bill No. 103 — An Act to repeal Certain Acts respecting the payment of Grants or Rebates of Property Taxes**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 28**

Devine	Muller	Birkbeck
McLeod	Andrew	Lane
Duncan	Hardy	Smith (Swift Current)
Baker	Dirks	Klein
Martens	Folk	Petersen
Hodgins	Parker	Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Myers	Rybchuk	Hampton
Gerich	Tusa	Meagher
Glauser	Zazelenchuk	Johnson
Morin		

**NAYS — 7**

Blakeney	Engel	Lingenfelter
Koskie	Lusney	Shillington
Yew		

Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

**Bill No. 49 — An Act respecting Interest prior to Judgment**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I move first and second readings of the amendments.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — With leave now.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I move first and second readings of the amendments.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — With leave now, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 100 — An Act to Facilitate the Enforcement of Maintenance Orders and to Establish the  
Maintenance Enforcement Office**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I move first and second reading of the amendments, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — With leave now, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 109 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the  
enactment of The Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I move first and second reading of the amendments, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — With leave now, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**FINANCE**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 11**

**Item 1 (continued)**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I'll call you to order as we'll be carrying on with Finance and clause no. 1.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, I have received a variety of complaints from constituents about fee increases in a variety of departments. I've received complaints that the fishing licence has gone up. I've received complaints from constituents that the companies . . . that the fee for



registering a company has gone up, etc., . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and dog licences.

I assume, Mr. Minister, that all fee increases by various departments are approved by your department, and that you could, although probably not today — perhaps you could — and that you could give us a list of the various fee increases in the various departments. I'd ask you wither to give us that information if you can; if you have it or if it's too lengthy, give us an undertaking to provide it. It would be a very time-consuming thing to ask that of each individual department. As I say, I assume that your department has a list of them.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well that information we do not have. That's generally done within a given department. I can undertake, if you like, to go back to the departments and dig out the fee increases for the year and provide them to you. I have no problem with that.

(1530)

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Okay. That would be satisfactory. Mr. Minister, I wonder when — because some of these people are going to call me back — I wonder when I might expect to get this information.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Perhaps you could give me a couple of specific ones that you want to deal with, hon. member, then I can see if we can dig that up faster, other than going through a wide variety and trying to get it all put together. Give us the specific ones; we'll see what we can do.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well I would appreciate them all as a matter of keeping track of the financial affairs of the government. The two, I think, that come to mind were fishing licence, fees for fishing licences, and fees for the companies' branch, the various fee increases in the companies' branch.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — We will get that for you, I think, and I'm just throwing here from . . . (inaudible) . . . I think is that the one increase on the fishing licence relates to the fish enhancement thing, I think. And with regard to the companies, we'll try to find something from justice for you, but I can pass it on to the Minister of Justice, and I'm sure he will undertake to provide that for you and I will talk, as well, to the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources and get the fishing licence numbers for you.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, I assume that you're going to give me, as well as the actual increase, the total amount of the revenue and the total amount of additional revenues which it is estimated such fees increases will net the public.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — No. I indicated I'd provide the information as long as you'd just tell me how you want it set out, and we'd provide it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well let me just, then, define. Since you put it that way, let me just define what I'm asking for: all fee increases levied by any individual department; the actual amount of the fee increase per levy; the total estimated revenue from the fee in the upcoming taxation year — the '75-76 taxation year — and the increase, and the increased amount of revenue which you expect to get.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I take it you meant '85-86, not '75-76.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 11 agreed to.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**FINANCE — SERVICING THE PUBLIC DEBT — GOVERNMENT SHARE**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 12**

**Item 1 — Statutory**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, this is the item which has increased from 20 million to 140 million, or thereabouts, during this four-year period over which we are balancing our budget. Do we have any projection of what the figure will be at the end of another couple of years as you guide the finances of the province? I'm not suggesting that that's going to happen, but should that fate befall us, that unfortunate fate, at what rate do you expect that that figure will grow, given the track record of your government in having massive deficits?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I think that, number one, you should not be so quick to count your chickens that I will not be here for some time; that's number one. And number two, it will grow at a rate . . . it will grow at a rate superior to . . . It will be managed better than will any other provincial budget be managed.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I wonder if you could indicate whether or not there's any other jurisdiction in North America where the interest is growing at a faster rate in percentages than in Saskatchewan. When I look across Canada, I don't see another province where the interest on the debt has grown faster than it has in Saskatchewan in the last four years. There isn't one. There isn't one province where the interest on the debt has grown faster.

And I wonder whether or not you can indicate any jurisdiction in North America where the interest on the debt is growing faster, as a percentage, where it has grown at a faster percentage in real terms, Mr. Minister, than in Saskatchewan under your administration.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well the percentage of that cost of our budget is 4 per cent, and the percentage of the cost of the budget in Manitoba is 10 per cent, and in terms 4 per cent is substantially lower than 10 per cent, and we will stack up or control of the deficit against that of Manitoba any day of the week.

**Item 2 — Statutory.**

**CONSOLIDATE FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

**FINANCE — Nil Vote**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND DEBT REDEMPTION, SINKING FUND AND INTEREST PAYMENTS**

**FINANCE**

**Vote 175**

**Item 1 — Statutory**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, that 118 million, I suppose, is a money coming due. In very rough terms, what interest rate have we paid? What composite interest rate have we paid on the debt coming due, this 118 million, and what do we anticipate having to pay on the debt to refund it?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Would the hon. member be satisfied that that information be provided

by officials to you when they calculate it out?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

**Vote 176 — Statutory**

**Vote 177 — Statutory**

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 11**

Item 1 agreed to.

**Item 2**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to item 2, were all those remissions in connection with the rebates of capital gains tax?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Yes.

Item 2 agreed to.

Item 3 agreed to.

Vote 11 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE — SERVICING THE PUBLIC DEBT — GOVERNMENT SHARE**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 12**

Item 1 — Statutory.

**SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND**

**BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE (RESOURCE DIVISION)**

**FINANCE**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 12**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 12 agreed to on division.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985**

**SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**FINANCE**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 12**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 12 agreed to.

(1545)

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**PROVINCIAL AUDITOR**

**Item 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I just want to ask the question each year about the Provincial Auditor as to why you keep cutting the staff. This year you haven't cut it; you've left it at 66. But it used to be up in the 72 to 74 range. The Provincial Auditor is having more work to do. By the look of his reports he's finding more problems, and there seem to be a continuing range of issues which need to be dealt with.

I know, at least on the corporate side, you will want to have a good number of private sector auditors involved. But by what logic do you say that the Provincial Auditor should have three or four or five fewer staff than he had a couple or three years ago, when the size of government continues to grow, the amount of money continues to grow, and the complexity of operations continues to grow?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I suppose I've been following the auditor's report for seven years now, and constantly he made that request for more and more staff. If I recall, this year he was not dissatisfied. I mean everybody would like to have a few more staff people, but he did not make a large lobby and pitch for that, and I don't think he made a big to-do about that in the Public Accounts Committee. I don't know. I didn't read the report as thorough as perhaps I did when I was in opposition, or the report from the committee, but I understand that they were able to get by quite well.

There's some organizational change, I think, some more computerization that they've done there, and a bit more contracting out than perhaps they've done in the past.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, it seems to me when the present governing party was in opposition, their financial critic used to make impassioned pleas for more staff for the Provincial Auditor. I can play some of them back, if the member for Kindersley wants to hear them. I think they'll sound rather familiar to him.

Have you convinced your self that you were wrong before and you are right now?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — No. I think the auditor is moving forward. I tend to be of the view, and perhaps if you went back and were in before, tended to be of the view as well then that the auditor, with regards to comprehensive auditing in other jurisdictions with similar legislation, the auditor has the power to go in and do some of that stuff, real of *de facto*, I guess. And in other areas in fact does that. I think it's to a degree the style of the particular auditor that we have here.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There is, Mr. Minister, a modest — it's only 2.3 per cent — but there's a

2.3 per cent decrease in personal services, notwithstanding the fact that the number remain the same. I wonder how that arises.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I'm advised that the reason for that is the different mix of people with regards to number of years service, and if a younger CA comes in, a younger employee comes in, starts at a lower level.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 28 agreed to.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986**

#### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **PROVINCIAL AUDITOR**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 28**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 28 agreed to.

#### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE COMMISSION**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 52**

#### **Item 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can we start out by asking who the responsible minister is?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The Minister of Finance.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, when do you expect the commission to report, to bring in its final report?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I'm advised that there will be a second interim report in September, October of this year, and the area will be primarily in the field of assessment and how assessment relates to local government — the final report in May or June of next year.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 52 agreed to.

#### **CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

#### **SASKATCHEWAN MUNICIPAL FINANCING CORPORATION**

#### **Vote 151**

#### **Item 1 — Statutory**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to this corporation and

its financing, has there been any change in the last year on how you are financing in municipal financing corporation?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I'm advised that the nature of it is through the Minister of Finance, into the capital markets, then back to the municipal financing corporation; as opposed to the previous system, which would be to the municipal financing corporation selling it to various SGI, wherever it might be out there, their packages.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Any more questions?

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

### **CROWN INVESTMENTS CORPORATION OF SASKATCHEWAN**

#### **Vote 165**

#### **Item 1 — Statutory**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to CIC, and with respect to a statutory advance, what capital projects is CIC involved in, or what capital advances is it proposing to make to corporations which would require it to have an additional \$21 million in the upcoming year?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — It's primarily for small account corporations. Largest would be STC, which would be about 10 million. And that would be . . . We'd have to get into the details of STC, but it would be buses and that.

The next one would be Sask Forest Products, Sask minerals, SaskCOMP. Sask Water Crown, PAPCO, those types of things: Agdevco, that type of thing. Agdevco is 400,000.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can you tell me who the chief executive officer of this corporations is?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — At this point in time the chairman of the board, Graham Walker, is acting as chief executive officer pending the appointment of a new one.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can you tell me what role CIC is playing if any, with respect to the marketing of Saskatchewan Power Corporation bonds which are currently being marketed?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — That particular program has been handled by Sask Power and by the Department of Finance. Department of Finance has been the lead agency or the lead agency or the lead department on both the Sask Power bond issues, the two of them, and the Saskoil bond issue. And it's marketed through and led by the Department of Finance

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would you care to make a statement on the circumstances of the departure of the chief executive officer?

(1600)

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Only that Mr. Hindle resigned. The resignation was mutually agreed upon and it's my understanding he is returning back to Ottawa.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in order to translate that into a language which people can understand, one always has to ask then, was there a severance package? That indicates the circumstances of the departure. And basically what I'm asking is: did

Mr. Hindle just say, well I'm moving on and I'll resign? Or did someone else say that he's moving on and accordingly he's become entitled to some sort of a severance package?

Could you indicate just in general whether there's going to be a severance package? Is it negotiated now? Is Mr. Barclay called to the fore? Where does that stand?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I'm under the impression that it is in the process of being negotiated, that there will be a severance package. The severance package will be industrial standards.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, have you thought of putting a heading in the budget for severance pay, because it seems to be a fairly substantial item? I admit it involves a good number of agencies, as it always does. But there seems to be almost weekly . . . I think perhaps the former minister, the chairman of the compensation board . . . is a little more than some weeks, but it's not many weeks, and we now have Mr. Hindle. Is this a serious drain on the Department of Finance and will it show up in the CIC accounts?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well I think that you raise two points: number one is the whole question of severance packages. But the reality of whether you're in industry or the reality of whether you're in government is that you have severance packages, and I think that that's always going to be the case. People will come and people will go, and for a variety of reasons, and for changes, etc.

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

### **SASKATCHEWAN WATER CORPORATION**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 50**

##### **Item 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to the water corporation, this is a \$24 million item, and most of this is a straight . . . to be voted \$24.7 million; this is not the advance, and I was . . .

With respect to the water corporation, have there been any changes in the grant programs to local authorities under the water corporation this year? Have any of the grant programs . . . have their terms and conditions changed?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I'm advised there's no change in the formula, and it's again a case, I suppose, of whether you can meet all the expectation out there in this given year. Bu the formula, and I think that's what you're asking, is not changed.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, we challenged a matter of some weeks or months, I'm not sure of which, to see whether or not the carbon filtration plant in Buffalo Pound is working; there's no reason to expect it won't. It does not, however, deal with the problem of an adequate supply. the city of Moose Jaw not only has no members of the legislature who are able to speak on its behalf, but it has also been chronically short of water, and the city has been short for years. I grew up in that city. Thirty years ago there was water rationing on many a summer evening; there's still water rationing on many a summer evening, and that suggests a shortage of supply.

The solution which has been discussed over a period of some years is the water pipeline. I wonder, Mr. Minister, what is the status of that project. Is it being studied, and if so, to what extent is that option still being considered?

I believe it was admitted by all concerned that the filtration plant was intended to deal only with one of two problems: quality. It was not intended to deal with quantity. That remains an

outstanding problem, and I ask the minister for a statement of the status of that project.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, I think the hon. member raises (a) the question of taste and odour in the water is clearly, I think, first and foremost on the minds of many people living in Regina and Moose Jaw. One would hope that the carbon filtration plant will deal properly with that. I think what the water Crown is looking at is the water shortage question, not just in Regina and Moose Jaw.

Too often, I think, in this Assembly, and because it's a media centre, we are of the view, or people are of the view, that Regina and Moose Jaw is the only people with water shortages, or water problems, taste and odour problems, in the province. That's not true. Where I come from in Kindersley, for example, they are having difficulty expanding into more housing because there's not enough water supply. It's got to be piped. There's already a pipeline to the river that those communities built some 20 years ago, and would have to be expanded.

I can go on and on with regards to that. With regard then to the specific question of the Regina pipeline, I'm advised that that is still being investigated, but certainly no decision has been taken. And I don't think you would see any further announcements or action on that till we see the effects of the carbon filtration, and the impact that that has, first of all, on the water quality; and then dealing with the wider question of supply as an ongoing process, both in Regina and every place else in the province.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Quite right, Mr. Minister. It is an issue throughout, not just Regina and Moose Jaw, but throughout southern Saskatchewan. I suppose that there are . . . I would have two comments with respect to the expansion of this problem to solve all the problems in southern Saskatchewan. I don't know that any method of doing that, not at any price . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. That's right. All you've got to do is move the rocky Mountains to the east of Manitoba, and you'll probably have a lot more rain.

But part from the Rhinoceros Party which did propose such a proposal, I don't know that any of us are going to attempt that. There is, at this point in time, while I admit, a water problem in such, diverse areas as perhaps Radville and Estevan, there isn't a ready solution to that.

There is a solution to the problems of Moose Jaw and Regina at what I think is an affordable price. I suggested to a number of your predecessors — I wasn't aware that you were now the minister in charge of the water corporation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you're not. I suggested to the present minister and one or two others that when you expand the problem to say we're not going to solve any problems unless we can solve all the problems, what you're saying is we have no real desire to solve any of them because you can't solve all the problems in southern Saskatchewan.

There is a solution to the quantity problem in Moose Jaw and Regina. It is available at an affordable price at a time when the jobs, and economic activity, is sorely needed. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, why the government can't see the opportunities that await it and deal with the water problems of these 12 constituencies.

I remind you, Mr. Minister, that by my count — and I did it very, very quickly — all of the other . . . there are a total of 20 ridings affected by this problem, 12 of which are in Regina and Moose Jaw, that solved the problems of the majority of the ridings. So I wonder, Mr. Minister, why we don't begin work on solving those problems we can, and leave to the next generation, or to some future year, the problems for which we really can't solve.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — It would be fair to say that the only area that has proposed solutions to their water problems is Regina and Moose Jaw. And it would not be fair to say that it's only the supply of drinking water, or water for the residential consumer, or perhaps a business consumer, that is at issue here with this particular corporation.



They're also dealing with water management, with flood control, working with agriculture in the area of irrigation and how that irrigation proceeds. I think it's not fair. The point I was simply making — it's not fair to sort of indicate only that Regina has the problem, and only Regina is one needing and calling for solution.

What you indicate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it's the only one you can solve, you say. I think the member from Morse or the member from other places say that we've got a solution to the irrigation of farmers in that area, and that all it requires it X million of dollars; and the member from Rosetown saying that we've got a solution to the water quality problem in the town of Rosetown — it's only going to cost a few million dollars for a pipeline. My constituency, they would say, well it's only going to cost \$7 million to build that pipeline from the river up to Kindersley. And I think you can go on and on of people that have ready solutions on this.

The question is: do we have the millions of dollars needed for this, and how do we properly plan it? Now the water Crown is in fact looking at these solutions and one would hope that certainly we have not given up on the pipeline or the irrigation ditch, whatever option we would look at for the city of Regina and Moose Jaw. We see that as a major concern that has to be dealt with the water quality through the carbon filtration. But I don't think it's fair to say that this government has put on the back burner on the whole question of the water pipeline for Regina. That's clearly not the case.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My only point . . . And I don't intend to rag this endlessly. My only point, Mr. Minister, is that there is a solution available to the water quantity problem for Moose Jaw and Regina at a cost, on a per capita basis, which is affordable. I am not aware of any solution to the water problems of the farmers and ranchers in Morse, which is available at a cost which is affordable on a per capita basis. The cost on a per capita basis to the water problems of the 10 ridings, of the people who live in the 10 ridings in Moose Jaw and Regina, is affordable on a per capita basis.

A similar solution to the . . . And the member for Morse could get in this if he feels that he has a contribution to make. The cost, Mr. Minister, per capita of solving the water problems of the ranchers and farmers in southern Saskatchewan, whether they live in Morse or Assiniboia or Shaunavon, is not affordable on a per capita basis. It's an enormous amount. It would cost more than the farms are worth.

(1615)

So I say, Mr. Minister, you've got a solution to the water problems of the urban areas that's affordable and available. I don't think you've got that to the farmers. So I ask you, Mr. Minister, and I ask you once again to stop avoiding the question by pretending that I said there is not water problem south of Regina and Saskatoon. I have never made any such statement. I grew up on a farm in south-west Saskatchewan. I'm well aware of the water problems of rural people who live in southern Saskatchewan. I just don't know of a solution to it, and I don't think they think they know of a solution to it, however you might want to misconstrue the problem.

I don't think they're expecting a solution here and now to the water quantity problem. The people of Regina and Moose Jaw do believe that that ought to be solved. The solution is available. It's affordable, and apart from the inability of this government to do or execute anything, apart from the complete paralysis of this government, I don't see why you don't move on the solution when it's needed and when the jobs are needed, and the economic activity is needed.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would hope that your party doesn't use you as a spokesman out in the rural area of Saskatchewan, saying the problems associated with farmers along the Diefenbaker Lake, both the east and the west side and the people within that area, that it's not an affordable deal. Good luck in going out and telling those farmers that if it's not an affordable

and not a do-able deal.

With regards to the people of Rosetown or the people of Kindersley, to say that it's not a do-able deal to fix up their water supply, to the folks in Biggar who have some water quality problems in that particular town . . . I think we could go probably through the list. The reality is that they have to look at where the dollars are appropriated, where the best place for the dollar is to be appropriated, and I suppose one would like to see the pipelines built every place. There's no decision taken on that at this point in time, so I don't have a great deal to report.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. . . . I don't know, should I call you deputy minister, or Mr. Minister, that is looking after the water corporation. Several . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You're not a bureaucrat? Well, you sound like one. You sound like you are afraid to face issues be they in Finance or dealing with water. A name, Mr. Chairman, that will be familiar, will become more familiar after the election is called, is a member that has . . . or a person that has been drawing to our attention a serious problem with the canal in Speaker's constituency, and that one person is George Tweedy. And he's raised this with us on a number of occasions.

And George tells us that it wouldn't take an awful lot to fix the canal that is leaking. The seepage from the canal is causing some serious problems in an area along the canal route itself where water's coming up and creating even a saline problem that should be fixed. And if you're not going to fix it it's going to be a pretty serious expense to the farmers that are adversely affected.

And I was wondering when or what the water corporation is planning on doing with this canal. The canal is a benefit to those that are irrigating from it, but land adjacent to it and the repairs that need to be done, it's similar to your road maintenance. You're not doing road maintenance, and if road maintenance isn't done you can get by for three or four years, but after that you're in big trouble, and this maintenance on the canal is the same thing.

And just those very minor maintenance problems you haven't taken care of, and I would like to get an assurance from you so George could go back and tell the people that are raising it with him, after unsuccessfully raising it with you people, that you will fix this, and that you will do some patching on this canal and sealants and prevent their land from going into severe saline conditions.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, that question is being dealt with and investigated, and looked upon or looked at by the water corporation, and not because of George Tweedy, but because of the interested farmers on the west side of Lake Diefenbaker. And those farmers on the west side of Lake Diefenbaker have been, I think, properly represented by Mr. Speaker for some time.

If I recall, those irrigation projects on the west side of Lake Diefenbaker were built many years ago by canals. The canals were built many years ago, and for 11 sorry years there was not a whole lot done in that area even to get water put back into those particular things. So what I can assure the hon. member is he can go back and tell George Tweedy that it's being looked after by the government. It's being looked after or looked at by the water corporation, and that information will be communicated back to the various farmers that are involved and worked very hard to get that project on course after waiting many, many, many, many years to deal with it. And those farmers — many of them who I know — are in that area, have been working on that project a long time. The corporation is looking into those concerns and seeing how they can deal with those concerns.

**MR. ENGEL:** — You've underlined the fact that there's a problem there, and that they're looking at it, but how many years do you expect a farmer to have seepage coming onto his land in conditions that could be saline before there is a severe problem that he won't get anything to grow there?

And, Mr. Minister, it's gone way beyond study. It's time to start patching. You should have done

it this year before water goes into that canal this year. That patching should have been done last fall and it was put off and now you're passing the buck again. And Mr. Minister, if you're not familiar with seepage conditions in land that's prone to be saline, I would like to tell you that it doesn't take three years to create a very serious problem, and that problem is growing — growing worse than the grasshopper situation is in that particular spot. Because when the water comes up off the side of the canal in a nice flat area that they could farm and they could keep under control with continuous cropping, once you've got seepage coming off the canal to the extent that the farmers can't get in and cultivate and grow materials there, that land is going saline and you're causing a very serious problem.

And I'd suggest that your studying turn to action — turn to action. You've studied and dillied away a whole term of office, and you've ruined the land in that area, and I'd suggest . . . Action is what George Tweedy tells me we require, and he'll see that they get some action, but I want a commitment from you that you're going to act on this now, not two years down the road.

That action, that sealing, needs to be done now. The canal, the water shut off, dried down two or three days time, and seal it, and then put water back in. Now it's as simple as that. And there are clays and soils available that can be placed inside that canal to seal it. That material can be sealed very, very inexpensively, and I'd suggest that that action take place.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — That west side canal was built 12 years ago. Two years ago it had water in it for the first time.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And it started leaking.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, yes, but it was built 12 years ago. Now you can talk to me about study and theories and everything else. For your entire administration there wasn't even any . . . it didn't even . . . The water didn't even touch it. So I mean there was nothing done there.

Now there is a question of seepage problem that has been identified. The problem is that it's not been dealt with in a meaningful way in very many places. I'm advised by the people from water corporation that it's not quite as simple as your friend, George Tweedy, would have us believe. And the studies and the scientific work being done is trying to make sure that it's done and done in a proper way, and they are working on that. I can assure the hon. member that they are, in fact, working on it. They are concerned about that seepage problem and hope to get a solution to it.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Minister, I want to tell you this much: that you take water off a saline area and in three years' time, you can grow a crop there. I can prove that. I can prove it in areas of my own where there's been less water because of the drought. The stuff grows in the saline areas. We can grow a crop there. And the opposite is true.

The is the third year you're creating a saline problem for those farmers — three years of water three years of seepage. And I think that you either shut the water off or fix the problem, because you're ruining people's lands that are not benefiting from the drainage. They're not benefiting from the canal.

I think that the farmers in the area have tried their utmost. They've gone to you and you are now rendering their land useless by dilly-dallying and then putting water on for the third year.

There's another problem that I would like to raise with you that seems to need some resolve. Ever since the conservation and development has been moved into the water corporation board, more and more farmers have been — and I've raised this before — more and more farmers have been raising the issue as to how do we get to report or complain about . . . The opposite to what . . . I'd love to have that problem in my area.

I'm talking now about a situation that doesn't exist anywhere near or close to Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and that's because we haven't had enough water to worry about the drainage. If our sloughs would fill up, we'd be happy. But there are situations beyond our particular area. And this is basically where I'm fielding questions from — from farther reaching areas. And that is that they haven't been comfortable with the answers they've been getting from the water corporation as to water that has been drained onto them by some farmers that are using some pretty fancy and sophisticated equipment, and moving a little dirt here and little dirt there and creating drainage ditches where there haven't been drainage ditches before, and all of a sudden a farmer down the road is stuck with quite a quantity of water in some flooded area.

In the past, we changed a legislation that I felt was working really well. And in the past, if the person complained to the conservation and development branch, that branch would then put the onus on the person that drained the water to make sure he could bring that drainage situation back to its original state, be it a municipal construction of a municipal grid road that created a drainage problem. This one example at Rouleau, where some road improvements were made and the new road drained water on them.

I'm wondering what kind of teeth does the water corporation have. And is this legislation similar, or does the person that receives the water . . . What process or what channels does he go through to get some corrective action? Does he have to go through the court process or are there restrictions in place similar to what it was during the last little while in the conservation and development branch?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I'm advised that it's simply been brought under the umbrella of the water corporation, that the process is still the same with a couple of exceptions, one being is that we now have regional offices as opposed to centralized right in Regina. Now that's maybe not problematic to you in your proximity, but it is to other people. So there is regional offices, and I'm advised by the water corporation that in fact the complaints have reduced over the period of time. Now whether that's because there hasn't been as much water to be drained, be that as it may, I don't know.

In my career before politics, in the law business, one thing I knew is that those are very difficult problems to deal with. And I think any farmer knows that those are difficult problems to deal with in the sense of farmer A saying farmer B has pulled in a big cultivator and scooped the dirt a little bit more and a little bit more, so the flow goes. And I suppose that's a difficult process for any people to deal with. And all I can say to you is it's being dealt with in the same way that you talked about.

**MR. ENGEL:** — A simple question that the farmers are asking me is: it's more than a cultivator, Mr. Minister. Nowadays there are many, many road builders out of work, many of them. There's a contractor told me that last year was the first time in July in his life that he didn't have any road construction to do.

Those people will go out on an hourly basis. If somebody would move on to a farmer with four Euclids that have a capacity of holding 40 yards each, you know how long it would take him to change the face of that drainage, and how good that farm would look afterwards, because you wouldn't have any more sloughs. They'd fill up the little holes, dig a little ditches here, and then they'd go back and put the topsoil back on.

And I agree that it's virtually impossible to determine where the water came from and where it was before, because you can change the face of the landscape overnight with that kind of equipment. And that's what's happening.

Now, once that happens . . . Let's say that happened to me, or even do it worse than that, let's say I hired some equipment and did it on my land. What would my neighbour do between me

and . . . if it's not a sufficient source and there's no contract or nothing in place to give me an agreement to drain that water to that particular source? What steps would I take to get some corrective action in place?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — What that person, I'm advised, should do would be to go to one of the people working for the water corporation, in a regional office preferably, but otherwise to get a hold of them by telephone, file the necessary complaint. The complaint is then investigated by officials from the water corporation. Corrective action is then determined.

And I take it if it's two farmers bickering over level A versus level B, you go through an arbitrary arbitration-type process as set up in the drainage appeal Act a number of years ago — or five years ago maybe. And failing that, there would become an appeal to the courts, which ultimately I suppose that stuff gets to.

**MR. ENGEL:** — By transferring the authority from conservation and development to your Crown corporation, has that legislation and that Act that was in place changed at all?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — No.

**MR. ENGEL:** — And are you saying that . . . previously, if I felt that I was aggrieved by the actions of a neighbour, if I reported it, they would come out and take corrective action. Is your Crown corporation short-staffed then? Why are we receiving so many complaints, even in spite of the less run-off?

(1630)

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I'm advised that they're receiving fewer complaints.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Then the problem, Mr. Minister, must be that the farmers aren't familiar where they go since conservation and development has moved out and moved into the Crown corporation sector, that they either aren't getting a sufficient answer or . . . I'll deal with the minister privately on the cases that are aggrieved.

The other question that I would like to raise again and that's of some concern particularly to people in my area because of the long-term implications as far as power development is concerned, and what position and where's the study at . . . and can you give me an update on the negotiations with the United States and the people in the Weyburn and Estevan area, as far as the development of the Rafferty dam is concerned? How far along is that study and what . . . Can you just update as to where that is at?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well that's purely within the gamut of Sask Power Corporation, and I don't totally know the answer to that, other than that it's still in a pre-decision process at this point in time. No decision has been taken.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Would not the water corporation be responsible for the legal aspects of damming up water and studying the amount of water that could be in that area? Does Sask Power do an individual study? Does the water corporation not study that? Aren't they broad enough to take care of all province, or do they just take care of parts of it?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — No, they would become involved if there was a decision taken to spend X-hundred million dollars on a new power plant, and then they would become involved in them, but they wouldn't become involved prior to that decision.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Maybe I didn't make the question clear enough to the minister, but I can just give you a brief history. Back in the days when the Deputy Premier was sitting over on this side, I travelled down to the States and we met with Governor Olson, and several people there, and

listened to their concerns about and their interest in relation to building the Rafferty dam, and flood-proofing Minot and that whole Souris Valley further, and putting in a power control or water control system that had nothing to do with Sask Power. This wasn't a Sask Power study at all, and at that time I was under the impression that an internal study was taking place jointly with the United States and Canada, and our people involved.

I'm not sure if a joint commission was studying that or if that was individual studies by the state of North Dakota and the province of Saskatchewan. But I would just like to know where that study is at. And why I raised it in tone, as far as the long-term implications are concerned, it sounded like if the Rafferty dam would go in, Sask Power would take advantage of that water.

But at any rate, I understood that there was some study going to take place in some concern, and at this time I'm not saying I'm for or against building Rafferty dam. I just was wondering where that study is at so that we have a little better idea where we are going to go once we take over and move to that side of the House after the next election.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — It's not in the . . . No study is being conducted in the water Crown. If it's being done in Environment or being done some place else, I'm not aware, nor are the water Crown people aware of it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — This is, Mr. Minister, a matter of legitimate concern to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation. It falls within their ambit. There are two problems with the project. One was raised at a meeting at which I attended last summer in Estevan. The invited were: the Premier, myself, Grant Mitchell, Lonny McKague, Frank Switzer. Of the above, the report says only the Premier did not attend.

But there was a number of people there. There was a good deal of concern expressed about the dam. The concern expressed there was the flooding. It would flood a fairly large plain. At this point in time it is probably some of the best pasture land in southern Saskatchewan — in south-east Saskatchewan, I'm corrected. That's one concern is that a lot of land, a lot of good land will disappear. It's a shallow basin.

I think the second concern is that it has the odour of pork-barrelling. The power . . . There is unused capacity at the plant in Coronach. There seems to be no reason why Coronach should not be expanded. The plant is there. The environmental problems have largely been dealt with though not entirely.

I think the community is genuinely anxious to have the expansion. It means more jobs, and more economic activity. The infrastructure is all in place. There are no environmental problems to be solved. Why not? It's also unquestionably cheaper power than to build a brand new dam.

The alternative is a proposal in the Premier's constituency with enormous environmental problems, with a significant increased cost and, as I say, the project has a bad odour of pork-barrelling.

And I ask you, Mr. Minister, why the government wouldn't obtain the excess power at Coronach where everything's in place except a bit of hardware; why the government would be considering the Rafferty dam, and it is getting active consideration — why the government would be considering such an environmentally dangerous and such an expensive project, whereas no active consideration is being given to Coronach.

If there is an explanation other than pork-barrelling, I wish you'd offer it to me and to the community of Coronach, and to their able representative, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well as I understand, there's no decision taken on (a) whether Sask Power needs additional power; and if they do need the power, then there is three options: option one would be Rafferty; option two would be Coronach; option three is to buy from Manitoba and expand the grid out of Manitoba into Saskatchewan.

The decision has not been taken yet. If the decision is taken and the choice is to (a), (b), or (c) of those three choices, then environmental impact studies will in fact be conducted.

I think the argument perhaps is more appropriate in Sask Power for that particular issue as opposed to water Crown because it's not the water Crown primarily that would be involved in that. The water Crown would be involved where there became a water element to it. But there's been no decision taken on that, and until such time as there is a decision taken in Sask Power, you know, we're arguing something hypothetical.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — But the difficulty, Mr. Minister, is that only one of those alternatives seem to be being considered.

Let me read from the August 22nd edition of the *Estevan Mercury*. As I say, I was there, and I think this is accurate:

The SPC has proposed construction of a 600-megawatt thermal generating station about 10 kilometres south-east of Estevan and the Rafferty reservoir about six kilometres west of Estevan. To supply cooling water for the station, SPC proposed to build a dam across the Souris River to create a reservoir that will flood 11,860 acres when at full supply.

That 11,860 acres — some of the best pasture land in the south-east. It also contains some natural flora and fauna which cannot be moved and which is not duplicated, certainly in abundance, elsewhere.

So SPC is actively considering an expensive and environmentally dangerous alternative. It is giving no active consideration to expanding Coronach, partially because it doesn't need a whole lot of consideration. There aren't any environmental problems of substance. The infrastructure is there. All one needs is a bit of extra hardware.

But there is no consideration being given to Coronach. The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg represents the area and I am that community once a week, and I'll tell you, if there's any consideration being given to it, it is very effectively disguised, as nobody in Coronach knows it.

Everybody in Estevan knows that the Rafferty dam is being considered. So our complaint, and the complaint of the people at Estevan, is not that you've made a decision. No one can prove that. But it is demonstrably true that you are actively considering the Rafferty dam and are not actively considering Coronach.

All logic and good sense seems to suggest that additional power should come from Coronach rather than the Rafferty dam area.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well I don't think the member opposite does himself a lot of value and does even anybody in this Assembly a lot of value to say that other options are not being considered.

I indicated to you that Sask Power indicates that all options are being considered. That's number one. And number two, for you to stand up and say that you have an all-knowing about the technical question of a Rafferty dam versus a Coronach versus a grid-in Manitoba, you're not being very forthcoming with people to make kind of rash statements like that.

And for the member opposite who doesn't profess to be an engineer, I can assure you that Sask Power is looking at all the options. And you are not being very fair to the people of Sask Power to indicate and to suggest that somehow it's a *fait accompli* and nothing is being investigated. And that's not fair.

**MR. ENGEL:** — If Rafferty is being considered, what source of information are you studying, if your own water corporation, where the arguments that the minister made when he introduced the water corporation, that there is going to be a board that's going to look after the overall water situation in the province, that'll take into account what the needs of communities are, the needs of our crown corporations, the needs of our farmers, and so on, and here you have a situation where you say that the water corporation hasn't been drawn into it yet?

Why not give the water corporation that authority they need, rather than be political and decide that in the Premier's constituency we'll give some special consideration, we'll bypass the water corporation's expertise and we'll decide on the political implications of building and expanding in Estevan rather than units three and four at Coronach?

I would like to ask the water corporation board if there's sufficient water in Cookson reservoir to support a third generation plant.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — There is. I 'm advised that water studies are being done on that very question.

**MR. ENGEL:** — How many people have they got studying, and how long do they expect before they can bring in a report from the three or four people studying it, b perhaps September.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — They would anticipate, with regard to that particular question, some kind of report back from the three or four people studying it, by perhaps September.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Are they taking water temperatures, and so on, to indicate what the difference in the temperature of the water is with the second unit pumping hot water into that for coolant, or is that the kind of study they're making, or what are they studying this summer?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I think they're looking at availability more so than temperatures. I'm advised that the temperature things, and that type of thing, tend to be the more expertise within Sask Power.

**MR. ENGEL:** — I think that . . . One more question that I was going to ask of the water corporation, and they're looking at supplying the needs to farmers, and that is: have they expanded further on testing of where some underground lakes are, and the depths to those lakes, and if there's a possibility? They were talking about doing some test holes and drilling. Have you looked at that in southern or south-central Saskatchewan to determine if there is a source of water, and if it's usable?

(1645)

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I'm advised that it's not seem as a high priority by the water Crown, and the main reason for that is that, while identifiable water and underground rivers are there, the quality of that water is very, very poor as a rule and therefore they're using their efforts into areas more of ground water as opposed to, or surface water as opposed to the underground ones. At this point I time, that's something that could be considered, clearly. But by and large, most identified underground water tends to be of poor quality.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Have they had sufficient samples, or where have they taken samples? Can they at least give me one location within 50 miles of my place, where they've taken a sample to see



what the quality of that water is?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would have to try to find that information and get that back to the hon. member.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Just, back to Rafferty dam for one further question, Mr. Minister. *Estevan Mercury*, June 13, 1984, a quote from George Hill, then chairman of the board of directors of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. He outlined four options, two of which, I guess, were at Estevan. He splits the Estevan options into two. He said, however, that “the new plant at Estevan currently appears to be the most economically desirable of the four options . . .” then to construct it, and went on to describe the number of jobs it would create. Here we have the chairman of the power corporation expressing a preference for a project many Saskatchewan people, many residents of that area, have expressed something less than enthusiasm for.

So I say to you, Mr. Minister, that when you say they are actively considering both, that is not what we’re being told, and that is not what the community of Estevan’s being told by the chairman. He was at the time chairman. At the time he made the statement he was chairman of the board.

So I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that it is to be hoped on behalf of the stock growers in the plain to be flooded, on behalf of the people of the community of Coronach, and on behalf of the taxpayers, who must for this pork-barrelling, that a more even-handed approach, a more even-handed approach, Mr. Minister, is taken in the future than has been taken in the past.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, I can only reiterate what I’ve said before and one would trust that there will be a legitimate study being done. That’s what we are, in fact, doing. To say that one riding is represented by a member from this side, and another riding’s represented by a member from the other side, and the choice he made on that basis, I don’t believe it.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 and 3 agreed to.

#### **Item 4**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Could you given me the comparable figure for ’84-85. These books are very difficult to follow when the figures are spread all over.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — We’ll get it and send it to you.

Item 4 agreed to.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Just a clarification. It’s my understanding under subvote 3, what these are in face is, by and large, a series of grants to the different municipalities. It’s also my understanding, and I stand to be corrected if I’m wrong, that these are recurring grants. They recur each year. This is for operating and not for capital. If I am correct that these are recurring grants, which re-occur each year, could I have the comparable figures for the individual municipalities for the last year?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I’ll provide that information to the hon. member.

Vote 50 agreed to.

### **CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

**POTASH CORPORATION OF SASKATCHEWAN**

**Vote 158**

**Item 1 (Statutory)**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There is a decrease here, Mr. Minister. Do I take that that, indeed, marks a decrease in the capital spending program of the corporation?

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 158 agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Primarily, it's less capital going into Lanigan expansion.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, I guess there's an obvious question as to why.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Because it's nearing completion.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — When do you expect it to come on stream and be completed?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I believe it's '86. I think it's pretty much completed. It will be, I think, into production in '86.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

**SASKATCHEWAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**Vote 148**

Item 1 — Statutory

Vote 148 agreed to.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

**SASKATCHEWAN POWER CORPORATION**

**Vote 152**

**Item 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I think I would ask only the questions which were asked previously under the water corporation with respect to Rafferty. Is any of this money thought to involve any expenditure associated with any major generation project at Estevan, including Rafferty?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — No.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, are you able to give any sort of a status report on the power corporation's major generating plans? And I'm not talking about small matters, but when is it anticipated that the power corporation will make a decision on the next major unit of electrical generation. Has it been made? It must be soon going to be made. Has a site been selected?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — No. As I indicated to the hon. member on a previous questioning on the same issue; there still is, as I'm apprised, three options being investigated. One is Rafferty; one is Coronach; and the third is buying power from Manitoba Hydro. There's been no decision taken on that, and that's a very large decision which would usually also go to the cabinet table.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Could the minister indicate how close they came to peak consumption in the peak period last year? I heard some staff at Sask Power tell me, they use colouring to how close they come out to a certain out, and I don't remember if it was a brown-out or a yellow-out but it sounded serious, and that we were within a whisker; and a night when it turned down to 40 below, if we would have had a little bit of wind instead of calm, that Saskatchewan could have faced a pretty major disaster; and we were that close to peak production, and that our generating stations were running full out, and any change or any malfunction of equipment would have caused some pretty serious problems when it's that cold.

And I was wondering what indication Sask Power has given to you through the minister in charge, to indicate how soon they're going to have to proceed with some more development. Or are there interconnecting lines in place that can substantiate?

Say, you should have a failure at any one of the major locations of either Estevan or Coronach on the present power generating facility, is there interconnections available to take care of additional peak capacity, or are we pretty close to the limit?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — This particular vote, hon. member, and chairman, deals with the capital. And those questions, those detailed questions, would tend to be posed in the committee on Crown corporations where the officials are there in a large detail to deal with the specific operating questions.

What I can do is undertake to take note of that question and advance it to the Deputy Premier who will get that information provided to you if that's satisfactory.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Well just to wrap up comment on that, I'm aware of the situation in Coronach that the generating stations are supposed to be 300 megawatts and they were providing above that amount. They were running at 120 per cent on some occasions and I'm not sure that the equipment was designed and would stand up very long under that kind of extreme usage. And we should be looking at building a third generating station. And I would highly recommend on behalf of the chamber of commerce, town council, and the people of Coronach, saying that that is a place you should seriously consider.

I've had three cases, Mr. Minister, of individuals transferred out of Coronach, for example, that aren't able to recover their investment even though Sask Power has a buy-back policy on their houses, that aren't able to cover their costs of their investments and are fighting with Sask Power because they're not happy with what they're getting for their houses. And I could give you those names afterwards too to look at. I've already talked to the Deputy Premier about that.

But there's an indication there that growth and expansion in Coronach was planned for, and the housing and units and structures are there. Your railroad track is there to supply the coal from the coal-mine site. And all you need is, like the member indicated that spends a day a week down there, that it's just a matter of another generating station and you'd have power. And I think you should seriously consider that phase and not use political input to try and build one down in your Premier's constituency.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I think I've commented on that. It's going to be decided in the most economic and proper way.

#### CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

## SASKATCHEWAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS

### Advances (Statutory)

**MR. ENGEL:** — I have a couple of concerns that I would like to raise with the minister in charge of Sask Tel. And the interesting one that really impressed me and would cover off a problem that a lot of farmers are raising in my area: in light of the technological development as far as computers and so on are concerned, it's imperative that farmers have private lines.

Now, when you compare (and I would like to give me just a brief answer on this) how different is . . . Let's use a network going out of Woodrow. How different are the buried telephones cables that have been put in recently, that is in good shape, in an area like Woodrow, where it's serving — let's use just a hypothetical figure of 50 farmers. The old Woodrow rural telephone company was amalgamated to Lafleche, but a line came out of Lafleche, a trunk line, and then there's branch lines at Woodrow. How different is that from a 50-unit apartment block where you can use a small number of lines leading to the apartment block, and yet you can give the 50 people in an apartment block private lines? Are you following, Mr. Minister?

(1700)

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, the cable is quite different. The cable that's installed in rural Saskatchewan right now can only take the power to basically drive the one telephone off the line.

If we were to go with individual line service, the cable . . . It's a new cable altogether, that can take more power to take extensions and whatever other equipment would be attached. If your comparison is a 20-unit apartment building, the lines are quite a bit heavier, and they take more power to drive the equipment that's attached. So on individual line service there has to be totally new lines throughout rural Saskatchewan.

**MR. ENGEL:** — The switching units that will make a single pair into a multiple pair line, are you saying that that's the case from Woodrow out to the rural area, or from Lafleche to Woodrow? You know, this is the simple question I was asking.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Just so we understand, the line itself, the individual line into the farm, has to be a much stronger cable than that is now used for a multi-party line.

Secondly, if we're talking about the switching, if you're arguing the technology as to whether you can divide a multi-party line with a switch into a single party line, no, we have looked very, very seriously at different technologies, and the only one that seems to work is horrendously expensive and simply not feasible.

If you're talking about the switching in a centre to surrounding lines, that has nothing to do with the lines going out. And we have announced a modernization, and we are accelerating the modernization of rural switching, so if I recall it, we hope to have it done within five or seven years. I'm not sure that which figure, but that will virtually have completely modernized the switching in rural Saskatchewan.

**MR. ENGEL:** — By modernizing, you mean that a farmer would have direct distance dialing type services but still not private individual line service — individual?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — they are separate issues.

**MR. ENGEL:** — How, in your plan in the future . . . what percentage of arm units are you expecting to add to a system at this time to provide individual private line service?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No decision has yet been made as to individual line service.

**MR. ENGEL:** — When you talk about horrendously expensive, have you a costing that would roughly relate to how much per farmer?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No, when I talked about the question of expense I was referring to that issue you raised about the . . . if there was a technology to convert a multi-party line to individual lines. That is horrendously expensive.

The estimates we have, as I indicated at Crown corporations on individual line service, run anywhere from 100 to \$200 million.

**MR. ENGEL:** — For how many farmers are you talking about?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — We're talking all of rural Saskatchewan.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Mr. Minister, now that you've got most of your fibre optic cable buried, have you looked at providing private line service for the majority of rural Saskatchewan or at least the ones that would want it?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well certainly we are taking an active look at individual line service.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — When you talk about taking an active look, Mr. Minister, are you talking about possibly doing something in the next year or two? Or maybe you won't be here in the next year, and I can understand that won't be, but I think that's something that we would certainly be looking at — at providing private line service to rural Saskatchewan. And I would hope prior to that time, Mr. Minister, you would do some real serious study on whether we could provide it or not?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Yes, we are doing some very really serious studying, and I frankly wish that it had been done during the 10 years you were in office, but it wasn't. We had to start from scratch. It's a great disappointment to me and to most of the families that you wouldn't consider it.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Mr. Minister, you say you were hoping that it would have been done 10 years ago, and you had to start from scratch when you took over. Mr. Minister, I think most of that is certainly not true because there was a good system of fibre optics being put into place at that time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . as my colleague says, one of the most advanced systems in the world at this point. And now that that's completed, that was an important one to put in . . . Now that that's completed, I think, we could go the other phase which would be to provide private line service for a good portion of rural Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Now I haven't reviewed it, but I can't believe that there is one farmer that's hooked onto fibre optics. So you made the choice and you chose where your priorities were. We will be making some decisions in the very near future, and we will let you know where our priorities are. We did simple things that you oppose, for example, letting an individual in the cities buy an extension phone from somewhere else. It didn't cause any great problems for Sask Tel; it made most people happy.

We've announced a major modernization of all of rural Saskatchewan's switching equipment so that farmers will be able to access. When we announced the Agritex program for farmers, we made it clear, and we designed the technology so that the farmers, even on a multi-party line could access videotex. So we've been very conscious of the desire to improve communications for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

And let me add that it was through the initiatives of this government that we were successful in

changing, having the policy of the Government of Canada changed so that rural Saskatchewan will have access to the same type of television service that urban Saskatchewan has. And I suggest to you that we have made more changes in the last three years directly impacting on the farmer, and I can assure you there will be more.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Mr. Minister, you go on to say that our priorities were putting in fibre optics, and they were at that time, that no farmer is on fibre optics. Certainly not. But, Mr. Minister, without the additional ability for the lines to carry the different kinds of services that are being provided to rural Saskatchewan, it wouldn't be possible.

We went ahead and installed a system that's going to be able to provide a good number of services in the future to all of rural Saskatchewan. That phase is now virtually completed. The next phase, Mr. Minister, is to start providing private line service to most of rural Saskatchewan so that they could tie into many of the services that are available.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well again, you're not quite correct. As a matter of fact, you're not correct at all, that the bulk of the fibre optic services is for the high use areas of the major cities, not rural Saskatchewan at all. And it has very little, if any, effect. That's not to say it can't be used because obviously it's a communication line. Is it necessary for rural Saskatchewan? No, it wasn't.

So your argument about your choice of priorities, I think, is unfounded. I say to you that with the attempts of this government to change the infrastructure to rural Saskatchewan in terms of communications, we will be the first in the country. And it was our efforts that changed the federal government policy that allowed the smaller communities to be able to set up their own television system. And I suggest to you that by the end of this summer that will be in immense demand throughout rural Saskatchewan.

It is our government that is looking at individual line service. We're doing the planning, the studying, and attempting to do the costing, and we'll make the decisions. It is our government that is bringing rural natural gas to rural Saskatchewan, not yours. You had 10 years; so don't sit there and tell me . . . You said it was too costly; you opposed it. And I suggest to you that by the time this administration is finished its term that the farmers and the people of rural Saskatchewan will have services equal to those of the urban centres. And I suggest that that's a dramatic change in rural Saskatchewan.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Well, Mr. Minister, you say that all of the programs provided to rural Saskatchewan are your programs. We had announced a natural gas program before you came into government. We had set up one of the best telecommunication systems in this country for all of Saskatchewan. And Mr. Minister, I can assure you that after the next election we will be the New Democratic Party government, and we will provide private line service for rural Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well if you had a natural gas system, it's going to be a great surprise to the farmers and the people of rural Saskatchewan. Having said that, if the member from Pelly is back here after the next election, it will be a great surprise to the people of Pelly and the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I know the minister would be awfully surprised if I wasn't back here after the next election, and I can assure him that I will be here after the next election, and we will be implementing all of the programs that are required in Saskatchewan.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I have a couple of items I'd like to bring to your attention during estimates of Saskatchewan Telecommunications. The first one deals with a letter I received regarding X, Y, D, camps just north of La Ronge — just a few miles north of La Ronge.

There's a group of five families and two tourist operators living three, possibly 400 hundred yards away from the main highway, and away from the main power line, and the families are wanting to know if there's any program applicable that would enable them to have the conventional telephone system brought into their area — now we're talking about seven families.

The letter states, Mr. Minister, that the conventional telephone system is done way in La Ronge, but north of their small community, and they're wondering if there's any possibility that, you know, some help could be had. At the present time all they have for communications is their individual mobile phones and this is a very costly item for them.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well I'm not aware of the details, and I don't have any of the technical information. if the hon. member would give me the letter, we'll take a serious look at it, and respond back to you. Generally, and the member is well aware, that in rural Saskatchewan, or northern Saskatchewan, we thought we had a new system that would be a better service. It was not accepted, and we've gone back to the drawing board, and we'll be meeting further with those in northern Saskatchewan to have a phone system that's acceptable to them.

**MR. YEW:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I certainly appreciate the fact that you have extended to look into the matter, Mr. Minister, by . . . I will be sending over to you a copy of this letter and hopefully, you know, the matter can be looked into indepth and perhaps could find someone to resolve that issue. You know it's really unfortunate that the North is as isolated and remote as it is, but anyway, thank you.

I have another item here, Mr. Minister, before we can move on into estimates. I have another letter here by Saskatchewan Northern Native Communications Society, and they're proposing to set up radio and television small community-controlled units in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister. The letters are directed to me by the community programmer, Buckley Belanger, and he's also on the board of the directors of the Saskatchewan Northern Native Communications group.

(1715)

Now he's proposing to work . . . He's worked in a number of communities in the North, and he's proposing to visit Deschambault, Creighton, Sandy Bay, Cumberland house, and Pelican Narrows. The communities are certainly interested in developing some sort of radio-television community-owned units and programs.

I want to know, Mr. Minister, if there is any possibility that we can accommodate this organization. There's a lot of groundwork being done at the moment, a lot of anticipation by the communities themselves. And I would certainly appreciate hearing from you if there's any possibility that they can . . . if there's any possibility that certain programs in your government can be taken advantage of in terms of accommodating the Saskatchewan Northern Native Communications Society and the communities mentioned.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — We'll certainly take a look at those. I'm not familiar with whether any request has gone to Sask Tel or not. The general policy, and it's been a long-standing one, is that the only charity, I believe, that gets some contribution from Sask Tel, or Sask Tel on behalf of the government, is the Kinsmen Telemiracle, and it hasn't gone beyond that. But if that's what they're asking for . . . I'm just not sure. If you would give me those, we'll certainly take a look at them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Any more questions?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you some questions with respect to the applications which are currently before the Canadian radio and television commission by SaskWest on one hand, by Harvard-Allarcom on the other . . . (inaudible) . . . Mr. Minister, that

you have written the federal government, and I believe the CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission) in particular have endorsed the Harvard-Allarcom application.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you'd tell the Assembly why you took the step.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Generally we felt that we would try and support the locally owned proposal. That was the prime reason.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, I wonder about the wisdom of injecting your self into this debate. If indeed the market in Regina, and I guess in Saskatoon, is only large enough to support one off-air station, wisdom would appear to justify the granting a decision to Harvard-Allarcom. I may be mispronouncing the last name. Allarcom, I'm told it's pronounced.

If, however, the market will justify and can support two off-air stations, the SaskWest application would appear to be superior. The capital investment is considerably larger — \$3 million versus 678,000 for the Harvard-Allarcom application.

The number of employees — the off-air station will employ 67 versus 15 for Harvard-Allarcom. The hours of local production is 20 with the off-air station versus six for the Harvard-Allarcom station. There is more local newscasts.

I will readily admit that I am reading from a document I believe prepared by SaskWest. However, when one considers it, an off-air station which also serves people living out of Regina and Saskatoon would appear to be clearly preferable to a cable service which just serves the city, just serves the people living in the two cities.

It appears to be preferable both because it is available to people outside the urban areas and because, by its very nature, an off-air station involves more people, more local production.

So I wonder, Mr. Minister, about the wisdom of injecting yourself into a debate about which I suggest to you know very little.

So I wonder, Mr. Minister, about the wisdom of injecting yourself into a debate about which I suggest to you know very little.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — The answer has already been given to the hon. member, that the government chose to give some support to the locally owned application. The document that you read from, of course, is the submission made by the applicant. I can't comment on the feasibility and practicality. I believe that you should not limit the Harvard-Allarcom to the narrow delivery that you've indicated. There are some commitments in terms of educational television time, redistribution, depending on market expanding that system. So it's not limited, as you indicate, to re-delivery.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, the regrettable thing about this is that the allegation has been made that politics is playing a part in this decision. The regrettable feature of your injecting yourself into the debate is that you will almost surely cause the result to be open to question. By injecting your self into an area that you have no expertise about, and an area which, I may add, you have no responsibility for, you are going to bring into question the final decision. If the final decision is to grant it to Harvard, a good many of the people who live outside Regina and Saskatoon will inevitably say it's politics. We didn't get a third option because of politics, Mr. Minister.

I doubt, Mr. Minister, that your interjection . . . I express the hope that your injection will not sway CRTC in deciding what is best for the people of this community. It will, I think, however, inevitably taint the final decision unless the decision is for SaskWest. You have put the CRTC in



the position of really having only one honest option left as far as the public are concerned. So I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, your interjection into this was very, very ill-advised.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — With all respect to the hon. member, I'm sure that's not the view of the applicants that asked for government intervention, and all of them did. So they obviously didn't feel that way.

Secondly, I don't want to get into debate about who knows what about what. But I can go back about CPN, and I believe you were personally involved in that. And if you ever want someone going in and not knowing the foggiest idea of what they were talking about, the ramifications of what they were doing, and the cost involved, I suggest that that is it.

I've given the reasons. It certainly wasn't a concern raised by the applicants themselves. And be that as it may, it wouldn't matter if we didn't do anything, I'm sure you would say it was politics, and if we did do something, it'd be politics. So that's fair game — say it's politics.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Any more questions? That's it.

### **Motions for Supply**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Chairman, I move resolution no. 1:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$183,266,880 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Chairman, I move resolution no. 2:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$2,127,692,400 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Chairman, I move resolution no. 3:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$102,780,000 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Chairman, I move resolution no. 4:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$552,041,680 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Chairman, I move resolution no. 5:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985,

the sum of \$40 be granted out of the Special Projects Fund.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Chairman, I move resolution no. 6:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$1,766,680 be granted out of the special Projects Fund.

Motion agreed to.

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

(1730)

### APPROPRIATION BILL

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move:

That Bill 1114, An Act Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending Respectively on March 31, 1985, and March 31, 1986, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a first time.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — By leave of the Assembly, and under rule 48(2), I move that the Bill be now read a second and third time.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this Appropriation Act. The purpose of this bill is to give legal effect to the government opposite's fourth budget — the Tory government opposite's fourth consecutive budget and fourth consecutive deficit budget. And it's a big budget. Total spending of \$3.6 billion; 37 per cent increase since the government came to office — 37 per cent increase; spending \$9.5 million a day. That's what the budget does.

Now this budget has some distinctive features. It was billed in advance as the most intelligent budget. We recall that. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that's not what my constituents are calling it, and I suspect, not the constituents of members opposite. I suspect that the Tory colleagues of the Minister of Finance are having other words to describe that budget. It imposed the biggest tax increase in the history of Saskatchewan and the most unfair tax increase in the history of Saskatchewan.

And despite these huge and unfair tax increases on working people, the budget has another distinctive feature — another deficit, a huge deficit, which a couple of months ago was estimated at \$291 million; has already gone up by 25 million on top of that and 28 million on top of that. So we're looking at a deficit of 340 million or so now, and rising.

We well remember last year. They came in with it, as I recall, at about 260 million. Doesn't matter much what their figures say; it turned out to be roughly 400 million. We're now up to 350 million — 340 million and growing.

Certainly we can expect yet another massive deficit. And this budget has some pretty distinctive features, and some pretty sorry features — 9.5 billions of dollars a day and what are Saskatchewan people getting for that? Are they getting a reduced unemployment rate? No. Are they getting some solid assistance for hard-pressed farmers? No. Are they getting better highways? No, no. Are they getting a fair deal for northern people? No. Are they getting fair

treatment for nurses and teachers? No.

What then, if the government has no money for virtually any of these needed services, what are they spending their money on? Well we can recall a number of things without difficulty as we've gone over these estimates. We can recall a number of things: \$12 million a year for advertising, twice what was ever spent before. The most expensive cabinet; the largest and most expensive cabinet in Saskatchewan history. Who, Mr. Speaker, can possibly doubt the fact that this cabinet is not only perhaps the loudest cabinet in speaking from its seat, but also the largest and most expensive cabinet we've ever had in Saskatchewan's history.

We've got a cabinet which likes to go on international junkets; international junkets, many of which are ill-disguised holidays, whether it be Las Vegas — and I'm just going up and down the rows — or whether it be Hawaii, or whether it be New Zealand, or Palm Springs. Many, many of these tips . . . some of them obviously are necessary, but many are ill-disguised holidays.

We have exorbitant salary increases for high-paid political advisers, and we've seen them go from 4, 8, 12, 16, right up to 60 per cent for the adviser for the minister in charge of crop insurance. And these are some of the priorities; these are some of the priorities that this government has brought to bear in this budget. That's where their spending goes. Certainly that's one reason why they've had to bring in the biggest tax increases in Saskatchewan history.

Let's look for a moment at some of these tax increases. Yes, surely, that was the most distinctive feature of this budget — the massive tax increases. We've seen a 5 per cent increase in sales tax on used vehicles. They promised to do away with the sales tax altogether. What they have done is increase sales tax on used vehicles by 5 per cent, and this goes to cabooses and a great number of other vehicles besides cars and trucks.

We've extended the tax we promised to eliminate, so say the Tories. And they have no other explanation. They say, yes, we promised to eliminate the sales tax, but unfortunately we're going to have to extend it.

Then we have an income tax. Here was a group of people who said, we'll cut your income tax by 10 per cent. And what did they do in this budget? They socked it to all of us, but particularly to middle- and lower-income people. They socked it to them and they're going to see a very massive increase in their income taxes. So more and more broken promises.

And what about property improvement grants? What about property improvement grants? These are being eliminated at a cost of \$100 million — a cost of \$100 million.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'm going to ask the members to be a little bit quieter. It's getting very noisy in here and difficult to hear.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, they're eliminating property improvement grants, and in so doing they're taking \$100 million out of the pockets of home owners, farmers, small-business people, renters, particularly farmers, who are losing not only their property improvement grant, but their home quarter education tax rebate. An average farmer is losing 600, \$700 a year. Now that's a lot of money for farmers at this time, hard-pressed as they are.

So we have seen a budget which piles on taxes, piles on extra expense for these home owners, farmers, small-business people — just ordinary people who have a wife and kids, who used to be able to have a deduction from their income tax for those wife and kids, but not under the modern reformist flat tax put forward by the Minister of Finance.

They talk about tax reform, but they're afraid to talk about tax fairness. They're afraid to talk about tax fairness because their changes are not fair. They are not fair. They hit low- and

middle-income people hardest, and no amount of talk about the airy-fairy proposals for tax reform in any way blunt the hard facts of the application of this flat tax as it hits people with low and middle incomes, as it hits people with families who used to be able to have deductions and don't have them on the flat tax.

And they certainly have not aimed their guns at the resource companies. Oh, no. We have just, Mr. Speaker, passed certain resolutions which say that out of the Heritage Fund in this year we are going to get less money for general revenue than we got last year. Last year the minister was able to take the amount he put in the blue book plus \$100 million. This year he's going to take less. Why is he taking less out of the Heritage Fund? Because there's less there. Notwithstanding the fact that oil production is going up, that other resources are being produced in substantial quantities, he's taking less money out of the Heritage Fund this year than last — less money because the money isn't there.

We have seen, under the guidance of the current Minister of Finance, his take from oil decline from . . . During his first year he got about 42 cents on the dollar of oil . . . value of oil production. In this budget it's going to turn out to be less than 27 cents. He got 42. And this is not talking about some days of NDP administration. We're talking about this government, this minister, in his first year getting well over 40 cents on the dollar, now down to 27 cents.

Is there any wonder there isn't money in the Heritage Fund? Is there any wonder? Is there any wonder that we're actually going to get fewer dollars out of the Heritage Fund in this current year we're in than we did in the year ended on March 31, 1985?

Those are hard facts, Mr. Speaker. And I know members opposite would like to think they weren't, but they are hard facts. And that is the program, that is the spending priorities of this government as set out in the budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party has a different view of priorities. We believe that money should be raised for public purposes, but that more money should come from resource revenues. Yes, indeed we do. We believe that interprovincial truckers should pay more, while retaining reductions on fuel taxes for Saskatchewan people. We see no reason why interprovincial truckers should have the free use of our highways.

We believe that used vehicles should not be taxed. We believe that the flat tax as currently structured by the minister is grossly unfair. Certainly we favour an income tax with a graduated scale, and with many fewer deductions and exemptions than now exist. And we therefore agree with some of the ideas that are propounded and called a flat tax, but not the minister's flat tax, which leaves almost all the loopholes in place and hammers the exemptions that people had for dependent wives, children, charitable donations, and the rest.

We believe there should be relief for property taxpayers. We don't believe that all the costs of schools should be paid out of property taxes. We've never said that, and we do not. But we favour a greater share of school costs being borne by taxes better related to ability to pay than are property taxes. That's the position of the New Democratic Party.

We believe that that combination of school taxes and property tax rebates, combination of property taxes and school tax rebates, which that combination was far higher than at any time in the past, and far higher than it will be this year, far higher than it will be this year, is a better way to go. We think that the removal of the property tax rebates makes our tax system more regressive.

(1745)

With respect to farmers, we believe that benefits to farmers should be continued, and my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, has outlined on other occasions our basic

farm policy, and I'm not going to take the time of this House to do it again on this occasion.

We believe that the time has come for Sask Tel to look at a better grade of service to farmers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now that . . . Well, and members opposite say, why didn't, why didn't. Mr. Speaker, if there is a single member opposite there who doesn't know the grade of telephone service has increased absolutely astronomically in terms of the quality of service rendered, because of the assimilation of rural telephone companies, I don't know where they've been. They ought to go around rural Saskatchewan and know what's happening.

They also ought to know . . . They also ought to know that a microwave system, that a fibre optic system has been installed and that, Mr. Speaker, has taken fibre optic service to more than 50 communities. The next step is called to be taken. The next step must now be taken. We have rural telephone companies assimilated during the 1970s. We have a fibre optic system being built in the late '70s and the early '80s. The time is now to install further equipment so that farmers may be able to use electronic equipment, computers, and the rest, in the operation of their business enterprises. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the next step that ought to be taken.

When we turn, Mr. Speaker, to the federal budget, we believe that the government opposite should be speaking up for Saskatchewan. We adamantly opposed de-indexing of senior citizens' pensions as proposed in the Mulroney budget, and we say this, Mr. Speaker, that the government opposite should be considering this position very carefully. Because if Mr. Mulroney proceeds to de-index all OAS pensions, as is provided for in the budget, then the Government of Saskatchewan should step in — should step in to provide for some additional support for moderate-income senior citizens.

As a first instance, they should unquestionably — unquestionably talk to their colleagues at Ottawa to see if this retrograde step cannot be aborted. We think it can be. We think if they would stand beside the Premier of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, if they would stand beside the Progressive Conservative Party in Manitoba, we wouldn't have to talk about spending provincial government money to shelter moderate income seniors from de-indexing. But that should be done, Mr. Speaker, if the government opposite is not prepared to stand up for us at Ottawa.

Now I turn to health care, Mr. Speaker, and I review what's in this budget on health care. And I say this, Mr. Speaker. I have talked to many, many people who work in hospitals. And at a minimum I say this, that the budget should provide for additional funds for staff in hospitals, major base hospitals and perhaps other hospitals that are under stress. We should be putting an end to this do-it-yourself hospital care which is becoming all too common in our hospitals.

And I want to say something about the financing of the capital cost of hospitals. There was a day when the financing of the capital cost of hospitals was thought to be something which governments should provide. But what are we being faced with? What are we being faced with? We have volunteers being asked to run raffles. I have out at the Plains hospital here in Regina the senior hospital staff running raffles in order to buy equipment for a base hospital.

We obviously need volunteers. We obviously need to encourage the volunteer sector. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that volunteers should be engaging in patient contact, but also should be engaging in getting equipment that are extras, getting equipment which is in some sense experimental, and not out there sweating it out buying the base equipment which should be provided by any government which claims to have a concern for the health of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to talk about education and about the quality of education. And our aim must be to increase the quality of education. And the aim must be to reduce the adverse movement of the pupil-teacher ratio which we have seen in each year since this government came to office. I hope we will reverse it. I hope they have now learned that you cannot improve

health care and you cannot improve educational services by socking nurses and socking teachers.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can talk about increasing the quality of education unless in some instance we increase the number of teachers. But not I every case. But I say to you that where there are students with special needs, we need more teachers than we now have in some schools. And this isn't a matter only for students with special needs.

When, Mr. Speaker, students with special needs don't have enough teachers, it affects all of the students in the school. And we have seen in each year that this government has been in office, an adverse change in the pupil-teacher ratio. The number of teachers per hundred students has gone down. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope we're going to reverse that; but certainly New Democrats believe it ought to be reversed.

When I come to teachers' salaries I say this, Mr. Speaker: teachers don't ask for much. They just ask for recognition that when others are getting increases, so should they be considered. They don't mind joining in the general restraint. Teachers are not asking that they be exempted from bearing the burden of restraint; they're not asking that. But they do say this: they do say that they do not wish to see the teaching profession downgraded.

And when other professions, the public service and others, are getting regular increases, teachers should at least be considered. And when politicians and public servants and physicians are getting money out of this budget, how come there is nothing for teachers? How come there is nothing for teachers?

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to jobs, and I won't say a great deal about jobs. all I want to say is that the obligation of the Government of Saskatchewan today is to hold out to young people the opportunity to get a job, to hold out the possibility that they will be able to contribute their talents to this community and thereby enrich their own lives.

And they don't see it in this budget, Mr. Speaker. They don't see that encouragement; they don't view the world with the confidence they should, that they can get a job and contribute.

And I talk about farmers. All I say, my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, has outlined or farm policy. All I can say is that if any farmer looking at this budget can believe that the government opposite is prepared to step in and help that farmer when he's in trouble, they will not find it. They will not find the basis for that belief in the budget.

No, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and give a good number of other comments about that budget. But I will conclude in this way. The budget before us in this Appropriation Act is a bad budget. It's the biggest and most unfair tax increase in the history of Saskatchewan. It's a bloated budget — a bloated budget spending \$9.5 million a day — \$9.5 million a day, and yet having not enough money for many, many basic services.

It's another deficit budget — a deficit which does little or nothing for jobs and farmers and small-business people and ordinary families — a budget which has already been retreated from, a budget which will be \$50 million short the day we voted.

In a few minutes I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance will stand up in his place and he will trumpet his theme defence of this budget. He will try to persuade us of its virtues. All I can say is that he will not convince us and I doubt very much whether he'll convince any of his colleagues. He will not convince wither of us on this side, or his colleagues on that side of the House that he's putting a good budget forward.

But it doesn't matter, Mr. Speaker, because the ultimate audience is the people of Saskatchewan. They are going to judge this budget. They are going to judge this budget. I don't believe members opposite want them to judge this budget. If they had confidence that the people of

Saskatchewan would accept this budget, they would call for a general election now . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — And I say we will not have a general election now. And I say that they will not wish to test this budget on the people of Saskatchewan because it would be met with a resounding rejection. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It's my duty to inform the Assembly that the minister is about to exercise his right to close debate, and thereafter all members will be precluded from speaking.

If any member wishes to speak, let him do so now.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we just experienced from the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, was the following. He started out by talking about what kind of money is coming this year from the Heritage Fund.

For the last three years he has been trumpeting out that myth to people that somehow when he left office the Heritage Fund was jammed with money, boiling over with money — and nothing there. There was nothing there, Mr. Speaker. There was nothing there.

The second argument he advances, Mr. Speaker, is this: that somehow the oil policy is not working in the province. He doesn't indicate though, Mr. Speaker, that \$200 million more is coming into the treasury of the people of Saskatchewan for education and health care and policing costs and whatever. He doesn't say that. He doesn't say the number of new jobs. He doesn't say the number of new activities. He doesn't indicate the success that has been experienced in the oil industry in this province. We don't hear that.

What we hear, Mr. Speaker, is the same thing that we've heard from the eight members opposite since 1982. We hear the same thing. Always, Mr. Speaker: what am I against? The Leader of the Opposition says nothing more than, what am I against, not what I am for. The people of Saskatchewan ask their politicians to say what are they for. What do you stand for? Where are your new ideas?

The second thing that you see in the members opposite is the same rhetoric about gloom and doom. No matter what happens, Mr. Speaker, the sky is falling in. It's gloom and it's doom. The people of Saskatchewan do not accept that. Saskatchewan people are not gloom and doom people, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan people are vibrant; Saskatchewan people have hope; Saskatchewan people have excitement; Saskatchewan people look forward. They have since time began, Mr. Speaker, and they're not about to change because the members opposite preach doom and gloom in this Assembly every day.

What we undertook with this budget, Mr. Speaker, was four main areas that we call the four corner-stones upon which we must build. Number one corner-stone, Mr. Speaker, was the question of unemployment. And prior to coming into this Assembly, prior to coming into this budget, there was concern. Or members were out and we talked to the people, and the concern they advanced to us was the question of unemployment — the question of unemployment, Mr. Speaker.

(1800)

And we responded to unemployment, Mr. Speaker, with unprecedented action — unprecedented action, Mr. Speaker — \$600 million. And \$600 million, Mr. Speaker, not to build a new building here or not to build another Crown corporation, but we relied, Mr. Speaker, on the

small-business sector of this province working in conjunction with governments, creating jobs, thousands and thousands of new jobs. the province of Saskatchewan has consistently, and consistently leads the nation in creating new jobs. Nobody can match the record of this government, and that is evident, Mr. Speaker, by this fact.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — It is evidenced by this fact, Mr. Speaker, that not once in this session, not once since the 10th of April, have the members opposite rose in question period and posed a question to this government on the record of employment creation. Not once did they stand in their place and raise a question of unemployment. That tells me, Mr. Speaker, either they're not interested of the Government of Saskatchewan is doing a proper job, and a valid job, and the best job in this country, creating jobs for the young people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Our second approach, Mr. Speaker, was we had to deal with the question . . . we had to deal with the question, Mr. Speaker, of health care. And the budget this year I health care is well over \$1 billion.

And what do the members opposite do? One day in estimates — one day out of 60 — to talk about the expenditure of a billion dollars to health care. What's that tell you, Mr. Speaker? And how many questions did they advance in question period about health care? None, Mr. Chairman. None, Mr. Speaker. No questions were advanced.

And there was a very significant thing besides the budget and health care. My colleague, the Minister of Health, this year, through negotiations, through compromise. Through getting along, eliminated the extra billing that took place in this province since 1962 — something the members opposite talked about; something the members opposite could never do, Mr. Speaker.

The number three item that we went after, Mr. Speaker, is the question of education. And nobody in this country can compare to the commitment that this government made to education — \$400 million additional into education. And talk to the universities. Ask them. And they say that is what we have been asking for for years and years and years; five years of commitment, five years of knowing where they're going — proper dollars, Mr. Speaker, that we can bring in the new programs, the new approaches in our universities; to once again restore that very, very important institution of any society — the institution of higher learning — to a place that properly deserves to be a place where our forefathers put it, that was allowed to deteriorate under 11 years of the Blakeney government.

Mr. Speaker, besides that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I would caution the member to refer to other members by their constituency or their position.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — With regard to the expenditures, Mr. Speaker, for K to 12 in education, \$275 million, part of that used to lower the property taxes, larger grants to school boards. But also more important one, and that is new dollars to education to build quality education for our children. That will build us jobs in the future. But that will give our children that little edge, that necessary advantage that they need in the future.

Mr. Speaker, for agriculture . . . And I can go on for agriculture. A few hundred million dollars additional money into agriculture, on top of the many programs that we advanced. What we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about, not is the status quo that they would have us believe, but change. In 1982, the people of this province voted for change, Mr. Speaker. And in the last three years that's what this government has been about.



Welfare reform — they were against. Reform to agriculture — they were against it. Tax reform — they were against it. Crown corporation reform — they are against that. Reform to education — they don't want to see that. Smaller government rather than larger government — that's what the people asked for.

Mr. Speaker, a shift to using the private sector as not a dirty word, but as a partner with business and government and everybody else for the betterment and the general good of our society, and a different approach to federal-provincial relations, where it's not a gun battle every day between the two levels of government, and people didn't want that.

People, Mr. Speaker, want to go forward; they do not want to go backwards. People are not in favour of the *status quo*; people do not want doom and gloom, Mr. Speaker. But that is what the debate is about, Mr. Speaker. What the debate has been in this Assembly is: should we and can we go back to yesterday? And that is the policies of the NDP — doom and gloom and yesterday's policies, and *status quo* and don't change.

First is the policy, Mr. Speaker, of forward looking, of reform, of new ideas. That is what the people want, Mr. Speaker. And let me close by simply saying this: the members will get their early . . . (inaudible) . . . What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is what I witnessed in this House last night.

In 1982 the members opposite in this grand and bold and arrogant was says, we're gong to sweep this province one more time. And I remember then in the House here, saying, where is this invisible man — this leader of yours? Where is he? Where can we find him?

Well in April of 1982, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province, the now Premier of this province, showed what he really was. But in the House last night, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly last night, the Premier of this province showed it one more time, Mr. Speaker, showed it one more time.

And what he did — the Premier of Saskatchewan, last night, Mr. Speaker, showed the country and showed the province that he is a better man than the Leader of the Opposition. He whipped him, Mr. Speaker — whipped him good.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — he whipped him, Mr. Speaker, like I have never seen a leader in this Assembly ever been whipped before. And they quit, Mr. Speaker. And they quit, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what this is all about is: do we want dynamic, youthful leadership looking forward with new ideas towards tomorrow, or do we want old leadership looking back to yesterday, looking for excuses, wanting the *status quo*? That's what we're about, Mr. Speaker. That's what this budget is about. That's what this Assembly is about. I have confidence in the people of this province that they want to go forward with excitement and with youth, and when they are given that opportunity, they will resoundingly say, we want the Premier back another term.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 32**

Muller  
Baker  
Hampton

Birkbeck  
Dirks  
Gerich

McLeod  
Dutchak  
Boutin

Andrew	Lane	Taylor
Duncan	Katzman	Hardy
Garner	Smith (Swift Current)	Martens
Young	Petersen	Smith (Moose Jaw)
Myers	Rybchuk	Tusa
Meagher	Glauser	Zazelenchuk
Johnson	Swenson	Morin

**NAYS — 7**

Blakeney	Engel	Lingenfelter
Koskie	Lusney	Shillington
Yew		

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

**ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS**

At 6:13 His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

(1815)

Bill No. 67 — An Act to amend The Motor Dealers Act

Bill No. 72 — An Act respecting the provision of Financial and Other Assistance to Urban Municipalities and Hamlets for Capital Works Projects

Bill No. 85 — An Act respecting Film and Video Classification

Bill No. 91 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984 (No. 2)

Bill No. 95 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 104 — An Act respecting Rebates to Senior Citizens

Bill No. 79 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act

Bill No. 87 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan medical Care Insurance Act

Bill No. 111 — An Act to amend the Statute Law to enable Urban, Rural, and Northern Municipalities to Broadcast Radio and Television Signals

Bill No. 81 — An Act to amend The ?Workers' Compensation Act, 1979

Bill No. 106 — An Act for the Protection of the Health of Persons exposed to Radiation and for the Safety of Persons in Connection with the Operation and Use of Radiation Producing Equipment and Associated Apparatus

Bill No. 112 — An Act respecting Liens in the Construction Industry

Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act

Bill No. 86 — An Act respecting Mental Health Services

Bill No. 105 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act

Bill No. 113 — An Act respecting Facilities that Provide Certain Residential Services

Bill No. 49 — An Act respecting Interest prior to Judgement

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act

Bill No. 83 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act

Bill No. 94 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act

Bill No. 100 — An Act to Facilitate the Enforcement of Maintenance Orders and to Establish the Maintenance Enforcement Office

Bill No. 103 — An Act to repeal Certain Acts respecting the Payment of Grants or Rebates of Property Taxes

Bill No. 109 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act

Bill No. 114 — An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years ending respectively on March 31, 1985 and on March 1986

His honour retired from the Chamber at 6:18 p.m.

## MOTIONS

### House Adjournment

**HON. MR. MCLEOD:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, just prior to the motion for adjournment I would just like to say I wish you and all the members of the . . . the Clerk and members of the Clerk's staff, the press gallery, and certainly all members of the Legislative Assembly, a good summer. I know we've had a good long time here. I believe it's the 65th sitting day. And I would just say to everyone, have a good summer.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave of the Assembly to move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Health, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley:

That when this Assembly adjourns at the end of this sitting day it shall stand adjourned to a date and time set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government, and that Mr. Speaker shall give each member seven clear days notice if possible by registered mail of such date and time.

I so move.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, just before we adjourn, I would like to join with the Acting House Leader for the government in wishing all members and yourself an enjoyable summer. I'm sure that members have had a relatively long session — 65 days, I think the member for Meadow Lake has stated.

I think a productive session, and I think, particularly I speak for the members of the opposition, but I do want to say to the members opposite that I hope they and their families have a bit of a rest before they get back to the routines. And also to the press and to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the staff of the Assembly, have a good summer. We look forward to being back in the fall.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:21 p.m.