

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Johnson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great pleasure for me this morning to introduce a school from Bredenbury, Saskatchewan. They're grades 7, 8's, and 9's. They are seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker.

Bredenbury is on No. 6 Highway in the Yellowhead, over east of Yorkton, between Yorkton and Langenburg. They're visiting Regina today and I wish to inform them that I'll meet with them for a chat afterwards in 218, and we'll have some questions and some drinks.

Welcome to Regina. We hope that you enjoy your stay in Regina and enjoy the proceedings in the legislature this morning, and I'll see you after question period. So I'll ask all members to please join me in welcoming these students to Regina. Their teacher, Charlotte Thies, is with them, along with their . . . and Rob Wilson, and bus driver, Ian Ziprick.

So if we would welcome them in the usual manner. thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Collective Bargaining for Technical Institute and Regional College Employees

Mr. Shillington: — My question is to the Minister of Labour who has arrived, although somewhat belatedly. It deals with the . . . He is just taking his seat, so I'll give him a moment to collect his thoughts.

It deals, Mr. Speaker, with the government's latest attack on working people in this province. Specifically, it deals with the arbitrary decision of your government to deny 1,500 employees of the newly centralized technical institute and regional colleges their rights onto existing contracts and collective agreements.

With the stroke of a pen, Mr. Minister, your government has unilaterally brought to an end their collective agreement. It has wiped out people's seniority rights. You've denied their right to continue to belong to the union, and you've even gone so far as to define what is an appropriate bargaining unit in the centralized institute.

Mr. Minister, how does your government justify this naked abuse of power in its ongoing attack on working people in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, there are several points here, and I'm not going to answer the question fully and I'll give you the reason why. But first of all, we have denied nothing. The workers have a choice to choose

which union they want to represent them, and there's no major change here.

We are talking here about an educational institution and they have a choice. I won't answer the question any further, Mr. Speaker, because the member opposite knows the Bill is before the House. The question is out of order; we cannot raise a point of order during question period, but he knows the question is out of order and he can raise those points in debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Well I thank the minister for that, although it was enlightening neither with respect to the section 3 nor with respect to rules of the House. You're wrong on both points, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. speaker. Mr. Minister, you not only wiped out their membership in the union, you also terminated their collective agreement. So you did take something away from them, something that they have bargained for over many, many years.

Mr. Minister, last spring with 36,000 people unemployed you terminated the employment of 2,000 people and then were boorish and insensitive enough to run around the province bragging about it. That's the kind of commitment that you've shown to working people, and the polls suggest that the people are getting kind of tired of it. What I want to know, Mr. Minister, is why your government decided unilaterally and arbitrarily to deny all the employees of the centralized technical institute and the regional colleges the rights that they've bargained for over many, many years in the collective agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, we are talking here about a new educational institution, and the employees will be retained at that educational institution and will have a choice whether they wish to be represented by their existing union, any other union they wish to form, or a faculty association if they so choose. They have those choices. I don't know what is radical or undemocratic about choice. There is nothing radical or undemocratic about people having a choice. They can still be members of whichever union they wish. Anyone in this province can join any union. This has absolutely nothing to do with their union membership. What it has to do with is who is the bargaining agent for the employees, and that they will have to determine for themselves.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Three years ago . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Is it a supplementary or a new question?

Mr. Shillington: — It's a new question.

Mr. Speaker: — New question.

Mr. Shillington: — Three years ago, Mr. Minister, another member of the cabinet to which you belong gave people the option of transferring to the private sector. Now you're giving them the choice of renegotiating a contract which they have bargained for over many years.

I want to know, Mr. Minister, if anyone in your government had the courage to attempt to justify this to the executive of the union who are the democratically elected representatives of those employees? Did you have to the courage to justify it to them?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Speaker, his question is contradictory. He said they had lost their membership, and then he tells us that they still have an executive. It sounds to me like they still have an executive; they still have membership; they still have a union, and that they still have jobs, and that this province has a new educational institution. It seems to me that they can now bargain the details of their working conditions and how this educational institution is going to be operated. It also seems to me that the faculty can decide whether they wish to have a faculty association or SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees Union) or CUPE (Canadian Union of Public Employees) or the postal workers' union, or any union they choose they can have them. That's up to them.

Now you want us to maintain a law that forces them to take a union that they already have. They can decide for themselves.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. The purpose, Mr. Minister, behind this section is rather clearly set out in a memorandum with respect to the privatization of the corrections institutes and turning them into Crown corporations. Mr. Minister, and I quote from document, from a letter from an internal memo from McPhail to Terry Thompson, sets out the implications with respect to labour relations of the privatization of the corrections institutes and says, as one of the advantages:

It may allow the new employer to make important changes to working conditions and work rules.

Mr. Minister, do you deny that this arbitrary action taken by your government with respect to employees at the technical institute is going to be repeated every time you privatize something or transfer something to the private sector or into a Crown corporation, that the people who are going to pay most for it are the employees who will lose all of their rights which they've bargained for and won.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — With regard, Mr. Speaker, to any review of the correctional system and whether or not the correctional system should be moved to a Crown corporation, that matter is being reviewed, Mr. Speaker. There are other advantages in ability to finance new

correctional institutions in the province of Saskatchewan through a Crown corporation. So, yes, it is being looked at.

Secondly, the hon. member will have the following assurance from this government, that upon the privatization he will have the ability to vote in this Assembly on each privatization; he will be able to ask questions during the debate as to the privatization; and he'll be able to stand up before the people of this province and tell the people of this province . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Mr. Minister, under the legislation that was brought down yesterday, will you not acknowledge that for the first time employees in this province who were unionized are going to be arbitrarily told now that they can be switched from one bargaining unit to another; if they choose to unionize again, that their certification orders are being arbitrarily taken away from them; that you are in effect rewriting the rules of labour in this province under the auspices of an education Bill; that you're changing The Trade Union Act under the auspices of an education Bill in this province. Will you acknowledge that that's what you're doing?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, in deference to your rulings of yesterday, I will be as polite as possible and point out that the member opposite is mistaken. The same type of Bill was used, and the same type of situation took place when we changed the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation and Saskoil. And the employees were treated fairly, and they made their choice as to which union they wished to have representing them. There's nothing novel about this.

So the member opposite is mistaken, and I'm pleased to correct him on that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — New question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, a contract is a contract. It used to be that the word of the government of the day used to be its bond. This government, your government, has broken its word. This government has arbitrarily broken an agreement which it agreed to with this action. I ask you, who is going to be next? Can anyone rely on this government to keep its word?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, one thing that's come through loud and clear on this \$90,000 a day Legislative Assembly session is the inability of the public to believe any of the facts being misrepresented on a daily basis by the members opposite who are so bankrupt of questions that they are simply repeating, Mr. Speaker, repeating questions from last June and throwing out spurious false accusations, false information, Mr. Speaker. I think, Mr.

Speaker, that's what's become evident in this Assembly, and the members of the press know it.

To the hon. member opposite, the hon. member knows full well that the members of the union will have the right to make their choice once this new educational institution is established, Mr. Speaker. You can vote against this new educational institution; you can vote against the change; you have to right to do that. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that both parties, the government and the opposition, will be judged which is the best for the people of this province — a new educational system or the old ways of the New Democratic Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Status of Manager of STC

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible to the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, and of course it deals with the status of STC's transportation manage, one Rick Millar.

Mr. Minister, last Friday you were unable to tell us in this House and to tell the taxpayers whether this senior executive was still employed by STC or not. And yet just this Wednesday of this week you told the news media that Mr. Millar had been dismissed last Wednesday. Was Mr. Millar dismissed with cause?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I will confirm that Mr. Millar is no longer with the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. Mr. Millar was relieved of his duties. I believe the date was Wednesday, September 23, and I would say that it was with cause the he was relieved of his duties.

Free Trade Discussions

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question will be for the Deputy Premier, and it has to do with the free trade discussions with the United States.

Mr. Deputy Premier, yesterday after question period the Premier was quoted as saying that he would be going to a meeting in Ottawa today, prepared to accept a trade deal with the United States that is "less than perfect."

By the time this House meets again on Monday, the whole thing may be over and done with, and therefore I would want to ask the Deputy Premier today, in relation to that first ministers' meeting that is taking place virtually at this very moment in Ottawa: was the Premier quoted accurately yesterday in the news reports about what he said after question period? And if so, what does your government regard as "acceptable" but "less than perfect"?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on as to whether the quote was accurate or not.

I do know that the quote that I saw was words to the effect that it would take a great deal of courage to support a deal that was economically correct but less than perfect politically. And that was the quote that I heard, and so that one I cannot deny.

As it relates to the meetings going on this very moment, I suspect that the hon. member is right — those meetings are going on at this moment. And I expect that once those meetings are concluded, we will receive a communication from the Premier or his staff spelling out to us what is going on in that particular discussion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Speaker, in those discussions — because these may well be the final hours of the talks going on with the United States — can the Deputy Premier indicate whether or not the Premier of Saskatchewan will be giving in or giving away anything with respect to dispute settlements, agriculture, or regional development? And could he specifically say if there is any risk that these discussions with the United States, now in their final stage, could hold up or derail a plan to make a deficiency payment to grain farmers in Saskatchewan for 1987. Is there any risk of that whatsoever?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Number one, Mr. Speaker, to answer in reverse order, I don't see how this would impact on a deficiency payment. And we've already talked on more than one occasion about the unanimous consent across the country for the need for a deficiency payment.

As it relates to the earlier part of the question, what is the Premier prepared to give up, I think that he's made it very clear in this House on more than one occasion as to what the bottom line is for the Premier of this province and for the people of Saskatchewan. He's made that very clear.

As it relates to us here negotiating what may or may not be possible at these discussions, I think it's terribly inappropriate when the discussions are going on at this very moment in Washington and briefings going on at this very moment in Ottawa. And I think it's very inappropriate for us to be putting it on the Table here if, in fact, there is anything to be backed away from.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Increase in Licence and Registration Fees

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways. And, Mr. Minister, at a time that our economy is deteriorating and unemployment is increasing and rural families are hard pressed to make ends meet, I wonder why your government has decided to hit all Saskatchewan motorists with a huge increase in vehicle registration fees and double the cost of drivers' licences. You know that those increases took effect yesterday, or at least that's what your August 14 . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. It sounds like the hon. members is kind of getting into kind of a long preamble, and I know he doesn't want to do that.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — My question, Mr. Speaker: your August 14 news release said that those increases would take effect October 1, and I'm wondering if you can clear up the confusion for those of us that have a birthday in September and who had to end up paying the increase in

September already. What's happening here, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member well knows that the increases in drivers' licences fees, as well as the increases in vehicle registration fees, were part and parcel of the budget that was announced a good number of months ago. There was lots of opportunity for the hon. member to debate the issues during the budget.

Further to that, I can say that with respect to the implementation date of the vehicle registration fee increases and the drivers' licence fee increases, the date that they became effective was October 1.

I will certainly concede that to some members of the public it may have been somewhat confusing. You may well know that drivers' licences and vehicle registrations are sent out in advance of the actual effective date to give all the people an opportunity to buy their registrations a little earlier. But the actual date of implementation clearly, as stated, was October 1.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Confusing it is; certainly, and I would recommend to you some clarification in light of future increases.

I wonder if the minister can assure the motoring public in Saskatchewan that all those increases which have gone into effect that the additional net revenues from that will in fact go to help repair the highways in this province which are in a sorry state.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that the funds raised by these measures go into the general Consolidated Fund. You well know that with these increases in revenues to the general fund, that there will be more moneys available for all departments to draw on. And if you want to enter into a debate as to the condition of our highways, I am very certain that the hon. member, during the estimates of Highways and Transportation, will have all sorts of opportunities to intensely question me requesting the highways in this province.

Errors in Saskatoon Telephone Directory

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, in Crown corporations last week you told us, Mr. Minister, that ... I'm sorry. It's a question to the Minister of Finance. I said that, but it may not have been heard — to the minister in charge of SaskTel.

Mr. Minister, in Crown corporations you told us the number of errors in the Saskatoon telephone director had been definitively fixed at 127. Mr. Minister, the number is now 300 and still climbing — another one of your finely honed arithmetic calculations, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you've proved you can't

run a corner grocery store or administer a three-house paper route, much less something as complex as a telephone book.

My question, Mr. Minister, is: will you confirm that the known errors in the new Saskatoon telephone directory have now passed 300? And what corrective action do you intend to take to assist businesses, churches, and individuals, professional people, who have been very seriously injured by these errors and omissions?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, when the hon. members asks a question about running things, I think I recall that it was that hon. members who was dropped from cabinet by the New Democratic government because he insisted on putting television sets on the ski-doo's for the trappers of northern Saskatchewan and spending \$30,000 to repair a grandfather clock in his office, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — When the hon. members wants to talk about running things, I suggest that his record is there for the public to look at.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated at the time of the Crown Corporations Committee ...

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I know the hon. member doesn't want to hear about being dumped from the cabinet, but if the hon. member would pay attention, at the date of the time of the Crown corporations meeting that was the information as to the number of errors in the Saskatoon directory that they had at that time. There have been others, Mr. Speaker.

I think it would be rather strange for any member of this Assembly, when you have the information as to the number of errors at the particular time that the question is asked, if there are subsequent ones coming to their attention that you would know those at the time. Mr. Speaker, I think that would be rather strange. And perhaps the now Leader of the Opposition was right when he dumped the member from cabinet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shillington: — I thank you, Mr. Minister, for that non-answer. Mr. Minister, the question is not whether or not you can count. You've given us the answer to that in vivid terms on different occasions.

The question, Mr. Minister, is: what are you going to do for the dentist who has a street-side practice who is left out entirely? And are we now starting the time when school children are going to dentists. What are you going to do for the doctor's office which was left out entirely; for St. Timothy's Church which was left out entirely, and for the other 300 people who are out of the telephone book? It's devastating for a business or for an institution such as St. Timothy's Church. Mr. Minister, what are you going to do for these people?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the misspelling of the hon. member from Riversdale's name didn't seem to cause a whole bunch of people to rush into a leadership campaign, so I'm not sure that that error impacted negatively on him.

But I suggest to the hon. member that we have already set out what we propose to do, that there are intercepts to get the correct information. We explained in Crown Corporations that the reason for the errors in Saskatoon — and they are serious, Mr. Speaker — is because of a transfer to a new computer system. It's the same printers that have been doing it for a number of years, and it's the transfer to the computer system. There will be an intercept.

If the problems remain serious for specific individuals — we indicated, as well, in Crown Corporations another example of the need to repeat answers, Mr. Speaker — that advertisements will be put in the newspaper outlet in Saskatoon as often as necessary to ensure that the public does know the correct numbers of those affected, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 48 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act.

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

Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Change of Name Act.

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

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Hospital Standards Act.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order, please. All members will receive adequate opportunity to debate the Bill. I would ask them to co-operate in keeping quiet while the Speaker is on his feet.

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

MOTIONS

House Sitting Hours

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Before orders of the day, by leave

of the Assembly, I would like to move a couple of motions: one dealing with change in sitting hours relative to the Thanksgiving weekend, and the other one dealing with estimates and supplementary estimates for the Legislative Assembly.

First one I will move, Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, seconded by the Minister for Consumer Affairs.

That notwithstanding rule 3 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*, that when this Assembly adjourns on Friday, October 9, 1987, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, October 13, 1987.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Estimates for Legislative Assembly referred to Standing Committee on Estimates

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer Affairs:

That the *Estimates* and *Supplementary Estimates* for the Legislative Assembly, being subvotes 1-3, 5-7, 17, 20-23, and 26 of vote 21, be withdrawn from the Committee of Finance and referred to the Standing Committee on Estimates.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Speaker: — Excuse me, before we proceed I would like to take this opportunity to table a special report by the Provincial Auditor to the Legislative Assembly, dated September 30, 1987.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 45

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last night we just nicely got into our opening remarks and the rebuttal. And just to refresh your member, Mr. Minister, last night I spoke of the need for renewed and reinvigorated department of co-ops. And I spoke about how the department of co-op activities should be geared towards active promotion and development of new co-operatives in Saskatchewan.

I outlined many types of co-operative enterprises that we

should be entering into. I'll just cite a few examples to bring you back onstream; worker co-ops to help the huge unemployment lines that we have in Saskatchewan, and there's great hope for many, many jobs to be created in that one area alone. I spoke of co-op farms; I spoke of machinery co-ops; I spoke of harvesting co-ops; day-care co-ops, and I also spoke of things as small as the snow-plough co-op, pointing out that the need has never been greater than it is today for co-op organization.

And I outlined, Mr. Minister, some of the devastation that I see to the once proud department of co-ops. I will discuss that devastation further in the estimates as we get to specific questions, so I'm not going to dwell on that right now.

But in your rebuttal you spoke of the strength and the resilience of the co-operative spirit, and it is indeed a spirit that is resilient and it is hard to kill because that's the very core of the spirit of the CCF. That co-op spirit, Mr. Minister, continues today, no thanks to you.

In your rebuttal you also mentioned that you had had a meeting with the major co-operatives, I believe you said at the Regina Inn.

An Hon. Member: — No, the Sask Hotel.

Mr. Trew: — Hotel Saskatchewan. My apologies; I recalled the wrong hotel. I remember your remarks, but the wrong hotel.

I was somewhat amused to hear that because in the Tourism estimates I'd found out that you'd had two meetings with people regarding tourism. So now in the past . . . since October 20 you've had three meetings, two of them in Tourism and one in Co-ops. It's not a wildly active year, if I might say; the only thing you've been active at is slashing the department of co-ops budget, and I outlined some of the numbers that went down in that respect.

Minister, while the provincial government has gotten rid of the department of co-operation, the federal government has recently set up a new co-operatives secretariat, and it has a permanent executive director's office and a system of committees to provide links between co-operatives and federal government departments.

Why is this government abandoning co-operatives and the co-operative development at a time when the federal government has recognized it has huge significance for all Canadians, and indeed the federal government has made that a new priority, while in Saskatchewan we have apparently abandoned that? Will Saskatchewan be losing out in terms of funding for programs because of your untimely decision?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Certainly not, Mr. Speaker, and I think I should correct a couple of . . . or inform the member of a couple of initiatives here regarding the development and the work that is going on with co-ops within the Department of Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives.

You mentioned about employee co-ops, and I just draw to your attention that already in this year of April to August, and that's the statistic I have before me, there's been formed two such co-ops, two employee co-ops, and we have a person in the Saskatoon office that is working actively with groups who would like to start those types of co-ops. And I could say that's an improvement over last year where there were no employee co-ops formed.

Also I think it is wrong to indicate that there isn't the emphasis on co-ops. In fact, as I stated to you last night, through the business resource centres I believe there is even an increasing emphasis at the grass roots upon co-op movement and co-op development. Regarding the meeting with the chief executive officers of the co-ops of Saskatchewan, it's true I met with them in May, as I told you, at the Saskatchewan Hotel. The other two meetings I was telling you about were large, grass roots consultation meetings, and not just on tourism.

In those meetings — and perhaps I should explain those to you for a moment, that all my CEOs accompany me to those meetings and all the areas that I'm responsible for. Now I'll give you an example of how these meetings take place so you'll see that co-ops are not down-played in them at all. At those meetings there are Mr. Otto Cutts, who is the president of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, and of course under that falls the Buy Saskatchewan program, and I do take my second-line administrators there too. In that case it's a man by the name of Mr. Dennis Wieler.

The people from Tourism and the questions on tourism and on small business and co-ops are headed up by Mr. Ken McNabb, my acting deputy minister. So the co-op input is there.

Also at these ones is Mr. Price, from Sedco, because people are wondering about opportunities for financing and so on in businesses, as well as Mr. Urness, who heads up the Liquor Board. So on these consultation workshops that we have, all the CEOs for the areas of economic development that I am responsible for in this government accompany me to these meetings. So there would be a component there for co-ops. If there are any co-op questions come up, I will answer them, or Mr. McNabb would be more than willing to do that.

Further to that, though, I have . . . I will be meeting — I believe it's scheduled for next month — with the second round of meetings with the CEOs (chief executive officers) of the major co-ops in Saskatchewan, as well as some meetings with the credit union movement.

So I think to indicate that there is not an emphasis upon co-ops, under the new structure would be misleading, would be wrong. Certainly we have dialogue ongoing, and as I said to you yesterday, co-ops from some of the largest companies in our province, in Saskatchewan. And Saskatchewan has a tradition of co-op development, and if people in whatever walk of life they may be in, be they employees, be they feeders — and I think we had this year already 16 feeder co-ops start, and I'm glad to see that because obviously that indicates that the red meat industry in this province is thriving.

If people are coming together to develop further value-added processing and value-added aspects of agriculture — what the Premier's been talking about for the last five years — obviously some of these people are choosing to do it in the co-op fashion, and that's fine, well, and good, and I'm glad to see that kind of development take place.

Further, I should just for — this is for your information — indicate that we do, through our people in the portion of co-ops within my department, have ongoing dialogue and discussion. And I have a paper here that shows — it's called "Inter and Intra Government Committees," — and there's a large number of them, and I won't take the time of the House to read them all out. But just to give you a few, for example: Co-op Housing Association of Saskatchewan, the Indian and Native Affairs committee, PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration), and Soil Conservation committee, Department of Agriculture — well some of those are added, but there's other ones here — centre for co-op studies and Co-op College of Canada. So there is a large number of ongoing consultations between co-op movements and my department that are ongoing at any time. If you would like this list, I'd be more than pleased to give it to you.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Minister. I may find that list of some value, and I would appreciate it if you would send it across at your convenience. What I garnered from your remarks is that co-ops are discussed in the same breath as liquor and tourism, and you listed two or three or maybe more other areas than meetings.

(1045)

Indeed, if that's the thrust of co-operative development in this province, I suggest to you, sir, that the co-op movement is being served a great injustice by your government because co-ops do not deserve to be part of things like a discussion on liquor. I just fail to see any connection there whatsoever other than some co-op members and indeed some of the board of directors and employees of co-ops perhaps drink some liquor on occasion. They're no different than any other people, but that's the extent of the connection.

You mentioned the business resource centres, Mr. Minister, and I was really pleased to hear you mention those resource centres for the simple reason that much earlier in this session in question period, in response to a question I was asking you, you spoke in glowing terms about the business resource centres and how the co-operative movement, if you like, was being represented there. You spoke at that time about people coming in, investors from out of province, coming in, stopping at a business resource centre, and then seeing the co-op mode of doing business. And they could set up their business after the co-op method.

Well, Minister, that's absolutely absurd to even suggest that an investor is going to come into the province with . . . name the amount of money, but I'll use \$100,000 as a simple illustration — that amount could be anything. But if I'm an outside of the province investor and coming in, I am going to set up a sole proprietorship. I may look for a partnership, but it is highly unlikely that I would come

from Alberta or B.C. or Manitoba or Ontario and try and set a co-op with \$100,000 of my own money. I would set up certainly a business, as I say, a partnership, a corporation, but not a co-operative. The changes of that happening are so remote as to almost be ludicrous.

Minister, I asked you a question about funding and we losing it, and specifically us losing the funding because of the lack of co-operative development thrust by your government and because of the federal government's new initiatives in the co-operative area. And to be a little more specific, housing co-ops have been a thriving part of the co-operative milieu over the years. And I'm wondering, what are the numbers of new starts that you see coming and how many people have you got out actively promoting housing co-ops?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — As my officials are discussing this, I will just get up for a minute and indicate to you that I think you fail to understand or grasp what the consultation meetings are. As I said, I am responsible for a number of aspects of economic development in this province, and we take all those people out and discuss a myriad of problems. So to say that co-ops shouldn't be discussed in the same forum as changes and development in small businesses, changes and requirements for Sedco, or as changes in the distribution and the sale of liquor, just doesn't make sense. Those are the things I'm responsible for, so I go out and talk to the people to hear what they think should take place within these fields. So to try and say that somehow we're meshing liquor and co-ops together is drawing an extremely long bow and is certainly not very credible.

Your second statement about someone coming in from out of the province to the business resource centres, it may well be, it could be. How am I to know that some doesn't come into Saskatchewan to a business resource centre and say, look, I want to do this. I see an opportunity here. I don't have the capital to do exactly as much as I'd like to. And the solution or the idea that comes to him or is suggested is, maybe you should form a co-operative with some other people in this province who have the same ideas and hopes and aspirations.

So therefore there is a possibility that could happen. But more than likely is that there are people in our province, our own Saskatchewan people who are wanting to take part in some economic endeavour who will go to the business resource centre, find out the amount of capitalization that is necessary, look at the different kind of structures of how you could do this. And many of these people are not informed in this type of decision making, and it is shown to them that you can certainly go the individual proprietorship. There's partnerships, there's corporate structure, and there's co-operative structure.

And it may well be that the structure that that person sees fits his particular economic endeavour is the co-operative. I would cite, for example, the feeder co-ops. As you know, and I think you did come from a rural background, that the opportunity today with cattle prices looks quite good to get into the feeding and the finishing of cattle. But you know it's a rather large expenditure for an individual to undertake alone. To start a feedlot with the most modern ways of feeding takes

considerable amount of capital, let alone looking at stocking it with the feeder cattle.

So therefore a young person with that hope or aspiration may say, well look, I can't handle this all by myself. But there may have been five other guys in with the same type of desire and hope. Well it may well be that these fellows by coming together and pooling their resources and forming a co-operative are able to get this thing up and going. I think the figure of 16 feeder co-ops since April of this year indicates that that is exactly what is taking place in our province right now.

Mr. Trew: — Minister, we're getting very little — making very little progress in that area, so I'm going to switch, and perhaps we'll come back to that.

Mr. Minister, how many people were employed in the co-operation and co-operative development department at the beginning, and how many people were employed at the end of fiscal year '86-87?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, in answer to your question, I think you asked for the last fiscal year, and there were 59 positions at the beginning and at the end of the fiscal year. I think what you're really wanting to know is: what is the situation now, though? Yes.

So if you take 59 positions, 35 of those were transferred to my department and to Consumer Affairs. That's 35 over to the two departments. Of the number that I actively have today is 22 positions. I can't speak for Consumer Affairs; you'll have to ask the minister when her estimates come up as to the number that she has at this point in time, but 13 were transferred.

Mr. Trew: — You have 22 positions in your new department of Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives from the old co-op department? You have 22 positions? How many people have you assigned to the Co-operatives area alone, of those employees?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Of the 22 people, person-years, that I have now, I have one person-year in administration; I have two person-years in communication; I have one person-year in business information resources; I have 14 person-years in regional services; and I have four person-years in Co-operatives. The last one, I am told, is called co-operative development.

Mr. Trew: — Minister, how many people were in the co-op development part of the branch before the reorganization?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We will get you the exact number. This officials are indicating approximately seven or eight — let's take eight as a figure.

I should indicate to you, if you look down the figures I just gave you, on the 14 that I have in regional services, that is the trust that I'm putting in into co-operative development is to be, in my mind, more grass roots and more to people who may not be a co-op member or something of this nature. Those people will be going into business resource centres.

So I believe by doing that, by having people right out there on development and on policy, working right out of those business resource centres, that probably we will be able to touch more people who have not perhaps had the opportunity, shall I say, of seeing the benefits of the co-operative method of organizing for certain business practices — so if you take those 14 and see that is what we plan to do on phasing them into what one would say co-operative development.

Mr. Trew: — Minister, you've gone, taken you department from 59 people all the way down to 22 positions — it is a nearly one-third the size department relating directly to co-ops — and that's including, that's including the 14 regional services people you have that are also talking about small businesses, also talking a little bit about tourism, how to make things happen in those areas.

(1100)

So, Mr. Minister, you have reduced the work-force from the once proud department of co-ops — cut it, slashed it to less, for all practical purposes less than one-third what it was when you took over at the end of the past year. How in the world has that, such a drastic reduction of people, been achieved?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That's not, that's not correct, Mr. Member, in that there are 22 housed within my department of the original 59. There were 13 transferred to Consumer Affairs, so it isn't cut by a third, it's from 59 to 35. But let me illustrate to you and explain to you how I feel really we have, through this, brought in some dimensions to the co-ops that were not as easily accessed before. For example, all the expertise and all the data and the research that we have in the whole small business department which was once separated from the co-ops is now meshed together — complete access to all that research that is there in small business in Saskatchewan.

I cite, for example, as I did last night when we were talking about venture capital, that now because of the amalgamation we are seeing some of the retail co-ops in Saskatchewan actively pursuing the VCC (venture capital corporation) method of financing. And I believe that kind of thing has come about or been made easier because of the amalgamation of the departments.

Also, and you will have to speak to the other minister, but it is my belief and understanding that with some of the function in Consumer Affairs there's also going to be some benefit there also; that maybe before when it was isolated as one department, and as you know how . . . and I don't mean to be too critical here of governments and bureaucracies, but there is always a little more difficulty in annexing from one structure over to the other. When they are working together and in the same building and in the same . . . under the same administration — they aren't all in the same building yet, but under the same administration — you get that, what I would call, cross-pollination or transfer of knowledge or access, ease of access. And I think that's a benefit.

So just to go back on what we have been saying, that I don't think we can say that the amalgamation has weakened

the co-op movement at all, and I'm advised that most of the positions that were lost were mostly overlap in common administrative services. And I'm sure you would concur with me, as we look to try and streamline government and to spend the taxpayers' money as efficiently as possible, where we can have one administration doing what previously two administrative arms had done before, those are savings that can be recouped by the treasury.

So I think . . . I feel quite certain that what has taken place in co-ops, I believe, can even increase or further strengthen the amount of information that people wanting to form co-ops, people in existing co-ops, can access. I cite again the VCC as a case in point.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, I'm not at all happy with your statement that the Department of Consumer Affairs now is, you think may be, may be picking up some of the co-op function. You talk about a cross-pollination, and yet you're the minister responsible for co-operative development and co-operation, and you say maybe the Department of Consumer Affairs is picking up some of the work. So obviously you don't know. You don't have a cross-pollination. You have a loss of thrust for the co-operative movement, and I say that's a real crying shame.

You spoke, Minister, of the positions being saved as primarily in the administrative areas. Will you give me a list of positions? I don't need the names, but I need the positions before and after reorganization so that I can check that what you're saying is so. And it would help me perhaps, me or whoever the critic of this department is next year, in following up on this.

Minister, particularly at the management level, I want to know how the priorities and policies of the department are now being set. For example, is it co-op officials or is it tourism officials that are making the decision? And undoubtedly the reorganization has caused some problems; it simply has to have. How are you handling those problems?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Now to go back on these questions and to give you some more information. You asked us for a list of names, and we will concur with giving those to you.

You had asked about who is making the decisions regarding co-ops at this time. Well I guess it's the same as the decisions for Tourism, decisions for Small Business — it's myself and some of my head officials. Of course, Mr. McNabb, the acting deputy minister, would have a considerable amount of influence in that, as did Mr. Folstad, who had a long and lengthy experience prior to joining our government, with Federated Co-ops; and Mr. Vern Kaisler, who is the head of the co-ops in our department. Those are the people, along with myself, with input from discussions with people across Saskatchewan.

I just wanted to indicate to you a couple of interesting statistics I think you would be interested in. And that is that in 1984-85 there were 55 new co-ops started in this province; in 1985-86 there were 45 new co-operatives

started; in 1986-87 there were 76 new co-operatives; and in 1987-88 there are 31 new co-operatives to the end of August. So I think the development is going on quite well and at quite a good speed.

And also it's been brought to my attention that co-operative officials have advised us that with the new alignment and with having two ministers, that this government is very open and responsive to the unique needs of co-operative organizations, and I will go back to the venture capital corporations as an example of that.

Further to this, it might be interesting for you to know that we have looked at rural economic development corporations. My colleague, the Minister of Rural Affairs, has been out dialoguing a great deal with various municipalities across the province of Saskatchewan, encouraging them to form rural economic development corporations so that they can come together in a joint type of venture — jointly to attract new industry and perhaps to join together in the building of necessary type of facilities. I think it would be interesting for you to see that, of the three new . . . the first three new rural development corporations that have sprung up in Saskatchewan have all chosen to be co-operatives.

So I just want to indicate to you and to all members present that with the new alignment I believe — and I will be straight and forward with you — that I'm sure there was some concerns and some worries about, will co-ops be down-played? And I think, as I told the members at the meeting in May, I said, we will see the proof is in the eating of the pudding.

And I would think, from the statistics that I have provided to you today you will see that the development is ongoing, new co-ops are being formed, and that some of those in record numbers. And some of those perhaps fears or concerns are being allayed as both myself and my fellow minister, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, are actively trying to dialogue and meet with those who are the leaders of the co-op movement and those who are interested in the development of co-ops.

Mr. Trew: — Moving along, Mr. Minister. The advice and the supervision of the co-op department officers and the levels of services that used to be provided in Saskatchewan is what made our province, for all purposes, Canada's banner co-operative province. There's been an especially detrimental effect on the smaller, non-aligned co-ops. I'm specifically think of day care co-ops. I'm thinking of employment, community service co-operatives, and those sorts of things.

Mr. Minister, there's a number of socio-economic needs in Saskatchewan to which the co-operative movement really could respond in a very meaningful manner. It could address the problem of unemployment. It could take up the challenge of providing social security and lost public sector services to people. It could contribute to the industrialization and economic diversification of the region; and come to grips with the new social reality in Saskatchewan, that is, the ever-increasing number of divorced couples, single-parent families, and children outside the traditional family structure.

Why not reinforce some of these creative avenues of development rather than throwing your money at Peter Pocklington and Weyerhaeuser and the oil companies for very questionable returns and very, very expensive jobs, if any.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, I just want to assure you that the services that were previously there for co-ops . . . and I agree that co-ops have been a part of the development of the province of Saskatchewan. I think, if you remember last night as we were closing off, that I indicated that my first job, the first five years I worked in this province was at the Consumers' Co-op Refineries and have fond recollections of my days there.

But we're informed that we have had very . . . I guess no complaints from small co-ops because many of the things, the services that they have required are still there. And I'll just go through some of the things that the department are doing for co-ops.

We have workshops and seminars, and accounting and bookkeeping for day cares, and preschool co-ops, feeder associations. We have board of director training seminars, we have the co-op merit awards, co-op week festivities. Co-ops have trade show displays, the co-op junior achievement program, the feeder association loan guarantee program, youth employment co-ops, soil conservation co-operatives, special emphasis on employment co-ops. As I said, there's been two new ones formed already this year. Women in employment co-op workshops, grazing co-op workshops, and employment co-op workshops.

So those type of supports to what one might say the smaller co-ops are still in place. And my officials indicate to me that they have not had people from the smaller co-ops indicating to them that they've not been able to access the type of support and services that they require.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, you say you've had no complaints from small co-ops and specifically I take it you're referring to the non-aligned co-ops, and it's quite natural that you would not have complaints from a fire hall co-operative for instance that . . . from a fire hall co-operative it's quite natural that you would not have a complaint from that.

(1115)

Most of those co-ops have been ongoing for quite a number of years. They're set up and functioning quite well, and they don't have paid staff to just pay attention how you're decimating the department of co-ops. They don't pay attention that. In other words, their world doesn't hinge on everything we do in this marble palace, and thank goodness that the world is that way. There is a real world out there and I wish that you were a little more in touch with it.

I have to question the effectiveness of the reorganization, Mr. Minister, in terms of the availability of support and advice for people that desperately need to set up co-operatives and to keep them going, and to help provide some advice when co-operatives get into some difficulties. Because as you should be aware, there are a

great number of co-operatives that are very small in nature and they do not have chief executive officers readily at their disposal. In fact, there are some co-operatives where the chief executive officer has to be picked from a handful of a dozen or so people, and then it's more or less a volunteer position.

Who's going to be affected most, Mr. Minister by your realignment? I've said it before and I'll say it again, it's probably the non-aligned, the smaller non-aligned co-operatives such as day care co-ops, community service co-operatives, employment co-operatives, I mentioned fire hall co-operatives, and farm machinery co-operatives, those organizations that don't have paid managerial staff to handle your new bureaucracy that is being created. And they don't . . . those very co-operatives don't complain about the services that are offered or not offered. They simply accept whatever tidbits you are able to put out to them.

What I am saying is it shouldn't just be tidbits, it shouldn't just be platitudes, we should be genuinely out there and helping them to organize themselves so that they can make their corner of the world a better place for them and their neighbours to live in. That's what the department of co-operative and co-operative development is all about, Mr. Minister.

I spoke earlier in the estimates about what's happened to the co-operative development officers assigned across Saskatchewan. You've indicated that those have been cut in half in numbers. Another concern that I have in that area is that their functions are now being taken over by people in the Tourism and Small Business portion of your portfolio and people who are only, if you like, mildly familiar with co-operatives. They may be a member of a co-operative, but many of those people, I suggest, have not studied co-operatives in depth and simply don't have the background, the wealth of information and knowledge to advise co-operatives on how to set up a co-operative or how to continue to manage a co-operative in an ongoing manner. And there's some real special needs that co-ops have.

So that's a concern that I have, and I would appreciate it if you would address how this is going to be looked after in terms of, specifically, people that are working in Tourism and Small Business now also taking on the co-op function in the . . . I believe, in the business resource centres is where that is beginning.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, regarding the small co-ops, the non-aligned ones as you indicate, certainly a number of these . . . In fact, what I am informed is that some of our field staff are really proactive in this and are going to them to see if they have any problems or concerns. I would say to you if you know of a fire hall co-op — you indicated that as an example that had some problem or concern — certainly if they would let us know, we would be more than glad to go out and counsel them and discuss with them.

I won't go back through the list but I just read out some of the services like the training of the board of directors, and things of this nature. Workshop seminars are held for many of these non-aligned co-ops. We haven't cut the

staff of the people that are out there helping them. I told you that was 14 and it has stayed at that, but the improvement that I see taking place is, and let's take a situation of say a small co-op outside of . . . maybe let's take the town of Bredenbury. I remember the students were in today, and say Bredenbury has a co-op, fire hall co-op.

If they're having some kind of difficulty or so on, I see it much easier for them now — they're not that far from Yorkton — to go to the business resource centre. If they cannot go, they're probably all working people or something of this nature, doing volunteer co-op fire work, if that was the situation.

Well then we have the business resource vans. We have the vans that go out from the resource centres, so all it takes is for a phone call into the people in the business resource centre in Yorkton. They will come out, meet with them at their convenience — at the convenience of the co-op group — see what the problem is, if there is a problem. They will then either come in and get the best information from the people in the department or if the need is for a field staff person to go out there, sit down with them, and try and help them alleviate this problem whatever it may be.

So I really see, and I think you will find that too, that there will be a greater network, there will be more contact at the community level, and also it brings with them, if it is a different kind of co-op . . . Let's switch to a feeder co-op or something. That individual who will come to them will come armed with all the statistics, all the research that the Small Business department has. Now I think that has to be a benefit to any type of commercial co-ops.

So I believe, and I understand your concern and your questions, but I again say to you as I said to the CEOs (chief executive officers) . . . and I'll be interested in meeting with them next month to see just what they feel about this too, that I believe we can strengthen the movement and the development and reinforce it at that grass roots level.

Mr. Trew: — Minister, we talked about the number of positions, the co-operative development officers, and I believe you said that went from eight to four. Correct? — the co-operative development officers. I'm not trying to hang you up. If that's your recollection, that's good enough.

But I have another question and it's related to, will the same number of co-op management advisers in the field, will you have the same number as before? And my information is that there was 18 district representatives out in the field; you're saying you've got the same number of people out in the field. By my count, you've got half the number of co-operative development officers, half. And instead of 18 district representatives out in the field, you've got 14 people who are also charged with talking about small business and tourism with co-operatives tagged on. Please correct me if I am somehow misled in my information, but it's a concern.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Each district will be dealt with as it was previously. I think you may be a wee bit confused. Let

me take my Yorkton example again. There I have now a business resource consultant. And that person is versed in small business . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, this is a different guy; this is my small-business guy. Okay? So then I'm going to take one of those 14 guys and put him in there, and that guy is the co-op expert within that resource centre.

But what I'm saying to you, Mr. Member, is that it seems to me, with the co-op expert there and the business expert there, that no matter who comes in, if it is a person wanting to start a co-op, he's got that expertise there, plus they can draw on all of these things from the business resource centre that probably wasn't there previously.

Secondly, if it's someone coming in to talk straight business and he wants to start something, then one aspect that could be described to him and discussed is a co-operative. And that co-operative, the person with the expertise is there also.

So I can't see where that isn't a better mix, where the clientele, whether they be people coming in saying, I know nothing about co-ops, and then deciding maybe I want to start a co-op, are not better serviced. Or if it is your fire hall co-op, and I'm using that as an example again, does not come in and have the same expertise, plus — plus this added amount of business expertise. I think that is a better mix.

And secondly, it's right there — right there in Yorkton, right there in Prince Albert, right at the grass roots. And furthermore, if the people can't come in, as I said previously, with the resource vans, we will go out to them in their locales in small towns and hamlets.

Mr. Trew: — Do you have 14 business resource centres, or how many business resource centres do you have?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We have 12.

Mr. Trew: — Twelve business resource centres. Okay. Do you have a person solely responsible for co-operatives at each business resource centre, and can you name those people?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — There are nine in the . . . We have 12 business resource centres, as I said. There will be nine of them that will be staffed with people with co-op expertise; they're in the structure now. Some of them haven't been moved right into the building. We're in the throes of doing that. They will be.

But the added service that will be there is through the business resource centres as we move out. And I'll indicate the North. I'll indicate Craik and Buffalo Narrows and areas like that which didn't have that expertise before, will be able to have that because of them coming out of the North Battleford business resource centre and La Ronge. So I think there'll be an expansion of services.

But to get back to your question, nine of the 12 will be staffed with people with co-op expertise, shall we say.

Mr. Trew: — So nine are staffed with the 14 people that

came from the Department of Co-ops. Correct? With 14 of the 22, but the 14 you listed as providing regional services.

Mr. Minister: are those 14 people, are they assigned roles that are something over 80 or 90 per cent directed at co-operatives, or are they in fact being paid out of the Co-operatives department budget and have something less than that — you know, maybe 50 per cent or 25 per cent of their duties directly related to co-operatives and co-operative development? Can you tell me what percentage of their duties, those 14 people, how much time do they spend on co-ops and how much do they spend on other things?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Getting back to the number of people, they indicate to me that in Saskatoon there are three people and in Prince Albert there are two. So in some areas there's more than one person.

Getting back to your question of how much time do they spend vis-à-vis small business, tourism, co-ops? One hundred per cent of their time on co-ops.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, will there be any cuts in the registry and inspection branch, particularly with regards to the inspection system?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That question will have to be addressed to Consumer Affairs. The function is transferred to Consumer Affairs.

(1130)

Mr. Trew: — With respect, Mr. Minister, to the business development grants in the economic diversification and investment fund, are there any grant programs for co-operatives, and how much money is involved?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'm advised that there were no direct grant programs, that if there were grants they came out of the line departments. Go back again to our feeder co-ops: if there would be something of that nature, that would be accessed out of agriculture; our housing co-op, if there would be something of that nature, it would come through housing. We weren't in the place of being a direct-granting agency.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, could you explain why the fee for registering co-ops has been increased so much more in percentage terms than fees for private small businesses? And I remind you that I've asked this in the House before in question period. But to refresh your memory, the increase in the fees for co-ops was 233 per cent all at one shot. Why did you allow that huge increase?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I guess I'd indicate this to you — and you're correct, the fee did increase of 75 to \$250 — I'd like to emphasize a couple of points though. Firstly, that the incorporation fee for a co-op, as you, I'm sure, are aware, is only paid once and at the time of incorporation. So it isn't an ongoing fee; it's a one-time charge.

And then secondly, the \$250 fee in Saskatchewan is comparable to the charge in other jurisdictions: for

example, Alberta charges \$250, and Manitoba charges \$140, and Ontario charges \$500, so I guess to keep it in line where the other fee increases are.

Mr. Trew: — Given the fact that your government has withdrawn so much in the way of support for co-operatives already, how can you justify such a further discriminatory increase? And I remind you that, for instance, day care's registration fee goes from \$75 to \$250 all at once — something that's much needed — how do you justify that? And further, can you tell me just what the Conservative policy is with respect to co-ops?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think we've been doing that all morning if you had been paying attention. Certainly, our policy to co-ops . . . As I've said, co-ops are a historical part of the province of Saskatchewan. Co-ops are an organization of doing business that some people feel is the proper way they'd like to conduct their business. That will certainly continue. I think the statistics that I've indicated to you time and time again prove exactly what I have been saying.

As far as the fees, I just answered to you that these are in line with fees in other sectors of the country, and to kind of insinuate or to indicate that perhaps there is some type of a lack of support for co-ops, I can't quite understand this. Sure there's been a realignment of the department into the Department of Tourism and Small Business. I believe we can deliver the programs more efficiently and to expand upon the delivery through that type of realignment.

I think the number of co-ops that are starting in the province when you see the statistics continuing to increase, then I would say: how would one draw the long bow to say that there is something taking place that is not supportive to co-ops? We see the number increasing each year. We see people in the co-op movement saying that we're very open to co-ops; that they can have good dialogue. We see co-ops that never existed before starting to be built and put in place. So I would say overall, Mr. Member, that the co-op spirit, as I said last night, is alive and well in this province and is developing as it has in the past, and in some cases faster.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, I want to turn your attention to the co-op youth program for a few moments. I have before me a memorandum dated May 4, 1987, to all field staff, and in part it says, the department will, for this year, take a leave of absence from any active participation. And it goes on — I'm sure you can appreciate I'm just reading part of the letter, more for time's sake than anything, not . . . it goes on, it is hoped that the decision will not preclude our participation in future years.

My question is: will your department ever again be actively participating in the co-operation youth seminars? And the reason I ask that is that young people are the future of the co-operative movement, as they are the future of our society in whole — and I don't see how in the world you can claim that you are working to actively promote co-operatives when the very essence of the new co-op movement is being so totally ignored by your department by your actions. It is just the wrong way to go.

There is no way you can teach people about co-operatives if you don't get out front, start with the young people, start with the very successful program, the co-operative youth program that's been largely successful for a huge number of years. Are you going to ever again get involved with that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well we are inclined to work with the major co-ops to see if there's an interest in them having and playing a significant role in the co-op youth seminars, development seminars. I think that's only correct that if these are of value and they want to see them further developed, that the major co-ops in the province should be willing to play a very significant part in the development of these.

Discussions, as I understand, have taken place. And certainly we will continue to discuss with them. But I believe that a lot of that type of function should be strongly supported by the major co-ops. So I'm quite willing to dialogue with them and see what they feel the need is, to see what there is in the request and in demand from young people, and then to try and see what role they will play in helping to put these together.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, I heard you saying that the major co-ops should be taking the initiative and coming to you and saying, please get active again in the co-op youth program. My next question is: did you consult with the major co-operatives before, at the late date of May 4, you cancelled your involvement in the summer co-operative youth programs? And I say, summer; I have before me a schedule of a number of things, through July and August, that were part of that program and yet May 4 you were pulling out. Did you, or did you not consult with the major co-operatives before pulling out?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well at our meeting on May 7 we were discussing to a great extent the realignment of the department of co-op into Consumer Affairs and Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives. This topic was not brought up for discussion. My officials indicate though that we did have people, that two staff people are actively involved this year in the co-op youth seminars. And as I said previously, if the major co-operatives are wanting to discuss this, I'm quite willing to do that. However, I would be very appointed in indicating that I would expect them to be playing a very significant role in the development of these.

Mr. Trew: — Did you say that two members of your department are actively involved in the co-op youth program?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We had two members this summer at the seminars.

Mr. Trew: — Do your memos mean absolutely nothing? I have here a memo from Vern Kaisler to all field staff in which it indicates very clearly, "the department will for this year take a leave of absence from any active participation." That's a direct quote.

Your mail doesn't mean anything; your word apparently doesn't mean a whole lot. Frankly, I'm shocked. What is

going on in your department?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well as I indicated to you, we had two people attend two of the seminars, and the officials tell me one of them attended two of the seminars, so there was participation.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, I am, just to set the record straight, I am glad that you had two people there. I'm just shocked that your own memos from your department indicated very clearly that there would be nobody there. There seems to be no direction from your department whatsoever. You say one thing and do the other, and it leads me to wonder about all your grandiose statements about the co-operative movement in other areas of these estimates. I wonder what we can believe and what we can't.

I want to turn to the government reorganization and the great fiasco where you were renting out the fifth floor of Credit Union Central for quite a number of months after the department shuffle. I was in there a couple of times just to observe it, and it was appalling to me to see that really nice office space sitting totally, or virtually totally, idle.

I shouldn't say totally because there was a computer that takes certainly less space than our of our desks here in the legislature, and there was also three employees in a building that . . . or the fifth floor of which is many, many times the size that's required. I estimated it's something like 10,000 square feet, and I could have been out by virtually any amount, but it's certainly a huge, huge area.

Why couldn't your department have planned the timing of the government reorganization and the cut-back of personnel so that you could have avoided that unnecessary space problem and saved the taxpayers of Saskatchewan more than \$12,000 per month? Surely to goodness it's not too much to ask that when you're doing a reorganization, that take place.

And I further submit to you, Mr. Minister, that if you had a long-term lease and knew you could not get out of it, surely to goodness there was some summer student employment programs that could have well utilized that space. Right on the edge of downtown Regina, it would have been just an ideal space for some summer employment. And again I draw it back to the student employment situation. They could have used that space, and it would have been, I'm sure, most welcome.

But my question is: why couldn't you figure out and handle a simple down-sizing or move of people so that you didn't wind up wasting what appears to be well in excess of \$50,000 of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money?

(1145)

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I cited last night, this House is going on a long time because of the same questions being asked time and time again. This question and my answer was given in question period; however, the member opposite sees fit to use the time of these estimates to ask a question that would best be asked under the estimates of SPMC, of which I'm the

minister, Saskatchewan Property Management Crown, and I will be more than willing to address the questions at that point in time.

But I just want to state a couple of facts here that I think are interesting. If you analyse what the member opposite is saying, Mr. Chairman, you will see that his rationale, his rationale for amalgamation, for slimming and trimming the delivery of government service to make it more efficient, should be driven, should be driven by the leases on government buildings.

Now I fail to see the rationale behind that. We have, and the Leader of the Opposition knows, and the members of the front bench know, government has a multiplicity of leases across this province — a large number in the city of Regina. So to say that you should not realign the Department of Tourism, Co-ops and Small Business until the lease is up on the Credit Union Central building, I cannot see the rationale for that at all, and I doubt if anyone else in Saskatchewan can.

And then secondly, to come along and say, just as he did a couple of minutes ago, well, Mr. Minister, if you couldn't bring the realignment when the lease come up, then surely if you wanted to realign, you should have filled the space up again.

Now if you fill the space up with people, Mr. Chairman, it costs you money — it costs you money. So here is the member opposite saying on one hand . . . I hear him stand up and say to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, we want you to balance the budget. And in the next breath, he stands up to me and says, you've got a place in Regina that's empty; fill it up this summer with more employees. How do you wash that? One hand, it's here; the other hand, it's here.

I cannot understand the rationale of your statements. First of all, do not realign until the leases in the building run out. And then secondly, if the leases in the building continue, for God sakes, don't leave it open, go out and hire a whole bunch more people to fill the building.

Now I hope that you never ever get the opportunity to be in the financial decisions of a government in this province of Saskatchewan, because if that would ever be the kind of rationale you would use, it would be a disastrous situation.

I would like to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the member from Regina Centre should really well know and discipline his member in the back for such a ludicrous and ridiculous statement. On one hand, never down-size until the lease is gone — don't down-size until the lease is gone. That's the driving thing in the efficiency of government. Run government by leases on buildings. And secondly, if you can't do that, then fill 'em up, hire more people and fill 'em up because, my God, you've got some empty space. But I can tell you we're looking at trying to bring people into that space from other sectors, not that it will cost the government. If we can get out of the lease and have that good space used by something else that will develop and diversify this province, that's what I think we should be doing.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, you first of all rant and rave about the time it's taking us in this legislature, then you proceed to rant and rave for Lord knows how long. I don't think you need a clock, I think you need a calendar when you're on your feet speaking.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — We had the spectacle of yesterday, your minister from Weyburn boring us to tears for more than an hour with a speech we've heard him give many times in this very session — many times. And you have the gall to accuse us of holding up the session and taking up your time. Well I'd say you've got an awful lot of gall.

You talk about a lease of the Credit Union Central building, and you talk about, gee, well what should we do? We're just going to empty it. I said to you — and you know very well what I said — why didn't you look for some summer employment jobs. There must have been some student job creation programs that by the very nature of them last only through the summer. For those job creation programs, those student job creation programs, there are offices needed. There's administrative offices needed somewhere, and I am merely pointing out to you that the government had at its complete disposal some very first-rate, excellent offices that you could have played football in them and it wouldn't have bothered a soul.

And I'm certainly not saying empty offices and fill them up. I'm saying that when you've got some short-term jobs that you know are going to end at the end of the summer, and you know your lease is going to last at least that long, move those jobs into those vacant offices rather than going out somewhere else and buying or renting other office space for them.

You talk about financial responsibility, and you say you're glad that I and my party are not responsible for the budget of Saskatchewan. Well it's obvious you are not responsible; you have accumulated a deficit well in excess of \$3 billion in just over five years.

I remind you that the New Democratic Party before that had 11, 11 successive surplus budgets — 11 in a row, not a deficit to be found in the whole works of them. You have yet to deliver a single surplus budget, and I don't think you ever will because you are the incompetent fiscal managers.

You can't count; you get the Minister of Finance on his feet talking about the Saskatoon telephone directory. I was in the Crown Corporations Committee when he gave us the definitive number of how many mistakes there were. Today in question period the member for Regina Centre pointed out he was out by more than 100 per cent, and yet not very long ago he was giving us "the" definitive amount.

That's your Minister of Finance and obviously he can't count, and I don't think you can count one bit better. So I don't think you can talk to members on this side of the House about how to look after the province, how to manage money, how to keep people working, how to see that the Department of Co-operatives, co-operation and

co-operative development expands and helps people make life better for themselves. I just don't think you've got any credibility at all in that area.

I asked you, Mr. Minister, a simple question about that office reorganization, and it was: why didn't the department plan its timing so that that government reorganization would not result in many months of empty office space at a huge cost to Saskatchewan's taxpayers? On one hand we get the Minister of Social Services talking about cutting back welfare and saving at times up to \$200,000 a month. Wonderful? Save some money.

But on the other hand we have a spectacle of your department, the department of co-ops just blowing into the wind in excess of \$50,000 for phantom employees, for empty air space. I would like to know why you can't manage the department and the department reorganization in a much more efficient manner than you did.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well simply put, as I told you a whole ago, because there are ways that one looks at reorganization rather than when the leases on the buildings run out. If you can't understand that, I'm not going to spend my time to tell you again.

However I will say once more that, and anyone who is watching can check the *Hansard* — I'll supply the *Hansard* — where you'll see the same question raised in question period, the same answers given. But the member opposite and the party opposite feel it is in the best interests of Saskatchewan to waste the time of this House and ask repetitive questions. If you check through the *Hansard*, you will see that time after time after time.

And I'm getting phone calls from people saying, what's going on; how much is this costing per day? And certainly they are concerned. They are concerned with the repetitive questions. They certainly are very concerned with the actions of the opposition in this government, and they know that it is costing thousands of dollars a day to continue the operation of this Legislative Assembly which this session has been one of the longest that has taken place in recent years.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, this spring prior to the reorganization of the department of co-operation and co-operative development, did the North Battleford telestation co-op receive a \$2 million loan guarantee from this department?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'm informed that just the former department of co-ops did give a loan guarantee to the company that you have indicated of approximately — and I say approximately; I'll get you the exact figure — but approximately \$1.3 million.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Minister, who suggested that that loan . . . Who brought the thing forward? Who's the principals involved in that loan? And who ultimately authorized that loan guarantee?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'm informed that the loan guarantee was for 1.2 million. I said 1.3 a minute ago. One million two, and it was for refinancing existing, and financing and

an expansion for The Battlefords community cable co-op. And the guarantee was made to the co-op.

I don't know who all the principals were in there. This was made in 11 of August, '86, prior to the amalgamation. But I will have my officials go back through the records of the previous department to get that for you if it's your desire to have that. I can't give you the names right here, but we will certainly research it for you if you want that information.

Mr. Trew: — I most certainly do want that information, Mr. Minister.

You said a moment ago you don't know all of the principals. Do you know any of the principals? And to be a little more specific, can you give me the name of the president of that particular co-op?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We'll have to supply that. We will certainly supply it to you. We don't have that information with us right now.

Mr. Trew: — Were any of the officials involved then, the officials that you have now? Or why is it that the officials don't seem to recall anything about that?

(1200)

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The officials that were involved with that transaction have been moved to Consumer Affairs. They're not officials that I have retained in my department.

Mr. Trew: — So we have a reorganization designed partly so that we can't get some answers. We will.

Mr. Minister, to my knowledge the department of co-operation and co-operative development has never guaranteed a loan of that magnitude ever before. I might be wrong, but tell me, when is the last loan guarantee, and what amount?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — My indications are or my information is that it was four or five years since there was a loan guarantee previously. I don't know the magnitude of these, whether the department or not had guaranteed to Co-op Implements. We will look into that. It seems to my knowledge, when we first took over the government in '82, that there was some loans to Co-op Implements in Winnipeg that came up for discussion, but that's some years ago now.

However, I will get you that information of what loan guarantees there have been. I think you realize that this is back in the co-op department before the amalgamation, so I think it's understandable that it'll take a little bit of time. I will get you the principal. So if you would just reiterate so we get it exactly correct what you want, we would be more than pleased to supply it.

Mr. Trew: — So you've told me that it is clearly not a common practice for that department to have made loan guarantees.

It made a loan guarantee quite a number of years ago

when a machinery co-operative manufacturer, in other words Co-op Implements, was in some financial distress — a machinery manufacturing co-operative that provided equipment all across Saskatchewan, in Manitoba, and in Alberta. And indeed, the interests of many, many farmers were at stake there. Then we had a loan guarantee, but certainly a loan guarantee to a cable co-op is very, very unusual. It is not common practice, to put it mildly.

The reorganization also adds a little bit of cover and smoke to what did go on there. I'd be most interested, Mr. Minister, to get to the bottom of that whole transaction because it is very unusual that just before you have a government reorganization, you suddenly have a loan guarantee in the magnitude of \$1.2 million. It's just remarkable that you would wait until the 11th hour and then have that loan guarantee at that time.

I'm going to take a short break from this right now, and the member for Regina Centre has a few questions he'd like to address to you.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. I want to join my colleague from Regina north in decrying the incompetence and mismanagement which this department has exhibited.

Mr. Minister, it is not acceptable practice to leave office space vacant for many months. It's not acceptable for your government to do it. It's not acceptable for other governments to do it. We don't believe that, and I can assure you the public doesn't believe that.

Mr. Minister, in a day when you are cutting back on drugs, on drug care for people; in a day, Mr. Minister, when . . . Well if you want to . . . if the member from Souris-Cannington wants to attend any drugstore in this city and talk to the people who are paying for drugs, you'll call it a cut-back. I'm not sure what you call it, but I know what the public call it.

Mr. Minister, in a day when you haven't got the money to feed people — and we witness the growth of food banks — at a time when you're cutting back on health care, to be so sloppy and incompetent as to leave expensive office space vacant for months with nothing but a computer on it is not an acceptable way to run a government. And if that's what you're suggesting, Mr. Minister, then you're going to get a rude awakening at the time of the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I can assure you it's not acceptable to the public of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, you're spending 40 per cent more now than you were the last year we were in office. Inflation has gone up by 30 per cent. There's a 10 per cent real growth in your expenditures, and yet you haven't got the money to do any number of things which badly need to be done. And the reason for that, Mr. Minister, is because of the gross incompetence with which this government manages its affairs.

No government leaves office space of this size vacant for as long as you did, and none try to justify it by saying it's necessary. It isn't necessary, and if you believe it is, Mr. Minister, then the public are going to elect a government which will say it isn't necessary and we're not going to do it any more.

So I may say . . . I say, Mr. Minister, that . . . I say, Mr. Minister, that if that's the best sort of forward planning you can do, you're not fit to hold office, and you won't hold office very much longer, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I ask you again, Mr. Minister, to stand up in this House and tell us that leaving office space vacant for many months is an acceptable way to run a government. I just want to hear that again from you, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well the first thing I will admit to, that when you want to talk to an expert about losing office, he just spoke. You were the fellow, as my colleague said today, that was dumped from the cabinet of the government some time ago for complete incompetence.

I remember the report. I'm thinking of the author that you authorized him to do the report. And if you can think of this, the most nonsensical kind of suggestion that I have ever heard in this legislature — within that report that that member paid for when he was a minister, that there should be televisions on the snowmobiles of the trappers in the North.

I concur, I concur wholeheartedly with the Leader of the Opposition for dumping him. So when you want to talk about mismanagement and knowing how to run amok, I just can't understand.

I think the only mistake you made, you might as well have put all your eggs in one basket and put him in charge of DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan), because I can remember what George . . . Judge Hughes said about DNS: a department run amok. Well you might as well take the member from Regina Centre and put him in there and get a fine job of it rather than having one of your other ministers waste his time on that.

However, getting back to the management of, getting back to the management of space, as you well know, as you well know . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — You're not in the North.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well we may be out of the North, but you're still in the woods, my friend. You're in the woods, and have been for some time — two elections you were in the woods wondering which way the path out was, and unfortunately you never found it, thank God for Saskatchewan.

But let me tell you, and you know real well, if we want to discuss space and leases and so on, when my estimates on SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management

Corporation) come up, we will do that. But at this point in time we're talking about Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives, and that is the matter under discussion, Mr. Chairman. I think in the expediency of doing good dialogue and debate in this House we should keep to the estimates that are under debate.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, that is typical of you and your colleagues that when you don't have an answer you launch into some nonsensical personal attack.

Mr. Minister, I may say I don't recall the report which suggested we put televisions on ski-doo's. I can imagine some interesting, not only financial problems but engineering problems with the suggestion as well. But, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would like to deal with your estimates and not the estimates of some past minister who believed apparently that we ought to put television sets on snowmobiles.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you want to talk about this year? And I wonder if you want to just stand up again? I really want to hear you stand up again and tell this Assembly that it's acceptable to cut the grants for co-operative development, which you've done, and instead spend it on empty office space. That's what you're doing.

I have said, Mr. Minister, that the expenditures of this government are up by 40 per cent in the years you've been in office. Inflation has gone up by 30 per cent, so you had a 10 per cent real growth in expenditures, and yet you haven't got the money for the drug plan, you haven't got the money for day care, you haven't got the money for the women's transitional houses. What you apparently have is all kinds of money for vacant office space. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you're really prepared to justify leaving office space vacant and cutting the grants for co-operative development.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — There is no cut of grants for co-operative development, first of all. And then secondly, as you . . . I doubt if you would understand this, but I will try very slowly to explain it to you. Well it would be wonderful. You mightn't be bale to hear it because the chirping member from Moose Jaw is at it again.

However, let me indicate to you that there are such things as leases, right? And if you have a lease on a building, you've got two options. You buy out, if you wish, or you go the extension of the lease.

So certainly that is what . . . and let me go a little bit further in this little lesson to you. As you down-size, you're going to need less space. Does that make sense, as you down-size? So therefore you're going to have some surplus space which you have leases to hold you to or else buy out. So therefore you've looked at two options, either to buy out of those leases, or to try and find other groups that can come in.

Now your colleague says, no, no. He said, you don't do that; you wouldn't go to the private sector to see if there's someone who would want that space and try and negotiate and help both Credit Union and ourselves get out of a lease of space we don't need. He said, no, you wouldn't do that. He said, rush out, hire a bunch of

people for the summer, and fill up the space. Well I don't agree with that kind of action.

But for you to stand in here and say grants were cut because of space, is simply not correct because there were no grants cut.

Mr. Shillington: — I'll get to that in a moment, Mr. Minister.

In the '86-87 fiscal year there was 152,500 for grants for co-operative development. The figure is now vacant, with no explanatory note saying it's been moved elsewhere.

I really want to talk, Mr. Minister, about this system you have for forward planning. Mr. Minister, business people all the time deal with expansions or contractions of business, and I've done it in my own business. What you do when the lease is up, then you make a move, you make some changes. Until the lease is up you live with what you've got.

But of course I and other business men . . . And we're spending our own money. You're spending the taxpayers' money and it's a bottomless pit to you, and who cares if the office space sits vacant. No private business man would do that with his own money, and you ought to have at least the same respect for the taxpayers' money. But you don't because it's a bottomless pit and who cares.

I'll tell you who cares, Mr. Minister — the public care. The taxpayers are demanding of you a more business-like approach to government. If you're not prepared to give it, then you will reach a day when you'll have to stand aside for someone who will.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well as I say I don't want to get into a dialogue on space under these estimates. We'll do it in the other. And when we get into those I will certainly be able to . . .

An Hon. Member: — Let's go back to television sets on ski-doo's.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, it would be interesting to look back and we will do our background on that. And I think we'll look at Avord Towers in the '70s and we'll look at some of the buildings and some of the leases you had, but we'll do that under the appropriate estimates.

Regarding the grant as you see it, to the co-operative development, as is on page 92 in the *Estimates*, certainly that was the end of that agreement so there wasn't a cut of a grant at all. The agreement came to an end and that's why you see a figure there. Well you laugh.

An Hon. Member: — Well, indeed we do.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Did you ever hear of an agreement . . . The Leader of the Opposition chortles. He doesn't understand that sometimes some agreements come to an end. And if the agreement comes to an end, then it would seem folly for me to have to put money in for an

agreement that was open. I don't know where you see the difference.

Let me go at it again for you. If an agreement has come to an end in a budgetary year, then why would you budget more money for an agreement that you wouldn't have?

(1215)

Mr. Shillington: — Well let me give you some assistance, Mr. Minister, with that. Mr. Minister, previous governments previous to this have seen a value in co-operative development. It has been seen as a Saskatchewan way of doing things. Rather than have others control our resources and control this province we've wanted to do it ourself.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — And it's been a pretty successful way of doing it, Mr. Minister. It's been a very successful way of doing it. We've succeeded when we've done it ourselves, and we've failed miserably when we've called upon others to come and do it for us. Your approach may be open for business — a call for others to come and do the job for us. Our approach has been to do it ourselves. And that, Mr. Minister, in the history of this province has been the successful approach. That's why there've been grants for co-operative development.

Mr. Minister, for some decades there have been grants to co-operative development to assist co-operatives in starting, just as there are grants for private business. It's not different. Mr. Minister, you have done away with that program. If you're hiding your lamp under a bushel and it's somewhere else, I wish you'd tell me.

Mr. Minister, you've done away with the program for grants for co-operative development. There are grants for business development, but there are none for co-operative development. Mr. Minister, your government simply doesn't believe that there's any worthwhile reason to promote co-operatives.

An Hon. Member: — Business grants are good enough. Why no co-ops too?

Mr. Shillington: — My colleague says, quite rightly, business grants are fine and dandy but apparently not co-operative grants.

What it tells me is you don't believe in the Saskatchewan way of doing things, because while we have given support and encouragement to Saskatchewan businesses, we've also done that with respect to co-operatives, and both kinds of economic development have benefited the people of this province. You have a narrow approach, Mr. Minister. You don't believe in co-operative development and thus you've cut the program for grants for co-operative development which we have had for decades and which heretofore have not depended on any sort of agreement, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I listened with interest to the

member from Regina Centre talking about — we did it our way, and how good that was the way that you did it. And I just want to cite one of the examples of the way you did it, doing it your way, the socialist way, and I want to talk about the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, not the Saskatchewan way — there's a big difference there — the socialist way. And that is the Prince Albert . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Allow the member to make his comments.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I will tell you about doing it their way. And I want to cite, for example, the Prince Albert Pulp Company, the Prince Albert Pulp Company that was losing approximately 90,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, you asked about doing it your way, and this was one of your babies, \$90,000 a day. It was losing about \$90,000 a day, Mr. Speaker, approximately the same amount of money that it may be costing to run this institution day after day. Ninety thousand dollars a day is a lot of money in most people's minds. So this was one of their ways of doing it.

And then we brought in our way. And they say, don't ever let an outsider come in. They're evil, they're bad, they won't help you develop. Well I can tell you, because of the initiatives that we've taken, the Prince Albert Pulp Company is not losing \$91,000 a day. We have the Weyerhaeuser plant in there that is functioning well, is making money, paying taxes to this province, and more than that, building a paper mill that never would have been build under the government opposite.

So don't tell me about our way and your way. Certainly your way was to buy potash mines, to buy holes in the ground that were there, to not create one more job. The people of Saskatchewan know about your way. They spoke about your way in '82, they spoke about your way in '86, and they will speak about your way the next time the polls are called in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — And they will give you the same resounding message of the old-fashioned methods of the social governments across this country do not meet the needs of today.

I listened with interest the other day as I was driving home, on my car radio, to hear the complete change by the Labour government in Britain. The Labour government in Britain was saying the old methods, the old ways will not satisfy the needs of the next century and of Britain today. And I think Maggie Thatcher showed it to them three times in a row, and we're going to show you the same thing here in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Irregardless of which Boy Wonder happens to be the leader. We will show you the next thing. Screw up your courage, stick with your old mentality of socialism, stick with your centralization, stick with the idea of not letting anyone come in and help build this province, because that is exactly opposite to what the people in Saskatchewan want to see and want to

hear delivered here.

So I want to tell you, you can stand here, and the more you want to stand in this legislature and say, we want to do it our way, the old NDP way, the buy the control and not build and not develop, you stand up and you can talk here for four hours because you're just helping re-elect me, the member from Souris-Cannington, and everyone else in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I wonder, Mr. Minister, in your view, is your government going to screw up enough courage to put it to the test and have a by-election in Eastview . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I have a lot of responsibility in this government, but I must be humble and tell you, when the election in Eastview is called is certainly not my prerogative. That is up to the Premier, and I am sure he will do it when he sees that it is the time to serve the needs of that constituency. And I would just say to you, keep talking, get up here, because it'll do nothing but help us in Eastview.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Well if the polls are to be believed, Mr. Minister, you need all the help you can get in Eastview.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, some of my colleagues want to get into these estimates.

I have some questions that I would like some answers for. Mr. Minister, with respect to the guaranteed loans, I would appreciate a statement — it would be more useful in writing than it would be given orally — I would appreciate a statement of all of the outstanding loans, all of the arrears, and with a statement of all the loans and arrears . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, that's right, the ones that the Co-Op Guarantee Board has guaranteed. I'd appreciate a statement of all the loans, those in arrears. With respect to those arrears, when the last payment was received.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, we'll provide that for you.

Mr. Shillington: — When may I expect that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Just as soon as we have it ready.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, I have waited years for something that has been sitting on the minister's desk. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could undertake to get it to me. I suspect your officials could get it ready in an hour or so. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you'd undertake to get that to me within two weeks.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — How about 8:30 Monday morning?

Mr. Shillington: — That will do, Mr. Minister. Mr.

Minister, some of my colleagues have questions and I'm going to yield the floor to them.

Ms. Atkinson: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My question is to the minister, and I'm wondering if he can give me an update on the future of Canapharm in this province. I know that he is familiar with Canapharm because it's located in his constituency.

I understand it has been sold. I'm wondering if the minister can give us some details on how the company is doing in light of the new sale.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well yes, on this side of the House we're proud of being able to diversify the economy and move into the intravenous solution production here in Saskatchewan, and I would hope . . . It may be that you would be more inclined, and I'd like to hear your points on this, to buy from the multinational companies. That may be your viewpoint. Certainly it is not ours.

We feel that we can produce that can be consumed here in Saskatchewan, especially in the field of health care, is very good diversification and development. Because as you well know, that if there's an expanding field in Saskatchewan due to the ageing population, it will be in the consumption of health related supplies.

One can look at intravenous solutions, and I think you're somewhat knowledgeable in this, that through home care we can be doing more home feeding and things of this nature with solutions, that would prevent people from occupying hospital beds, because often the elderly become run-down, simply run-down, and with some addition of home-feeding they can be brought back very quickly. They do not become susceptible to any contagious disease that's around, and therefore do not end up occupying a hospital bed where I don't like to see them. Personally, if a person can be kept out of a hospital and living well — and I think that's what you and I all want to see happen, and I hope you would endorse those.

Now I don't now if you are more interested in dealing with the multinationals in the drug company. I can say on this side we're not. Because of that we encouraged the Canapharm to develop and certainly it's something that I think many people in Saskatchewan are proud of. When they had their product tested at the food and drug, the Canadian regulations, it tested as above many of the products, one of the best in North America.

And like many starting companies there is, I guess if one learns something from being on the economic development side, it's that with new companies, I guess if there's a problem that face many of them is number one, they have an idea and they know how to make a product, but it is that first year and a half of financing to get up and get your markets. And then secondly, I think, to have those sales and markets. And yes, I'm looking across the piece, and that I think is rather a general comment.

However, how is it doing? You know that I cannot, and I would not be right, and I do not have, I'm not privy to any part of the deal, and I don't think you're asking me to outline that in a forum like this because that is not what the legislature is for, is to delve into private deals. But the

Canapharm plant has been sold to . . . now I cannot give you the . . . I think they have a new name here, but it was called Magnetics. But I think it's a new name in Saskatchewan which is a group, Montreal based if my memory serves me correctly, who are very interested in what I described to you at the beginning in developing products for the health market, because it looks like a growing and an expanding market. And from all reports that I have heard, the sale went well.

The new company brings some expertise, probably that was needed, to the company. And the report that I've had to date is that it is moving quite well.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think that you would acknowledge that a great deal of taxpayers' money went into the creation of Canapharm in your constituency of Wolseley through venture capital corporation, as I understand it.

We now have gotten word that this company has been basically sold to a company that for the most part exists outside of Canada; it's not a Canadian company. And I'm just wondering if you could advise me, Mr. Minister, how many hospitals have purchased Canapharm intravenous solution instead of going with their former contracts? Can you give us that kind of information?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That would be better asked to the Health minister, but I will give you an approximate, a ball park figure, because I'm just going from memory of what I have heard in the last while. The company, I think you are wrong in saying that the company is an international company. The company is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it's a Canadian company. So I think, you know, you should check our facts there, because it is a Canadian company.

The employment, the number of people — in fact the opportunity for employment in Saskatchewan is apt to increase. The employment number of Saskatchewan people has not decreased. The product is being consumed and bought by more hospitals in Saskatchewan all the time.

I understand, and as I said, I would give you a ball park figure, and I'm not wanting to say this is carved in stone, but it's pretty close — and my figure that comes to mind is approximately 52.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you give us any information as to how hospitals have felt about being pushed into accepting Canapharm intravenous solutions? I've gotten a great deal of feedback from hospitals all over this province that they are being told to purchase Canapharm solutions, that they can no longer go where they think they can get the best deal and the best quality deal.

(1230)

We have a situation where there's a minister responsible for "Buy Saskatchewan," and I understand that he regularly, if a hospital is reluctant, calls up the chair of the board, or calls up the administrator, or has one of the hacks call up and say, you're to buy Canapharm

solutions. What sort of business process is that? Hospitals should be able to go where they think they can get the best buy and the best quality buy.

I understand, Mr. Minister, that hospitals are concerned about the quality of the tubing. And I notice the members over there aren't very happy about what I have to say. The truth hurts, doesn't it? The truth hurts. And I'm simply reporting to this House what people all over this province are telling me.

Now my question to you is: what sort of heavy-handed tactics are those when you have ministers and hacks phoning up hospital chairpeople and administrators and saying, you shall buy Canapharm if you want to continue to get your funding? What sort of a process is that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, when that member . . . And I want to go back, I want to go back a little bit. In the other day in the House I saw something interesting happen here.

I know that the member opposite, who is the critic for Health in the opposition, has a . . . And I've watched this since her becoming a member in here, and it seems to me that she has a tendency to want to, shall I say, exaggerate what is the actual fact. And there was time and time, and I think she got her wings clipped pretty good by the druggists — the pharmaceutical association who took her to task for statements that she had made that were not exactly as the world was turning.

And I want to point out something that was very interesting the other day. Day after day after day, the critic for Health asked questions in this legislature about health . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Absolutely.

But a very strange thing happened the other day. The other day my colleague, the Health Minister, wasn't here, so being the Acting Health Minister I was answering the question. The member, the Health critic, was sitting in her seat, but for some reason the member from Moose Jaw, who is the Culture critic, rose to ask a Health question, not related to Moose Jaw but related to Regina.

So that makes me wonder what has happened. And I think the new and aspiring leader of the NDP is beginning to jerk a few chains on the other side and say, you've been drawing a wild bow, a long bow, and if you can't ask the questions correctly, I'm going to give it to someone else. And I think that's why he gave it to the fine little member from Moose Jaw to try and ask it in a most sincere manner, because he believed that he wouldn't give in to gross exaggeration.

So when the member, the Health critic who is just questioning, gets up and says, I have representation from all over Saskatchewan — I can't put an awful lot of confidence in that kind of statement because of her past record. Obviously she is inclined to try and exaggerate and say a couple or three representations is a whole bunch from all over Saskatchewan. And I can tell you that that will only hurt your credibility, as a politician. But you make that choice yourself if you continue upon that tack.

Now it becomes very obvious, very obvious from her

statements in this House today — very, very obvious — that she is opposed to a Buy Saskatchewan program, that she does not believe that it is in the best interests of the province of Saskatchewan that where we can produce a product of acceptable and equal standard to anything else in the market, in fact better, where we can put jobs right here in the province of Saskatchewan, that that isn't the right thing to do; that it's better to go with some international companies.

And I will tell you one thing, Madam Member, that you're probably not aware of, that the year before Canapharm coming on stream, the cost of the intravenous solutions in this province — and I'd like you to listen to this — the cost of the intravenous solutions increased 30 per cent, because we're basically under a monopolistic situation.

So let me tell you, I can believe this cuts down costs. It also provides a product that is built here in Saskatchewan, and those are the things that we are going to have to do as a government and a province if we're going to diversify the economy of this province of Saskatchewan.

Lo and behold! we look out and the price of wheat today is 2.52 or something of this nature. We have countervails and anti-dumping on our potash. We're fighting today to get free trade with the United States that is eminently important to the future of the economy of this province, and there are those who will stand in the elected positions and say we shouldn't build it at home; we shouldn't try and develop it at home; and we should be dealing with multinational companies and international companies. I don't believe that.

I believe that what we can do in Saskatchewan here, to use Saskatchewan resources to give employment for Saskatchewan people, to supply Saskatchewan needs, is exactly what the Government of Saskatchewan should be doing, and we will continue to do that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Well I really did appreciate the lecture from the minister. Mr. Minister, for your information, and you should be aware of this, Mr. Minister, I am not the critic for continuing care or home care. The member from Moose Jaw South is the critic. I have never handled any of the details when it comes to home care or nursing home care in this House. You are sadly misinformed, Mr. Minister — you're sadly misinformed. The obvious thing here is that you don't pay attention to detail, Mr. Minister, and that's quite evident, by virtue of the fact that you have given us this long harangue and there's been very little details contained in your long harangue. You didn't bother to answer the question, and you wasted the time of this legislature.

Now if we want to talk about credibility, Mr. Minister, I'd like to talk about your credibility and your government's credibility. You're the government that promised a 10 per cent reduction in personal income tax. And lo and behold! we're here in the fall of 1987, and we've received a one and one-half per cent flat tax. That's the work of your government. You're the government that promised to do away with the E&H tax or the sales tax. Lo and behold! it's risen to 7 per cent and we're debating a Bill.

No credibility, Mr. Minister, no credibility.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — You're the government that in 1982 promised to do away, eliminate the gas tax, and lo and behold! in 1987, the fall of 1987, we have a gas tax of 7 per cent. No credibility, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — You're the government that in 1978 and in 1982 and again in 1986 promised the people of this province that their health care system was a sacred trust and you would never do anything to dismantle it. And lo and behold! in 1987, fall of 1987, we've had the drug plan virtually eliminated and people have to pay for up-front drug costs. We've had the dental plan virtually eliminated. Children over the age of 14 no longer have the plan, and children under the age of 14, their parents have to take them to the plan. And you have had criticism from people around this province about what you're doing to the health care system.

You're the government that underfunds hospitals in Saskatoon to such an extent that cancer patients are waiting six weeks to get into hospital, and that's not an exaggeration. And you accuse us of having no credibility. What a joke. You're the government with no credibility; you're the government. And if you think that the polls show you people having any credibility, you are sadly mistaken. You are reading the figures upside down, Mr. Minister. You have no credibility. Ask people around this province what they think of you. They hold you in disdain because of what you've done to the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Now I simply have a question, Mr. Minister. It's short and snappy. We don't want a long speech, just answer it.

I want to know whether or not you have had any kind of complaints or concerns from hospitals about the tubing associated with the Canapharm intravenous solution. Have you had any concerns expressed, and have there been any hospitals that have done quality controlled studies that will not take the product because of their concern over the tubing . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Order. The estimates before the committee is Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives. Order. I find that the questioning is getting quite far-ranging and I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the questions seem to be getting into the Health field in a technical sense. Order. In a technical sense the questions are getting into a Health field, and I would ask members to stick to Tourism and Small Business estimates.

Ms. Atkinson: — This is the Minister of Tourism, Small Business and Co-ops. Canapharm is a business located here in Saskatchewan that sells intravenous solutions. It's a health solution, associated with the health care field, but it is a business. This is the minister responsible, and I'm asking him some very specific questions about

Canapharm, a business located here in Saskatchewan and therefore under his ministership.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's obvious that the member opposite does not accept your ruling, so I will answer as best I can the question that she has asked. I want to pre-empt them though by saying, once again we see this minister using inflammatory and misleading words, saying that there's virtually no drug plan and virtually no dental plan and that is simply not correct.

We still have one of the best drug plans and dental plans in the Dominion of Canada. For her to stand up and try and mislead like that, I cannot allow that type of thing to be said in here because it is simply misleading and not a correct reflection of what is the situation in Saskatchewan.

She asked about the tubing in Canapharm. I said in my introductory remarks that certainly the solution was the best in the testing of the federal government, the best that there was in Canada — exceeded the requirements. And certainly there were some concerns expressed about the tubing. If the tubing is . . . once you get the good solution from the bag into the body of the person. And there were some concerns about that.

Some hospitals ran tests, and I would cite as an example the Regina General Hospital who have used the Canapharm solution for quite some time. Most of the major hospitals are using it now, and I, having dealt for five years with the executive director of the Regina General Hospital and the board of the Regina General Hospital, people whom I know well and have a great deal of respect for . . . the chairman is a very understanding and outstanding man as well as the executive director and the staff there.

And I guess to indicate or insinuate that some of these hospitals were questioning it and were wondering if this was safe would be kind of casting a slur upon what I think is an outstanding hospital which over the years that I was Health minister had a fantastic record for patient care. Certainly other hospitals will be testing the product . . . (inaudible) . . . That's only correct. They should.

And secondly, that they should compare price. We have no problem with that from the Buy Saskatchewan agency. We have, as I said previously in my remarks, where we can produce product of quality, where we can produce . . . (inaudible) . . . products of comparable price, where those products can use Saskatchewan resources and Saskatchewan people in creating jobs in Saskatchewan and paying tax in Saskatchewan, then I believe that's the direction we should be going as we diversify this province, not only in small business but in all other aspects.

And I could talk for a day and a half on that if you so wish me to, but that is the direction and that is the big difference between what we're doing and what the government that was in here many years ago now — about seven years ago — was not.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I think it would be a fair assumption from people on this side of the House that

we're not opposed to a Buy Saskatchewan campaign. In fact we think it's important that the people do support Saskatchewan businesses and Saskatchewan workers.

I think the concern here, Mr. Minister, is that there are some hospitals who have brought to the government's attention, I know, and to our attention, their concern over the quality of the tubing. The solution is not an issue. You wouldn't be able to produce a solution if it hadn't been passed by Health and Welfare Canada.

So I just want to make that very clear to you, Mr. Minister, we have no problem with Buy Saskatchewan. We just want to ensure that people aren't being forced to buy a product if they have some concerns about the quality of the tubing.

(1245)

And I think that's a legitimate issue to raise with you, Mr. Minister. And I think you have a responsibility as minister responsible for Small Business, not to have your government pressure hospitals into accepting this product if they have some concern about the quality of the tubing associated with the intravenous solution. Would you not agree, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well as I said there has been no question about the quality of the solution. I think we agree on that. There was some concern about the tubing. They undergo tests which all of them do, which I agree with. But certainly, as minister in charge of Buy Saskatchewan, if those . . . And my people have worked many hours with them and have set up meetings, have looked at bringing in experts to look at this dealing with the new company that has taken over. I believe any of these concerns have been set aside. And as the minister in charge of Buy Saskatchewan, I go back to the premises upon which we operate, given comparable quality, given comparable price — providing jobs, using resources — then we are for that kind of development.

And as the minister in charge of that which is under another set of estimates, but seeing we're doing half the government today, I'll talk about this, Mr. Chairman. We're into Health, we're into Buy Saskatchewan, we're into property management, we're doing a whole bundle today. So maybe this will help us and we won't have to spend so many days of the taxpayers' money, at \$90,000, if we get a lot of them wrapped up today. So maybe a lot of the questions have been dealt with.

You can see they're very itchy. Every time you mention the amount of money that this legislature is costing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, the magpies in the back row start to chirp and crow every time, the whole row of them.

So I think we've touched a nerve, because I've been getting phone calls from very responsible people and they have been saying to me, what on earth are they doing asking repetitive questions, asking the same questions? Why would you, in all due respect, go on for 35 days in the Department of Environment estimates? People are beginning to wonder what's taking place in here, and in times of restraint, and it is the opposition that shuts down any legislature, because when they quit asking questions,

that's when this place closes.

And I can tell you that this figure is starting to gnaw at the hearts of the people of Saskatchewan. It's a very similar, it's very similar and let me make this connection again for you. And, Mr. Chairman, you'll understand this because it comes up from near your seat where there was \$90,000 a day in PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company), and now it's \$90,000 a day, approximately, I guess, to operate this House. People are beginning to ask a few questions.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's interesting to have the minister's comments about how badly beaten up the government members opposite are getting. They're certainly feeling the heat from their constituents for your inaction and lack of action, your dismantling of the department of co-operation and co-operative development, for your mismanagement, for your incompetence. Obviously people are talking to you and they're giving you the message and it's finally starting to sink in, at least with that minister, that there's real problems.

Mr. Minister, I'd like a list from you of the salaries and expenses of your officials for this year and, included, any pay increases that they may have received.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Are you asking about my departmental officials? Is this who you want? The people around me here?

Mr. Trew: — Yes, I'm asking departmental, ministerial, executive assistants.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — So we have it correct. You're asking for the salaries of the people who work for me, and you mean the senior people and my staff, I assume.

An Hon. Member: — And expenses.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — And expenses, and if there were any raises. Yes, I'll provide that. I'll send it. It would have to come across later, I believe, but you have that commitment that I'll give it to you.

Mr. Trew: — Okay, thank you for that undertaking, Mr. Minister, and I will look forward to receiving that from you in due course — soon, I hope, and I think that's the undertaking that we have.

Mr. Minister, your government's economic development strategy has shown your misunderstanding of the particular economic circumstances and the traditions of Saskatchewan. We have here a unique mix of private enterprise, of public enterprise, and of a co-operative sector of the economy.

Your actions and the actions of your government are just showing that you really fundamentally don't understand the backbone of Saskatchewan and the things that have helped make our province a unique and indeed a wonderful place to live over a great many years. We have helped each other through co-operation since well before I was born. And it is my sincerest hope that that spirit of co-operation and co-operative development will continue long after I'm no longer alive on earth.

But that whole spirit is in some considerable difficulty right now under you. You've chosen to ignore and downgrade the importance of the co-operative sector. The economic development strategy places a great deal of emphasis on incentives for capital investment, trying to attract large-scale entrepreneurs. And what you want to do is to reduce — or at least I think it's what you want to do — is to reduce the unemployment just overnight. But it's never, ever worked that way.

Megaprojects are welcome. They help some. But the real backbone of trying to tackle the unemployment problems or the job creation problems that exist and are very real, that backbone has always been the small business sector for which you're responsible, and the co-operative sector of our economy, for which also you are responsible for. And it's a shame that we spent so much time on Peter Pocklington and on Weyerhaeuser and others, when we should be focusing on small business and co-operatives.

You've paid little or no attention to community-based opportunities and the development of human resources, Mr. Minister. It's a far more stable, successful, and long-term strategy for economic development than the one that you are operating under.

My point, Mr. Minister, is that there is a great deal of difference between measures which help to strengthen the economy and those which only temporarily reduce the rate of unemployment. And the qualities that are required for a successful long-term economic transformation are very similar to those of a strong co-operative society.

Co-ops enable local people to be part of the development process, to understand and agree upon what needs to be done, and to work together to achieve that change. People become directly and deliberately responsible for the development and the outcomes of those developments.

Successful long-term economic change calls for intelligence, calls for a high level of community organization, and the ability to compromise when one's self-interest is at stake. And that self-interest is something that your government just cannot get beyond. That has become patently apparent to us during these estimates, and indeed during the course of this legislative session. You haven't been able to get past your own personal self-interest, your own personal greed, and you haven't, just have not been able to get past that.

Mr. Minister, the co-operative ideal requires a firm confidence by our own people in their own abilities, it requires an investment of our own money, and it requires ... has a requirement to work things out amongst ourselves. If you like, what it takes is that, we can do it ourselves, we can help ourselves attitude. We need to provide the motivation and the organization, and it is patently obvious, Mr. Minister, that you have been unable to do that.

I want to mention a quote from Woodrow Lloyd, and he says:

People are still the greatest power. The purpose and extent to which their power is made use of depends on their motivation and their organization. We can't complain if things don't go right if we fail to provide the motivation and the organization. We can't complain if we lose the game by default.

That, Mr. Minister, is what is happening in the department of co-operation and co-operative development. We are losing the game by default. We are losing the game simply because you're not providing the opportunities for the development of that very important sector of our economy.

I point out to you, Mr. Minister, that co-operatives have for many, many years — as long as I can remember, co-operatives have been calling on the provincial and the federal governments to recognize the co-operative sector of our economy as a distinct and unique sector, so that we could have the private businesses as one sector. We could have the public enterprises such as Saskatchewan Government Insurance, Saskatchewan telephones, Saskatchewan Power as a second portion of our economy. And the third distinct portion, the co-operatives, have been lobbying governments for, as I say, for at least as long as I have been alive and can remember, they want co-operatives to be that third distinct sector of our economy.

And what we have is a spectre where it's taken your government more than four years to try and figure out just where it is going with regards to co-operatives. And that's not a good thing.

Mr. Minister, if the economic power and the potential of the co-op movement for job creation and regional development was really seen as a priority by your government, would the issue of the co-ops' policy continue to be shunted aside while you deal with more pressing issues in your mind?

Minister, co-operatives are a particular and a unique sector of our economy. It has its own distinctive excellence and its own distinctive reason for existence. I wish that the members opposite would pay a little more attention to co-operatives and what they are all about rather than being so cursedly anxious to get away from this legislature. I wish you would pay just a tiny fraction of those efforts. If you could funnel them into the co-operative development areas, Saskatchewan would indeed be a much better place to live.

I think I've pretty much covered the area of co-operative development, Mr. Minister. I am appalled to note that the number of employees has gone from 59 to 22. I'm appalled by virtually everything I see happening in the department. It is a great concern. There's a huge number of co-op people all across our great province that are deeply concerned with your obvious lack of commitment to the co-operative sector of our economy. It's a concern.

It's a concern that I am sure is going to be raised loud and clear with every ballot that's dropped in the ballot box at the next election. The things you have done, you have done so at your political peril, and I look forward to being

part of a New Democratic Party government that can help the co-operative sector, can help turn things around, and help get things going.

Just in conclusion, Mr. Minister, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and your officials for the answers. I have certainly let it be known to you on several occasions that I don't like the answers, but at this moment I'm not shooting the messenger.

I thank you for your information that you provided during those estimates, and I thank your officials for their time.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much for your comments. I won't take too long in just wrapping up what I wanted to say, but I just want to indicate to you that the amalgamation that we have brought about of the northern affairs secretariat, Tourism, Small Business and Co-ops into one ministry, I think is the right move to make. I think you will see, as time goes on, that services to the co-op sector and so on will be even enhanced. I was pleased to hear that some of the members opposite did support strongly the small business resource centres. I think they're a very positive achievement and the right move in developing an entrepreneurial and business climate in our province.

I cannot end without highlighting, once again — and I want to do this for two or three reasons, because I think it was a milestone and a real move forward in this province — and that was the Business Opportunities Saskatchewan show that took place in Saskatoon about two weeks ago. I want to do it for two reasons: I want my colleagues to hear again the accolades that have come in on this. I want the opposition to realize the importance of this show, and I also want my staff members who are probably watching this in Saskatoon to hear firsthand some of the strong support that has come in from across this nation because they were very instrumental in putting it on.

So with your indulgence it will take me about a minute or two to read through what I think pretty well sums it all up. And this is a letter that I received the other day, September 29, and it is from a firm in Winnipeg. It's called U and R Tax Services, who were present at the Business Opportunities show, and it's addressed to myself, and it says:

Dear Sir: The show which your department put on in Saskatoon, September 11, 12 and 13 was truly outstanding. From the moment we arrived on Thursday, May 10, until our departure Monday, May 14, we were treated "first-class."

The whole affair was well advertised in advance, the set-up well supervised, and the staff could not have been more congenial and co-operative. We have attended and participated in similar shows from Montreal to Vancouver and sincerely, yours stands out head and shoulders above the others. Without exception, from the time we first received notice of your show in late January or early February, every bit of correspondence, literature, and guidance was given with great consideration. The representatives of your Department were

most co-operative, particularly the ladies and those . . . located in out-lying areas of the province.

While I am praising your Department some plaudits must also go the province in general. Free enterprise appears to be alive and thriving. Saskatoon, as you mentioned in your remarks (and) appears to be rapidly expanding and upon our return through Regina we were pleasantly surprised to see the same hustle and bustle.

I don't know if it is my personal opinion or if it is generally shared by others, but I was under the impression that Saskatchewan was dragging a foot because of the potash problems, agriculture dilemmas and low oil prices. It could be the propaganda we are being fed locally. My two colleagues join me in wishing our provincial department for small business could be as concerned about the well being of small business as your department is in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan is well.

Once again, congratulations and thank you for an exceptional show. Invite us back next year. We'll be (there) front and centre.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, Hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think that illustrates the attitude that was there towards the development of small business and in that fantastic show that we held in Saskatoon. Once again I would like to thank my department for putting that show on. I'm proud of it; this government is proud of it; this province is proud of it.

I want to thank the people opposite for their questions. As it takes place in here, sure we get into the thrust of debate from time to time, but in the main, the questions were well phrased. You will not always be satisfied with the answers, as I'm not always satisfied with the questions, but in the spirit of developing this province and moving it ahead I want to thank you for your indulgence in these estimates. And to the people who are my support, to the people who I said the other night, follow the directions, make the wheels turn, make the business show a . . . (inaudible) . . . a hearty congratulations for your support. Thank you all very much.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Item 12

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a brief question of the minister. In item 12, in the last number of years there's been a payment under grants to local authorities and other third parties of \$152,500. I noticed that has appeared on the 1986-87, '85-86, and '84-85 Estimates in that same number, and yet it does not show up in the projected budget for this coming year.

Can you tell me what's happened with that grant to local authorities and other third parties?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It's a five-year agreement that was the grant money formally paid to the centre for co-op studies. The five-year agreement was terminated or came to its end in this budget year. That's why you do not see it as a budgetary figure in the present year.

Mr. Trew: — Just a supplementary, Mr. Minister. Can you tell me how the co-op studies is funded? I gather it is continuing on now. Is the department involved in funding it in an ongoing manner?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It has been funded in a joint funding between ourselves and the major co-ops. My understanding is that they have enough money at this time to continue on the studies. There has been no approach for further funding from us. We will be discussing and dialoguing in that.

Item 12 agreed to.

Vote 45 agreed to.

Consolidated Fund Loans, Advances and Investments Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives Vote 167

Vote 167 agreed to.

Supplementary Estimates 1988 Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 45

Mr. Chairman: — Any questions?

Supplementary Estimates 1987 Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 45

Item 1

Mr. Shillington: — Would you give us a list of those grants under the venture capital tax credit program, Mr. Minister?

An Hon. Member: — He did already.

An Hon. Member: — No he didn't. If he did, he lied about it.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I'd ask the member to apologize to the House for that comment.

Mr. Shillington: — That was meant purely in humour, Mr. Chairman. It was not in any sense meant to be a serious comment. I was just kibitzing with the Deputy Chairman. It was not meant as a serious comment.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, we'll give that to you.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 45 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1987
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Northern Affairs Secretariat
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 48**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 48 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — I'd like to thank the officials.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:13 p.m.

Corrigendum

The title at the top of page 2995 of the *Hansard* 88A, Thursday, October 1, 1987 should read: Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

[NOTE: The online version has been corrected.]