

November 27, 1981

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## **ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

#### **Members to Compose Standing Committees**

**DEPUTY CLERK:** — Mr. Miner, for the special committee appointed to prepare lists of members to compose the standing committees of the Assembly, presents the first report of the said committee. The lists of the members are now laid on the Table and will appear in this evening's *Votes and Proceedings*.

**MR. MINER:** — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to report that the select standing committee appointed to prepare lists of members to compose the select standing committees have not met. The report is now laid before this Assembly.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Meadow Lake:

That the first report of the special committee appointed to prepare lists of members to compose the standing committees of the Assembly be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

### **NOTICE OF MOTION**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I give notice that on Tuesday next I shall move that this Assembly approves the historic constitutional agreement achieved on November 5, 1981, by a consensus of first ministers in conformity with the conventions of Canadian federalism as espoused and identified by Saskatchewan before the Supreme Court of Canada and adopted by that court in its judgment of September 28, 1981, and that this Assembly also endorses the amendments to the constitutional agreement advocated by the Premier of Saskatchewan which secure full sexual equality rights for men and women and the recognition and affirmation of the rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

### **QUESTIONS**

#### **Purchase of Marathon Oil**

**MR. LANE:** — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In light of the comments made yesterday by the Premier that the program announced in the throne speech to supposedly assist home-owners will not solve the problem and that there would be no provincial moneys forthcoming, would the Minister of Finance be prepared to justify to this Assembly his government's priorities in spending \$200 million for the purchase of Marathon Oil but not giving one red cent to the home-owners of the province of Saskatchewan?

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

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there has been no purchase of Marathon Oil. I think the member loses sight of one very important responsibility of any government: it is important that governments provide services and programs essential for people today, which we are doing. That is why, out of almost one billion dollars of revenues which are coming into the heritage fund this year, we will expend a vast portion on programs in hospitals, schools, and on other services. But that is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. It is also important and a moral obligation of any government to prepare for the future. Therefore, it is important that governments invest in income and job-producing assets in order that the economy of tomorrow can be as strong as it is today, so that those services which we strengthen today can remain strong for our children and other generations in years to come.

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

**MR. LANE:** — It is rather surprising that every major investment by the government opposite has been in an industry which already exists in the province of Saskatchewan, which doesn't create one new job and doesn't return any additional moneys to the province of Saskatchewan. Given the fact, Mr. Minister of Finance, that housing starts in the province of Saskatchewan are down dramatically, particularly since 1979 by approximately 70 per cent, would the minister not admit that his choice of spending, bidding \$200 million for Marathon Oil and not helping the housing industry in the province of Saskatchewan, is really a callous disregard for a major industry in Saskatchewan which is in dire need of financial help?

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, once again I want to say to the member that although I don't discount the possibility of that happening sometime, I do not believe that there has been a purchase of Marathon Oil and I should make that clear. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how that would be much different from the purchase of Suncor by the Government of Ontario. That seems, Mr. Speaker, to be a perfectly good thing to do when it is the Government of Ontario and it is said to be important to Canadianize the oil industry in Canada. I think it is a perfectly good thing to do in the province of Saskatchewan as well.

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

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that in the budget provisions of this year, in answer to the member's question on housing, we have provided a number of measures which are assisting people. We have \$73 million in rebates of resource money to property owners in the form of property improvement grants to assist them with their property taxes. We have in the 1981-82 budget almost \$17 million in subsidies and grants through the housing corporation to assist home ownership or provide housing in Saskatchewan. In the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation budget this year we have authorized the construction of 2,917 units of public and rural housing and co-op and farm housing. So within the capacity of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I think our record is a pretty good one.

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

**MR. LANE:** — I'm glad that the hon. member mentioned Suncor in the province of Ontario because it's very interesting that the government of that province recently removed the sales tax from the automobile industry on the sales of cars in Ontario. This has dramatically helped the very basic industry

in that province. Would the minister be prepared to tell us today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's called help. It's called removing tax. It's called helping the people in the province. I ask the hon. minister, would you not be prepared to admit that your program of major acquisitions of existing industries in Saskatchewan and your refusal to help significant industries in the province is a question of warped priorities? Secondly, would you kindly advise this Assembly why yesterday there was no mention of assistance to the small businessmen and the farmers in Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, the last place I heard that kind of a speech and that kind of a proposal was from the province of Manitoba under the former Lyon government. They not only made the speeches, Mr. Speaker, but they also implemented the kind of Conservative policy which is espoused by the members opposite. Everyone in this House knows what was the ultimate result. Industry declined. I am prepared to compare the success that has taken place in Saskatchewan from the point of view of development to that kind of an experience any day.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I think the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, which has been making good returns on its investment and in the first year that comes to mind made \$167 million worth of profits, was a good investment. That's \$167 million that would have left this province and this country to go to the foreign owners that . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order! We have been in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and, quite frankly, I had to pinch myself — I thought I was in the Ottawa House of Commons.

I wonder if the members can confine themselves to questions and answers rather than debate. I know they are anxious to get into debate, but they will have an opportunity later to do that. Will the members confine themselves to questions and answers?

### **Effects of the Home-owners' Security Act**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier. The amendment to The Home-owners' Security Act which was announced yesterday in the throne speech will, no doubt, place a heavy burden on the lending institutions. Mr. Premier, since 50 per cent of the mortgages in Saskatchewan are handled by credit unions, is it your intention to place the cost of that responsibility on the shoulders of the members of the credit unions?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is appropriate for me to discuss the terms of the Bill which has not yet been introduced and, accordingly, its effect is perhaps best dealt with when we are dealing with the Bill.

May I just comment on the factual basis of the question asked by the member for Regina South? It is simply nowhere near the facts that 50 per cent of the mortgages are granted by credit unions in this province. I would think that the figure would be a good deal closer to 20 per cent. It is our belief that of the 5,000 home-owners who might be facing financial difficulty, approximately 2,250 would be with the chartered banks, about 100 would be with life insurance companies, about 1,250 would be with trust companies, and 1,400 would be with other organizations, the bulk of which would be with credit unions. So, given that 1,250 of those 1,400 are with credit unions, that would be one-quarter of the 5,000 loans in question.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I have always considered credit unions to be banks, Mr. Premier, and I would question the figures you have just indicated.

Mr. Premier, have you taken in consideration the effect that this may have in 1983? Will your amendment to this Act not place a loss on these institutions, therefore requiring them to raise the rates in 1982? Have you taken that problem into consideration in deciding to bring in this amendment?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, once again I think what we're called upon to do is to discuss the details of the Act, which is not before the House. I think that a more constructive debate could take place when the provisions of the Act are before the House and the specific impact upon borrowers and lenders could be more effectively ascertained.

**MR. ANDREW:** — A question to the Premier. In the proposed legislation that you set out yesterday, which you will be introducing down the road, is there going to be any relief for the people of Saskatchewan who have already renewed their mortgages at extremely high rates of interest in the past six to eight months?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, once again I think it's best to discuss the terms of that legislation when it is before the House. There's no point in speculating on what's going to be in the House and what's not going to be . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, what is being asked is very clearly what the terms of the Bill are going to be. It is simply not constructive to discuss the terms of a Bill which is not before the House. I again suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of the House, that the best time to discuss the terms of the Bill is when they are available for all to read and all to consider with respect to their effect.

#### **Government's Purchase of Norcanair**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — A question to the Premier. Since you won't discuss the Bill, maybe we could talk a bit about the recent buying binge that the government of this province has been on. I would like you, Mr. Premier, to justify to this Assembly the rationale for the use of some estimated 50 million taxpayers' dollars for the purchase of Norcanair. This is a venture, Mr. Premier, which you yourself admit will be losing money for the next five years, and I suggest for probably longer than that.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of \$50 million, \$5 million or \$5 having been spent for the acquisition of Norcanair. The members opposite are once again chasing rabbits in the fond belief that if they chase enough, they may eventually catch one.

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

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — With respect to the operation of an airline, our government believes that there ought to be effective airline service from Regina and Saskatoon into the north of Saskatchewan. We believe it ought to be done in order for the people of Saskatchewan to get the largest possible economic benefit from the mining activity in northern Saskatchewan. We very much wish this would be done by a private sector airline as indicated by the fact that for 10 years we have not moved in order to change the position with a private sector airline.

The private sector airline which is now operating there does not wish to modernize its fleet and is perfectly prepared to say that publicly, and has said it publicly. The proprietors are at a stage in their

business careers where they do not wish to make the very large financial investment which would be necessary in order to put new jet aircraft into service — aircraft which can provide the level of service which customers and airline patrons now expect.

If hon. members opposite are able to recommend any other airline which would take that over, we would be delighted to look at it. We are obviously somewhat apprehensive about its being done by Pacific Western Airlines because we are not sure that it would then be structured to benefit Saskatchewan as much as otherwise might be. We are certainly willing to consider any proposals put forward by anyone. We have no great enthusiasm for acquiring an airline, but it may be necessary in order to provide quality service to the citizens of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I'm glad that you mentioned the citizens of Saskatchewan, Mr. Premier, because I thought you'd lost track of the question for awhile there. My concern isn't so much about airlines as about the expenditure of dollars. Would you not agree, Mr. Premier? You talk about chasing rabbits. If you're the rabbit, I can tell you there are a lot of hunters after you and the Minister of Continuing Education. Would you not agree, Mr. Premier, that those dollars would be better spent in serving the people of Saskatchewan if you were putting that money into adequately funding the universities and the secondary education institutions in this province?

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, could I quote a small bit from the president of the University of Saskatchewan, just to substantiate what I'm saying? I quote from Mr. Leo Kristjanson, the president of the University of Saskatchewan, who said the following:

We have been forced this year to reject the requests of a large number of fully qualified high school graduates for admission to the colleges of nursing, commerce, education, pharmacy, engineering. These are the colleges whose graduates are currently required by the employers of this province.

My question to you is this: do you think it's better to spend that \$50 million on Norcanair rather than on the universities where you'll help more people?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, without being facetious, I can promise the hon. member and the president of the university that for all dollars spent to date on Norcanair a matching amount will be sent forthwith to the University of Saskatchewan. That won't get us very far. Certainly we need quality air service. Certainly we need quality educational services. We invite comparison between our province and other provinces — more particularly, Manitoba, Ontario, and others — about the support for universities. We invite comparison also with the province of Ontario in the amount it spends on its airline — Norontair — in order to provide service for its northern people.

I would remind hon. members that groups, let's say the Saskatoon Board of Trade, also emphasize the need for quality air service. If we can find another way to provide that service we can assure hon. members that it will not be our first choice to acquire an airline and go to the expense necessary to modernize it. If we cannot find another way to provide quality air service in northern Saskatchewan we will probably have to do what the Government of Ontario has done, act as a government, or what the Government of Alberta has done, act as a government, or what the Government of Quebec has done, act as a government, to attempt to provide quality air service for northern regions.

## Purchase of Oil Field

**Mr. Garner:** — Mr. Speaker, question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, it has been brought to my attention that your government plans on spending \$230 million to buy Gulf's oil field in southern Saskatchewan. Can you tell me where this money is going to come from and how you can justify an expenditure like this when your government will not freeze utility rates that are burdening the people in this province?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I've been asked to deal with the money that we might spend on Marathon, the money that we might spend on Norcanair and the money that we might spend on Gulf. None of that has been spent, so none of it can be depriving anybody of any service. I think that the hon. members opposite might well concentrate on things which have been done which they at least can ascertain the facts about, rather than speculate about what might be done in the future.

We certainly would like to think that we were strengthening the oil sector of this province. I am sorry to hear hon. members opposite feel that we should not be strengthening the oil sector in this province and the Canadian ownership of that sector. I am frankly surprised that they would line themselves up on the side of Gulf against the people of Canada in getting control of their oil industry.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Premier, you would like to discuss expenditures your government has already made? I will refer you to the August 11 Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* clipping:

Government spending, \$121,000 for a crown investments corporation office for two people, with a bathtub in it.

Now, can you justify an expenditure like that, Mr. Premier, for two people in the province of Saskatchewan, to the people who are facing high energy costs, high utility rates? One of the replies was, "To help clean the taxpayers when they come to the office."

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'll ask my colleague, the hon. member for Biggar, to reply.

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite operates on the same principle as the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, which is on the basis of rumour. They then turn that into editorials.

I invite the member opposite to come to Saskatoon and visit the crown investments corporation office. I have offered the *Star-Phoenix* a personal guided tour of the office of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation (SMDC) which they thought too elaborate, but had never seen. I offer the member opposite the same guided tour of the SMDC offices, the same guided tour of the crown investments corporation office, which does have a bathroom, Mr. Speaker, and a bathtub in the women's washroom. It has a shower in the men's washroom. The bathtub cost \$157.69, if I remember correctly. It is identical to the one you would find in almost any house.

**AN. HON. MEMBER:** — I doubt that very much, Elwood.

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Well, the member for Qu'Appelle doubts. That's because he doesn't have the guts to see it, to find out if those are exactly the facts.

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

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — The member for Qu'Appelle operates on the same basis as members of the press, which is on rumours, which they then turn into editorials because they don't have the courtesy, or the intelligences or the fortitude to go to see for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Wilkie, on his way home one of these times, would advise me when he would be passing through Saskatoon, I make him the same offer I made to the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, a personally guided tour of the office.

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

### **Tax Loopholes**

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance, in light of various things that we have been talking about this morning. Mr. Minister — hardships on certain segments of our society — I would like to ask you about a press release dated November 13, 1981, where you state the following:

At the last miniseries' meeting I called for an overhaul of the personal tax system to close loopholes available to the wealthy. The federal government has moved in that direction — a move I welcome, but there is still more to be done.

Those are admirable words, Mr. Minister, but would you not agree with me that it is rather hollow and hypocritical when one considers that the very loophole you are trying to close was used by the Premier of this province in securing a tax shelter in the name of Cavendish Estates at 2 per cent and a saving to him on his federal taxes of \$28,400?

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I don't quite get the thrust of that question, Mr. Speaker. I want to say to the member, and to the House through you, that I happen to favour the closing of loopholes which have caused \$47 billion in a year to be drifted away from the federal treasury to some of the wealthiest people in the country and to some of the largest corporations in the country. There are loopholes that the federal government did not look at which I was speaking about, and I am not supporting all of the things that they have done. I still support that principle, and I have no reservations about that.

### **Executive Bus Service**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, can you justify yet another seemingly unnecessary expenditure of one million dollars for a first class (I see your advertisement on Albert Street says fast class, but in reality it's first class) service for executive government officials, when in fact there is a dire and desperate need to increase the numbers of nursing home beds and hospital beds in the province of Saskatchewan? That is an expenditure, I think, that has been made. I would like a reply to that from the minister.

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I want to first of all remind the member that in July of this year our Minister of Social Services announced a new and major change in policy on the funding of nursing home beds, which is another example of what we are able to do because of the good management of the economy that we have undertaken in Saskatchewan in the last 10 years.

The member must be referring to the bus service that is established between Regina and Saskatoon. I should point out to the member opposite that that is being financed by STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company). It is an investment which is earning a return. I don't know where the members opposite learned about what it is like to run a business, but I invite them to speak to the people in STC someday and find out just exactly how that new, excellent service is operating.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — By way of supplementary, I would like to inform the Minister of Finance that the Minister of Social Services' infrastructure announced July 1 was in fact a direct response to our own nursing home study in 1979, which is a public document. That having been said, there is still a desperate shortage of hospital and nursing home beds in the province of Saskatchewan. Do you believe that that is a good priority for spending — spending money on a first class bus for government executive officials when we still need more beds in the hospitals and in the nursing homes?

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

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I wish I had brought it with me because I could send to the member opposite a copy of my election program of 1978 which said that we would reduce the cost of nursing home care to people in nursing homes substantially if we were re-elected. We were re-elected. We have lived up to that promise as we always do. I also want to point out to the member opposite that in this province we have 16,000 long-term and acute care beds which is the highest per capita allocation of beds of any province in Canada.

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

#### **TABLING OF DOCUMENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before orders of the day, I wish to inform the members of the Assembly that I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. The message is as follows:

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 68.7 of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, I hereby inform the Assembly of the appointment of the following members to the board of internal economy, effective July 14, 1981: Hon. J. E. Brockelbank, chairman; Hon. Roy Romanow; Hon. Gordon Snyder; Mr. Bill Allen; Mr. Randy Nelson; Mr. Graham Taylor; and Mr. Robert Andrew.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It's signed by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, C. Irwin McIntosh. I do hereby table the document.

At the same time I wish to lay on the table, pursuant to section 222(1) of The Election Act, the report respecting the election expenses of candidates and their business managers and of registered political parties at the by-elections held in the constituencies of Estevan, Kelsey-Tisdale, and The Battlefords, November 26, 1980.

I also wish to lay on the table the annual report of the Legislative Library for the period November 1980 to October 1981.

#### **MOTION**



**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, with leave, under rule 39, I move the following motion, seconded by Mr. Garner, the member for Wilkie. In light of the fact that the recent federal budget removes income averaging annuities as a method by which small business and farmers are not able to average a capital gain over a period of years on the sale of their business or farm, I move:

That this Assembly condemn the short-sighted policy under the guise of a loophole and demand that the federal government remove that provision from the budget.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Under rule 39, a member, in order to have a motion proceed, requires unanimous consent of the Assembly. I now inquire, does the member have consent?

Agreed.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have a copy of the motion so I can see what the hon. member for Arm River has put forward? While I'm waiting for the copy of the motion, I think the hon. member should know that upon hearing and reviewing the implications of the budget, the Minister of Finance and I forwarded a Telex to the federal Minister of Finance asking that that aspect of the budget be withdrawn. We will be glad to table a copy of that Telex, which I believe was sent last Friday, for the legislature and for the hon. members opposite.

Hon. members should also know that along with that Telex we released a press release outlining the position of the Government of Saskatchewan on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan concerning implications of the budget with respect to income annuity.

I may report also, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Finance for Saskatchewan, in meeting with the provincial ministers and the federal minister (I believe in Halifax this week — Monday and Tuesday) raised the issue. I have not, Mr. Speaker, had an opportunity to get a report from the Minister of Finance. I think he is checking his notes and will likely be returning to the House and will be able to give a report on what took place at the finance ministers' meeting earlier this week.

It is indeed a very important issue for farmers who have put all of their retirement money back into the farm, who are looking at selling, who are looking at using the annuity approach. That's going to change the whole planning structure. It certainly has implications, as has been brought to my attention by a number of people in smaller communities who have been advising farmers to pursue this route. It has implications for our land bank program. As a matter of fact, land bank, in a meeting this week, got a report from some financial people on the influence this change in the budget would have with respect to many farmers who have sold their land to land bank and used this approach to resolve their security in retirement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we are well ahead of the hon. member opposite. While I share (and I am pleased to see that members opposite share) in the concern, I think what we can do in a united way is take the position from the legislature to the federal government with all members supporting the motion put forward to see if we can influence the national government to make some changes.

I may report to the Assembly that the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Mr. Whelan, has called a meeting of provincial agriculture ministers for December 9 in Ottawa. We have forwarded to him a letter requesting that in addition to the issues that he wishes to raise, which relate to the future of agriculture in the '80s, we wish to raise the issue of stabilization for hogs and for beef, we wish to raise

the issue of interest rates and we wish to raise the issue of income averaging annuities. So, the government is pursuing it, I think properly, on two fronts: through the Minister of Finance to the finance ministers; and I'll be pursuing it, along, I'm sure, with other provincial ministers, with the Minister of Agriculture through the meeting coming up the week after next.

I would encourage all members to support this motion and I would encourage the hon. members opposite to report on the activities that they have been pursuing with respect to getting a change in the federal policy announced in the budget.

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

**MR. ANDREW:** — I would just like, Mr. Speaker, to make a brief reply. The Minister of Agriculture indicates that the Minister of Finance was quickly onto the path of this loophole that is described as a loophole, and yet in his press statement, coming out in response to the budget wherein the income averaging annuity contracts and the vendor financing on the sale of farms and small businesses clearly became a very significant part, no mention was made of that other than the fact that he was glad to see some of the loopholes closed. Of course one of the main loopholes that was closed was the ability of a farmer or the ability of a small businessman, once he sells his farm or his business that he has worked for a lifetime to build up, not to be taxed all in one year on that particular item but to be allowed to spread that over a period of 10 to 15 years and pay at a lower rate of tax.

I hope that the entire Assembly will give support to the motion by the member for Arm River and that we can communicate this particular motion to Ottawa. Hopefully, the Liberal government will see clear to making these changes so they don't seriously affect a lot of small farmers, a lot of small businesses faced with that problem in the past, people who have sold prior to the budget, and certainly people in the future.

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

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, before I take my place I will want to introduce an amendment to the resolution which I think would perhaps more accurately reflect the mood of the House and more accurately reflect what I believe has transpired since the MacEachen budget has been tabled.

I think what is important, in addition to the presentation of this resolution and our amendment of the resolution, is to have fully on record what it is that the respective political parties in this province have done about this problem of the income averaging annuities. We have just heard the member for Kindersley criticize the government for a press release which was issued almost immediately on either the night or the day after the budget was first announced by the Hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. MacEachen. The Conservative spokesman, seizing upon that budget, alleged or conveyed the impression that the Government of Saskatchewan somehow was glad that the loopholes were closed, or intended to convey the impression that the Government of Saskatchewan wanted that also to be the case with respect to income averaging annuities.

I say, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the member for Kindersley that, if I read his words, they represent a gross misrepresentation of the position taken by the Minister of Finance upon a closer reading of the budget and the telexing or communication of those points by the Government of Saskatchewan to the government in Ottawa on income averaging annuities. Loopholes we are opposed to as a government. The question of loopholes for those who are very wealthy, who have advantages

with respect to incomes, who can use tax laws to increase their advantage or, if you will, to avoid the payment of taxes that ordinary businessmen and farmers work day in and day out to pay — those are the kinds of loopholes we are opposed to. Income averaging, as it relates to the farming community (perhaps the most important aspect of our business sector), is something which we find is a necessity. A strong argument exists for its maintenance and preservation. It is the same with the small business provisions as they relate to income averaging annuities. That is not in the category of a loophole. That is not in the category of the kinds of initial steps, albeit rather timidly, that Mr. MacEachen is making in Ottawa. It is not in the category of the kinds of loopholes that we seek to plug, as a government, if you will, as a political party — loopholes which are available to those who need no extra advantage in the payment of taxes.

The Conservative Party opposite, in this province and outside of this province, has been opposed to any kind of covering of loopholes, generally. That's the simple, basic position. They smile when I say that. And if I'm wrong, I would like the hon. member for Maple Creek — in fact, I challenge (when I take my place) any member of the Conservative Party in opposition, now — to stand up and table, before this legislature, what exactly they did on the income averaging annuities proposal when it was first tabled.

I want to know what Telexes were communicated to whom, what telegrams were forwarded and what letters were submitted. I want them to table them. The member says he has them right there. Then I will challenge the member who introduced this motion (he has the right to close the debate) to do this and to indicate it. If he has, all to the better. If, indeed, the Conservatives have written letters stating positions like the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture have, both at the conferences and elsewhere, then I think this House can truly stand united on this important issue. If the Conservatives have not done this, then in my judgment they can be accused, and rightly so, of playing nothing but cheap politics with the farmers and small businessmen of this province.

If they have introduced this on a Johnny Come Lately approach — brought in this kind of a motion as an afterthought because they think it's going to gain them some form of political advantage, without any kind of telegram or anything — then I think they are going to be judged by the media and by the people of the province of Saskatchewan. So I say to the hon. members opposite that your actions are more important than your words about your concern for people. It is what you and members of your party do when it comes to tax advantages, and when it comes to programs for the people, that is important.

Judge them in Manitoba; judge them in Ontario; judge them in Alberta. Where do they stand on these issues of loopholes? Judge the Conservative Party. Where does it stand as to who should get these breaks, and who is arguing about the MacEachen budget exactly? If you say income averaging annuities should be maintained (which we do), then I ask the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, who was not in the House when I was speaking, to table his correspondence prior to this session.

The Minister of Finance is going to do the same here for the Government of Saskatchewan. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in order to ask the Conservatives to pony up what they've done, show the press.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — It's right there.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — When you sit down. Show the public what you have done and when you did it. Show them. We'll see where we stand on this side. In order to make this resolution more properly reflect what has been the story, I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Premier, that the said resolution be amended by adding the following words after the word 'budget' in the last line thereof:

And commends the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance for immediately urging the federal government to restore the said procedures.

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

**MR. LANE:** — It is rather a surprising day, when the Minister of Finance of the government opposite says that he's against loopholes and the Attorney General says that this one may be all right except that it's no good because it was the Tories who showed the leadership in this Assembly by criticizing the Government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, it's rather surprising. Here we have a government supposedly concerned, come before this House to ask for unanimous support to condemn the federal government? Did it really care, Mr. Speaker? No.

He says that it's two weeks too late. Let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, which is too late: the motion today condemning the federal government, or a so-called statement by the Minister of Agriculture which was completely contradicted when the Minister of Finance was in Halifax? Where does the federal government stand on the NDP position? Does it listen to the Minister of Agriculture or does it listen to the Minister of Finance who says, "Close all the loopholes?" I'm confused, Mr. Speaker, because I don't know where that government stands. I'm confused and the people are confused.

I have never seen a government trying to extricate itself from a very unwise position. I really have the suspicion that the real position of the government opposite is the one stated by the Minister of Finance. I didn't hear the House Leader of the government opposite stand up and say, "We don't agree with the Minister of Finance in our cabinet." We didn't hear him say that. We didn't hear the Minister of Agriculture get and say, "My Minister of Finance — I can't agree with him on this." We didn't hear them say that. So which one applies, Mr. Speaker?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there can't be a better way of expressing that to the Government of Canada than a unanimous resolution presented by this Assembly. And if the Attorney General wants to talk about tabling letters, I would hope that at a very early time in this session he'll table all his constitutional letters back and forth so that we then can find the various positions of the government opposite at the various times of the year on various subsections and everything else in the constitution. Mr. Speaker, I know that in the interests of tabling all the correspondence between us and our colleagues in Ottawa and you and your colleagues, those being the Government of Canada in Ottawa, you will table all your correspondence and I know that that offer is implicit in the statements made by the Attorney General of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part about the statements of the government opposite is that the people of Saskatchewan don't know where they stand on this question of income averaging annuity contracts. The damage that it causes to the small businessman and the farmer has been well-articulated in this Assembly. It's going to cause great damage. It's going to prevent a great number of farmers from selling for their retirement. What this proposal of the federal government means is that the farmers not only live poor but they're expected to die poor now. And yet the Minister of Finance of Saskatchewan says, "I'm glad that they closed that loophole."

Now, somebody on the government's side is going to have to stand up and tell the public of Saskatchewan that the Minister of Finance was wrong, that what he said in Halifax was not a statement of the Government of Saskatchewan's position, that he is prepared to retract the statement that he sent

out in his own press release and that he is reconsidering his position. Why didn't we hear that? Why, on something so important for the small businessman and the farmers of Saskatchewan, did the government opposite not have the political courage to abandon the Minister of Finance or get him to retract his statement?

There is only one way to give a clear message, and that is to take the motion as proposed by the Conservatives in its entirety without amendment. That's the only way. Otherwise you're embarrassed because you're taking the side of the Minister of Agriculture and you're abandoning the Minister of Finance. That is what your amendment said. I really think in something this important we could be unified in this House. Our position should be unified. And anything to take away from that is a disservice not only to ourselves but also to the farmers and small businessmen of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen over the last three or four years that when the Tories come in with a good idea the government opposite is opposed to it. That is really what is happening today. The fact is the first time under the new rules that section 39 came in (brought in by the Conservatives) the government didn't know how to react, except to take a foolish position of choosing one minister over the other. But unless their amendment puts in a specific clause that they disassociate themselves from the Minister of Finance, or unless the Minister of Finance retracts his unequivocal statement, the motion and the amendment opposite is really a fallacious one. I am surprised; I shouldn't really be shocked because it was the NDP of course that got us into this budget when in 1979 they very gleefully defeated the rather sound budget of the previous Conservative government in Ottawa. They did it. We can all remember how happy they were. Yet we end up with one of the most destructive documents from the Parliament of Canada, with the collusion of the members opposite. You have a choice. I think you are going to have to bring in a supplement to tell us which position you are taking. We would like to know and so would the people. Are you going to back the Minister of Agriculture or are you going to take the side of the Minister of Finance? Would you please tell us which way you are going?

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Speaker, the last speaker, so-called, the member for Qu'Appelle, said that he was confused and it was quite obvious that he was. That was the only thing that was clear in all he had to say, and he hasn't enough courage to stay around to hear what anybody else has to say. He talks about closing loopholes. In our request to close loopholes . . . It has been our request to the federal government; it has been our request to provincial governments, Progressive Conservatives and Liberals, throughout the years.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, if you would like to examine the records about closing loopholes, that the Progressive Conservative Government of Ontario and the Liberal government in Ottawa worked together quite nicely when it came to closing loopholes for major corporations like Inco (International Nickel Company of Canada Ltd.) when a few years back they allowed the International Nickel Company in Sudbury, Ontario, to walk off with \$70 million of the taxpayers' money, from Canada and Ontario, and to haul it off to Guatemala and set themselves up a nice, little operation for nickel mining there — which is now of course in trouble. That is a typical example, Mr. Speaker, of the way in which Conservatives and Liberals (their cohorts) close loopholes for their friends.

This attempt today, Mr. Speaker, is an obvious attempt on their part to show that they are really out there doing something for the people of Saskatchewan, but it doesn't quite work.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to closing loopholes, I remember quite clearly a battle which was fought with the potash companies in this province. I remember quite clearly members opposite standing up and

fighting against the Government of Saskatchewan when we were attempting to collect those taxes from those corporations. I remember quite clearly how they stood behind their leader, the member for Nipawin, and fought the establishment of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan which brings \$167 million in profits a year to the people of Saskatchewan. Those profits are now being used on such things as FarmStart loans and land bank, which those people also fought tooth and nail, Mr. Speaker. Now they attempt to come out and say, "Hey, we're the great defenders of the farm people in Saskatchewan. It just plainly doesn't wash and it won't wash with the people of Saskatchewan either.

You know, it was really rather interesting to note that the first person to bring this point up about income averaging was the Yorkton-Melville member in the House of Commons. It was a point which was worked out by a member of the Parker Quine and Company accounting firm in Yorkton; his name is Ken Laxdal. He worked in conjunction with another person who is the owner of Independent Agencies Ltd. in Yorkton, a fellow by the name of James Caudle. They then provided the information they had very carefully worked out to our member of parliament. After these fellows had carefully worked out this system on a three-quarter section farmer, it was interesting to note that the so-called Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, Grant Devine, came out as if it were his own discovery — long afterwards. The only difference was that he worked it out on a half-section farmer. He came out as if it were his own great discovery. Johnny Come Latelies is what they are called, and the people of Saskatchewan recognize them because that is exactly what they are — Johnny Come Latelies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to sincerely congratulate the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture for the stands they have taken in demanding the closing of the loopholes for these major corporations. I would like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for his insistence that the farmer be allowed to have income averaging so that he could have the retirement annuity which so many of us are able to arrange for ourselves through our life's work. These are the demands which have been made to the Ottawa government and the Johnny Come Latelies opposite have attempted to cash in on this. It simply doesn't wash. Thank you.

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

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I look forward to making a few brief remarks on this resolution which, quite obviously to all of us, has caught the mover of it by some surprise, because I have a suspicion he was not expecting it to come forward as it has. Now I find, in listening to the members opposite, a great deal of struggling and shadowboxing and dancing in order to try to construct an argument in support of the resolution..

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words to put the record straight. Obviously what the Tories opposite are doing is in the guise of this issue of income averaging annuities. They are trying to present an argument for no changes or no reforms to the tax system of Canada at all. That is the traditional position of the Conservative Party whether it is provincial or national. It is clear that that is still continuing to be the position of the Conservative members of this Legislative Assembly.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that what I said about the need for tax reform in Canada I stand by. I believe that the tax system should have equity in it, and there is this reform of the tax system which was long overdue. I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that what has been introduced under this great name of closing tax loopholes by the federal government is almost insignificant. It has barely touched the surface in reforming the whole tax system. Why should Shell Oil in 1979 pay no incomes taxes at all? I have to ask that question. Why, in the last quarter when the banks have once again increased their

profits by 36 per cent, should they be left totally alone and not make a contribution to the general revenues of the treasury of this country, in order that a national government and our provincial governments can provide the needs and the goods, the services and the programs that are essential to the citizens of this country? Those kinds of tax loopholes, Mr. Speaker, were hardly touched, so I say they have barely touched the surface.

A member in the question period raised a question about the income tax cut. I want the members opposite to know quite clearly, and look into the record on my press conference that I had on budget night, that I expressed a great deal of concern when I saw that some 50,000 of the highest earners in Canada, making about \$100,000 or more, were going to get a tax cut of \$5,622, whereas people on low income were getting an average tax cut of around \$150 a year. That, to me, is not a very progressive kind of tax adjustment, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I happen to be against real tax loopholes and so is the government that I represent.

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

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That is where, Mr. Speaker, we part company with the members opposite because obviously, in their statements today, they have a different point of view. But I want to make it clear that I do not consider the removal of the income averaging annuities opportunities from farmers as closing a tax loophole, because to me that is not a tax loophole.

Mr. Speaker, we had a federal budget on November 12. Today is November 27. I ask the members opposite where they have been. Where have they been for this period of 15 days to raise this issue? As the Attorney General said, “What steps have they taken to persuade anybody in the federal government to begin to bring some changes?” I know that the Leader of the Opposition — the illusive leader who does not sit in this House — had a press conference and made some comments. Well, all kinds of people can make comments to make a political point, but it is the kind of action which one takes to follow up on that comment that is significant and important. I submit that those members opposite took no action at all; therefore, their resolution and comments here today are rather shallow.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate the steps that we took as a government. First of all, as the member for Yorkton has already mentioned, the issue was first raised in the House of Commons and written about here in the *Western Producer* of November 26, as follows:

Farm spokesmen have since complained about income averaging contracts which are used by farmers who sell their operation.

It goes on to say, and quite accurately, I might add, the following:

The issue was raised in the House of Commons November 18, when Lorne Nystrom, NDP MP for Yorkton-Melville, complained the budget change would seriously impair retirement prospects for many farmers.

Even in the House of Commons the Conservative representatives sat on their heels, because they were not prepared to take up the issue until it was raised by the NDP member for Yorkton-Melville.

Mr. Speaker, On November 19, the Minister of Agriculture and I took some steps to try to persuade the federal government to change this provision which they introduced in that budget. The Minister of

Agriculture . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member says that the Minister of Agriculture stepped one way and I stepped another. Well, I want him to listen with real care as I read into the record of this House, the Telex which the Minister of Agriculture and I sent jointly to Mr. MacEachen, on November 19. It reads as follows:

The complete elimination of income averaging annuity contracts in your recent budget places a significant and disproportionate burden on Canada's farming community. In our experience, farmers rely heavily on the income averaging annuity provision to reduce the tax burden resulting from disposition of farm holdings upon retirement. As you may know, most farm cash reserves are reinstated in the everyday maintenance and operation of farm holdings. As such, many farmers are unable to contribute to tax deductible registered retirement savings plans that are used extensively by other individuals. The income averaging annuity provision at least ensured a farmer a means to reduce tax liability upon retirement.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You talk about jumping on the bandwagon.

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — The member for Maple Creek ought to listen to the next paragraph. I quote:

Saskatchewan's capital gains tax rebate program testifies to our belief that the capital gains earned by farmers from the disposition of real farm property should not be taxable. Combined with our program, the income averaging annuity provision gave to the farmer a fair return at retirement.

We agree, and we say that again, that a number of your budget's tax measures have significantly improved the equity of the tax system. However, in the case of the farmer who is unable to enjoy the same tax advantages available to other income earners, we strongly feel that a tax inequity has been created by the elimination of the income averaging provision. We request that you reconsider your position with respect to the taxation of the proceeds from the disposition of farm property.

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

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to table a copy of that Telex, the original of which I have here, in case someone wants to see it at this time.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What was the date that was sent?

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That was sent on November 19.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to point out to members opposite that in spite of the numbers of people they have in their research staff they do not pay attention or do not get all of their information.

The member for Lumsden stood in his place and quoted a news release that I issued when leaving for Halifax to meet with Mr. MacEachen and other provincial ministers on EPF and fiscal transfers and other matters. He failed to mention the Telex of November 19, which the Minister of Agriculture and I issued, and in which we indicated the Telex which we had sent to the federal Minister of Finance. But of course, Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that it would be nice and simple and easy just to send off a Telex and express some concern and make the political point and let it lie. We are not prepared to let it lie. When I went to Halifax and met with Mr. MacEachen I made a point, even though it was not on the



agenda, of raising this at the meeting of the federal Minister of Finance and provincial ministers once again. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that I generally supported the objectives that he was indicating in principle for eliminating unacceptable tax loopholes so that the burden of taxes can be more equitably distributed. As I have already indicated, I don't believe that Shell or any large corporation of that kind needs further breaks. I think they need fewer. I don't believe that the financial institutions of this country need further breaks. I don't think they are paying their fair share now.

But I also said at the meeting, Mr. Speaker, that I was quite concerned that the decision to eliminate income averaging annuity contracts may impose a particular burden on farmers and small businessmen when they sell their land or property in order to retire. I also said, Mr. Speaker, that it is a recognized fact in western Canada that many of our farmers are land rich and cash poor for much of their lives and for these people the value of their property (that is their farmland) is their pension plan.

Now I found it of some interest, Mr. Speaker, that I was the only Minister of Finance who expressed any concern and I heard not one comment from any of the Tory ministers who were there on this issue — not one. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen happening over there today is a desperate attempt by the Conservative opposition to make up for their lack of concrete policy on a lot of issues including agriculture. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we see here today an attempt by the members opposite to recover some of their broken credibility which they created for themselves when they opposed unanimously such programs as SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program), which is a stabilization plan for hogs, and when they opposed unanimously in the last session of the legislature the beef stabilization program. Four times, Mr. Speaker, they stood in this House (and it is on the record) and voted against stabilization for our producers of beef in this province. I say, as the Minister of Agriculture says, what kind of an agricultural policy is that?

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is clear, in concluding my remarks, that we did not sit on our heels and wait for somebody to say something. We did not make statements only so that we might get a headline. We as a government, the Minister of Agriculture and I, took action to the extent that we could take action in urging that there be a change in those loopholes. We hope that the federal government will listen. I could tell the House in concluding, we are not prepared to give this issue up and we will continue to press and to urge that there be some changes made.

**MR. SWAN:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the member for Arm River moved a very serious motion today as it applies to the farming community and the family businesses that are in our province. The removal of this particular clause by the Minister of Finance is going to have very detrimental effects in the province of Saskatchewan on our farmers and on our business people. I believe that the amendment that was moved by the Attorney General and seconded by our Premier is a cheap amendment — an amendment really only moved to pat themselves on the back for something that they have done very little with.

I am surprised that the Attorney General sees that as the time for cheering the government on. We should be looking at the serious hardship that this kind of move by the Government of Canada has placed on the farmers and the businessmen in our province. I believe that the Government of Canada is going to have to take a very serious look at this move if it is going to see the small business survive. You know, if we want to see the opportunity for one farmer to pass land to his son or daughter or some other family member, or a business to pass along in a family, the type of thing we're experiencing here is going to make it very, very difficult.

I don't see the purpose that the government has at this time in patting itself on the back for sending one telegram. We have all been in communication with our members and it's very difficult to table a telephone call, gentlemen. Try it yourself sometime. But we have been in contact and our contacts are having an effect on what's happening in the Parliament of Canada. We have moved a very serious motion here today with the idea that this particular legislature could pass a motion ratified by all of us that would have some effect on what the Government of Canada will do before the budget itself is finalized. I don't believe that we're 10 days late; we didn't have any opportunity to pass a motion in this legislature until today and we moved the motion at the first opportunity we had.

I ask the Government of Saskatchewan to take a very serious look at what we have here to back the resolution and forget the backslapping they are trying to do with their amendment. I don't think this type of thing is going to be of benefit to you as a government, but I believe the resolution put forward by the member for Arm River is a good resolution that we should all support.

**MR. JOHNSON:** — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite stand on this particular motion without very sound footing. The change in The Income Tax Act really brings about a change in the agricultural scene that their leader, Mr. Devine, advocated when he suggested that the number of farmers in the province of Saskatchewan should be reduced to about one-fifth. He is on record as having said that and you can read it where it is written.

Mr. Speaker, when you change The Income Tax Act in this manner, you immediately put into play a move to put into the farm communities in Saskatchewan large corporate operations, because they are not affected directly by this change, Mr. Speaker, the concept they are attempting to put across is opposed to what their leader has suggested should happen in the agricultural community and I say that they are only putting this forward to smoke screen their actual beliefs.

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

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, it was not clear to me today which of the members here had actually bought the stock, but I am absolutely shocked to hear that the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Finance and the member for Arm River have so much stock in New York Life, Sun Life and all of these large American corporations that are selling income averaging annuities because that is what this Act is designed to remove . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm happy to tell you about anything you want to hear about, Mr. Mostoway. Sober, too.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, this so-called closing of loopholes, which the Attorney General and the Minister of Finance have been so concerned about, is going to affect everyone. They're talking today about closing the loophole on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers, because there are a large number of voters out there who are Saskatchewan farmers. No mention has been made here of the closing of loopholes with regard to MURBs (multiple unit residential building program), none whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. They love the closing of loopholes with regard to MURBs. The only apartment construction in Saskatchewan in the last five years, except for those built by the government, have been those provided by MURBs. People in the province today are living in good accommodation because of MURBs, but the government opposite loves the closing of that loophole. They love the closing of that loophole. Why? Because it enabled private people to own private accommodation and private rental accommodation. They loved the closing of that because then the only people who can possibly construct apartments and rental units will be the Government of Saskatchewan or the Government of Canada or some other government organization. By removing that loophole the Government of Canada has very neatly and

nically succumbed to the socialist philosophy that it has always had and has prevented the private sector from going into that business any further.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest one or two other loopholes which haven't been mentioned here today. This is not a tax loophole but here is a loophole for the Minister of Agriculture to wonder about. There are now large numbers (not just a few) of Saskatchewan farmers who are selling their farmland to the land bank, and taking the money from the land bank to buy land in Colorado, North Dakota and Montana. Mr. Speaker, we can document that loophole. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because the land bank is paying them \$700 or \$800 an acre for similar land to what they are buying in Montana, Colorado, and North Dakota for \$250. They are getting a \$750 for the Saskatchewan land from the land bank, taking the cash and buying the dirt (radioactive dirt at that) in Colorado. How about that wonderful loophole, Mr. Speaker? Is that what The Saskatchewan Government is designing in closing the loopholes they are talking about — to provide these wonderful benefits to the people of Saskatchewan so that they can move south as well? There are large numbers of people moving south, Mr. Speaker, as you are no doubt aware. But now, Mr. Speaker, we are getting to the Saskatchewan farmers — the men and women who have provided for the people of Saskatchewan since its inception. The farmers and the farm families can't stay here because they don't want to be tenants on their own land. They don't want to rent the ground from the land bank so they are selling to the land bank and buying dirt in the United States. Isn't that a marvelous loophole they desire to prevent?

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the recently announced budget of the Government of Canada — so warmly received by the Minister of Finance, so readily received by the Premier and his government — is a disaster for the people of Canada and for the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it is not only the farmers who are affected. It is every man, woman and child in the country. Every man, woman and child in the province is affected by this budget — this so-called closing-of-loopholes budget that you so warmly received.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this. I don't intend to support either the motion or the amended motion because all it focuses on is one segment of the population which this budget is affecting. If you want to pass a proper motion, pass a motion, Mr. Speaker, that affects all the people of Canada and all the people of Saskatchewan because they are taking jobs away with this budget. It is a most shortsighted and ridiculous budget. It affects labour — labour hasn't been happy with it. It affects management — management's not happy with it. It affects the farmers. It affects everyone. Mr. Speaker, it is a dumb and stupid budget. You should not so warmly have received it. The Minister of Finance and the Premier should not have so warmly received it. They should have thought just a little more about what all these loopholes were going to do to the average citizen.

Mr. Speaker, it is so nice to be warmly received by the members opposite now. It's a pity that they aren't mentioning Swiss bank accounts and things of that nature now, because it was so much fun before when they mentioned Swiss bank accounts and shot gun, pistols — all kinds of wondrous little things that really affected the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the budget in Canada was a disaster. I'd be happy to support a unanimous resolution of the House condemning the Government of Canada for issuing that budget and for all of the loopholes which they plugged that are going to seriously affect the jobs and livelihoods of all Canadians and all people of Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I don't want to add a great deal to this debate, save only to list a few things that have been done. Members opposite are suggesting that a motion ought to be passed, in order that it might be communicated to the Government of Canada, dealing particularly with income averaging annuity contracts and their effect on farmers. I agree that we ought to send that message. I agree that that message ought to have been sent already, but that a further message being sent by way of a resolution from this House would be a positive and constructive step.

I simply want to point out to you that a good deal has been done already and that we have not, regrettably, heard what has been done by members opposite other than to raise this particular resolution. It may well be that you've been in touch with your members at Ottawa. It might have been helpful to this group if you had outlined in some detail what steps you have taken, particularly with respect to income averaging annuity contracts.

An attempt has been made by the member for Qu'Appelle to suggest that anyone who opposes tax loopholes is somehow opposed to the ability of a farmer to buy an income averaging annuity contract. That was the burden of his argument, and it was a bad argument — a bad argument because he took a general statement dealing with general tax loopholes and tried to apply it to every single thing that anybody might call a tax loophole. It's a bad argument.

When the Minister of Finance had an opportunity to address the particular problems of income averaging annuity contracts, he made his position and the position of the government perfectly clear. What has happened now? Firstly, a member from Saskatchewan, the member for Yorkton-Melville has raised this issue, at an early date, in the House of Commons. As far as I am aware, he was the first member of parliament to raise this issue of the application of income averaging annuity contracts on farmers. The same arguments apply to small businessmen.

We have then had the perceived need to say something more definite on behalf of our government. We had the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance send a detailed Telex to the Minister of Finance of Canada outlining the difficulties that this particular budgetary proposal was going to cause to our farmers and also to small businessmen and others who may be required to sell, in essence, their life savings in an asset, be it a farm or a small business. So that was done. It was done in a way which I think ought to commend itself to all members of this House.

For my part, I have spoken on a number of occasions on this issue. It is my judgment that we ought to organize all the support we can for the point of view put forward by the member for Arm River and shared by us. On November 17, I spoke to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and pointed out (I suspect they knew) that the budget had the income averaging annuity contract provisions in it which might have a serious impact on Saskatchewan farmers. I invited them to consider that. I didn't attempt to outline to them what their policy ought to be, but invited them to consider the provisions in the budget with respect to income averaging annuity contracts in the hope that their consideration would lead to their support for the position which our government took and that which was communicated by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture.

We then had the Minister of Finance take a further opportunity when he was down in Halifax at a meeting of finance ministers of Canada to speak to the Minister of Finance of Canada, Mr. MacEachen, and outline to him once again the difficulties that this provision of the budget was going to cause our farmers and small businessmen. As he reports, he was the only finance minister in Canada who took that opportunity. Never mind about that. He took the opportunity to put a point of view to a person who

ought to be the person close to the decision-making process. I think that is a considerable indication that our government was concerned and is concerned about the application of the budgetary provision on income averaging annuity contracts to farmers and small businessmen.

I think we should go one step forward as the member for Arm River points out. We ought to state the opinion of this House that we believe that that particular provision of the budget, that particular tax change, is one which will have very significant detrimental effects on a good number of Saskatchewan people. So, I will be supporting the amendment because I believe it is worth while to point out (as it was suggested by members opposite that it was not the case) that a good number of efforts have been made to make this point and to make it at the place it ought to be made: Mr. MacEachen's desk.

Also, I will be supporting the motion because I believe that the point of view put forward by the member for Arm River is a point of view which I share, and which I think all members of this House ought to share, the view that the federal government ought to be made aware of the detrimental effects of this particular budgetary provision on those Saskatchewan citizens. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting what I take will be the amended motion, moved by the member for Arm River, amended by the member for Riversdale, my colleague, the Attorney General.

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

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, I have sat here this morning and listened with interest to a lot of comments, ranging from nickel mines, who was first, who was best, and “why didn't you say something?” I wonder what all this had to do with this good motion which I think very member of this House would support. But what I saw in the amendment by the Attorney General was an attempt to change a motion which expressed the concerns of the farmers and small businessmen in Saskatchewan, a sincere motion, into a partisan political debate.

I heard the member for Nipawin rise and say that it was too limiting, that it should be expanded to cover everyone in Saskatchewan. If that is your concern, you have every right to bring in another amendment if you so wish. That wouldn't be the type of amendment that would put this motion into a political debate. That's what it has broken down to, just a political debate, because the Minister of Finance obviously spoke before he thought. Now to the Minister of Finance we will say that that wasn't in your best interest, but let's let that be.

If we are really here, as legislators in this province of Saskatchewan, trying to improve the situation for the people who have been affected by this very bad federal budget, then I say we should support the motion. I would urge the members opposite to show a little bit of statesmanship, to get out of the partisan gutter for a minute and look at the intent of that motion. What is Ottawa going to be impressed with in the amendment made by the Attorney General — “. . .and commend the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance for individually urging the federal government to restore . . .”? What does that add to the motion? It adds nothing. Is that going to influence the people in Ottawa who we send this motion to? Not one bit.

I just want to say one thing, and I'm trying to keep this nonpartisan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I say this sincerely, I think the Premier was trying to do that, but at the end he had to slip back to support his seatmate; I say that. He was talking and saying that the member for Arm River had good thoughts. We believe that; it's a good motion. But at the end he had to come and get this little bit of support for his two ministers who were going in opposite directions. Let's just say that the Minister of Finance spoke

without thinking one time. Let's not hold up a good motion because we're trying to protect the Minister of Finance. Let's defeat the amendment and vote for the motion. If you want to enlarge it to the people of Saskatchewan, bring in your amendment. Let's get on with this business and show a little bit of legislation rather than game playing on this first day of the legislature in this province.

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

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 32**

Blakeney	Pepper	Allen
Kaeding	Snyder	Romanow
Bowerman	Tchorzewski	Robbins
Baker	Feschuk	McArthur
Gross	Rolfes	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Hammersmith
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Byers
Cody	Koskie	Matsalla
Skoberg	Poniatowski	Johnson
Lingenfelter	White	Nelson
Lusney	Solomon	

**NAYS — 15**

Garner	Birkbeck	Lane
Taylor	Andrew	Rousseau
Pickering	Duncan	McLeod
Katzman	Hardy	Swan
Muirhead	Collver	Ham

Motion as amended agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 47**

Blakeney	Pepper	Allen
Kaeding	Snyder	Romanow
Bowerman	Tchorzewski	Robbins
Baker	Feschuk	McArthur
Gross	Rolfes	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Vickar
Hammersmith	Kowalchuk	MacAuley
Engel	Byers	Cody
Koskie	Matsalla	Skoberg
Poniatowski	Johnson	Lingenfelter
White	Nelson	Lusney
Solomon	Garner	Birkbeck
Lane	Taylor	Andrew

Rousseau  
McLeod  
Swan

Pickering  
Katzman  
Muirhead

Duncan  
Hardy

## NAYS — 2

Collver

Ham

## CONDOLENCES

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, we have reached the time in the session when we pay tribute to members of the Assembly who have passed away since we last met. There are two members that we have record of who have died since we last met. I would like to move the traditional motion of condolence. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kindersley:

That the Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of two former members of this Assembly, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contribution they made to their communities, their constituencies and to this province:

**Franklin Edward Foley**, who died on October 8, 1981, was a member of this legislature for the constituency of Turtleford from 1956 to 1964. He was born in Saskatoon on April 1, 1922, and received his early education at Marsden, Saskatchewan. He completed high school at St. Thomas College in Battleford and graduated from the Moose Jaw Teacher's College in 1940. From 1942 to 1943 he served in the Royal Canadian Air Force. He received his bachelor of education degree from the University of Saskatchewan in 1951. His teaching career led him to the principalship of the Glaslyn High School at Glaslyn, Saskatchewan. While living at Glaslyn he was active in the Elks Lodge, the Royal Canadian Legion and the Knights of Columbus.

Following his years of service as member of the legislature he moved to Kerrobert, Saskatchewan, where he served as superintendent of the then Kerrobert School Unit.

**Hayden William Owens**, who died on October 16, 1981, was a member of this legislature for the constituency of Elrose from 1971 to 1975. He was born at Swift Current in 1908 and was raised on his family's farm near Eston, Saskatchewan, where he received his early education. He attended the University of Saskatchewan and became an associate in agriculture in 1929. After farming with his family for many years, he served as foreman of the R.M. of Snipe Lake and later worked as an automotive and implement dealer at Eston. He was very active in local church affairs, was involved in a wide variety of community activities and was a founding board member of the Eston Credit Union, formed in 1942. He served as chairman of the board of the Eston-Elrose School Unit from 1953 to 1967. As a member of the Legislative Assembly he took a great interest in agricultural and educational issues.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy with the members of the bereaved families.

Mr. Speaker, before I close I would like to add a few more informal comments.

I served in the Assembly with both Frank Foley and Hayden Owens. I served with Franklin Foley between 1961 and 1964. I did not assist in getting him here. I served at the recount of the election in 1960 when he had a very close contest with a former colleague, Bob Wooff. Unfortunately he was so close that it was subsequently controverted and in the ensuing by-election Mr. Foley won a fairly convincing victory.

Many will remember Franklin Foley as a convivial person and relatively hard-driving member of the Assembly. He had a particular interest in education, as will not surprise anyone knowing his background, but one I was particularly aware of, because when he first entered this Assembly I was minister of education. Some will remember Frank Foley as one of those men who ran for the leadership of the Liberal Party in the provincial convention which saw the late premier, Ross Thatcher, chosen as leader. He was a very active member of his party.

Some will remember him as one of the people who was engaged in some of these exceedingly close contests with Bob Wooff, whom I talked about. Some of you who might have been thinking of upcoming elections (and several of us are) will recall that in 1956 Frank Foley won over Bob Wooff by 11 votes. In 1960 (the one which was subsequently controverted), Bob Wooff won over Franklin Foley by 12 votes. In the subsequent by-election, Mr. Foley won rather convincingly, and in 1964, Mr. Wooff won over Mr. Foley by 98 votes. So they had three or four contests — two of them by 12 votes or under, and the third one by 100 votes or under. That made for vigorous politics in the Turtleford constituency. He necessarily paid very close attention to his constituency, but would have in any case.

Some of us will remember Frank Foley as a very convivial person who was never, as it appeared, more happy than when he was sitting at the piano pounding out some of the great old songs for singsongs at which all members of whatever political stripe were more than welcome. Some of us here now may remember Franklin Foley's being at the MLA's reunion last year and, indeed, at the piano at the Hotel Saskatchewan, sitting down and playing the old numbers which led to a lively and enthusiastic, if somewhat ragged, participation by a good number of the members.

Finally, many will remember Frank Foley for his many contributions to the communities in which he lived, particularly the community of Glaslyn. He participated in many community activities.

To his family and his friends, I know we would all want to extend our sincere condolences on behalf of this Assembly.

I knew Hayden Owens, as well. I served in this Assembly with Hayden from 1971 to 1975. He was a genial man, always interested and well-informed, something of a quiet student of a man who was dignified in his demeanor. He contributed to the stature of the Assembly in that way as well as in other ways. He was a diligent worker, not only in the Assembly work, but on behalf of his constituents.

He will, I think, be remembered as a person who was understanding and tolerant. He had a solid commitment to his constituency and to a good number of values in his community, which would and do commend themselves to us. He was very active in school affairs for many, many years with the Eston-Elrose school unit. He was an active member of his church, and took his religious duties very seriously.

I know that he was also an active member of the business community of Eston. As I recall it (and my memory might be playing tricks on me), at one time, he was the General Motors dealer, the Massey



dealer, and the Imperial Oil bulk dealer all at the same time, indicating that in rural Saskatchewan, he was a considerable presence in the community. There was no doubt that Hayden Owens was a leader of the business community in the town in which he lived.

He was a person who you describe, I think, as a public-spirited citizen — a sincere man, and a good neighbour. I know that Hayden will be missed by his wife and family. To them especially and to all those who knew him I extend, on behalf of the Legislative Assembly, my most sincere condolences.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the opposition I would like to join with the Premier in paying tribute to these two gentlemen. As it happens, both of these former members eventually settled following their political careers. One, of course, Hayden Owens, always lived in the west central part of Saskatchewan and Frank Foley, of course, moved to Kerrobert following his retirement from the Legislative Assembly. I think we, as opposition members, certainly want to acknowledge anyone who has served in the capacity of a member of the Legislative Assembly in this province.

I knew Frank Foley only briefly. Frank worked in the school unit office at Kerrobert, which also happened to be housed in the Kerrobert Courthouse. Frank always looked forward to the opening of the fall session of the courts in Kerrobert and the spring session of the courts in Kerrobert. Among the lawyers, as they converged on that small courthouse from Saskatoon, Kindersley, Unity and North Battleford, he found a group of people with whom he could readily discuss the politics of the day. He always went out of his way, certainly as a member of the bar, to make bar members very comfortable in Kerrobert. He enjoyed that comradeship with the members. That was my knowledge of and acquaintance with Frank Foley. The member for Rosetown-Elrose, with his involvement in education, of course knew Frank much better and Mr. Swan will refer to that.

Speaking with regard to Hayden Owens, I was born and raised in the town of Eston and I suppose I knew Hayden Owens from the time I was a very young child. Hubert Owens, Hayden's only son, was a classmate of mine all through school and Hubert and I have remained friends since school days. Hayden did contribute substantially to his community, and I think that's where he will be remembered for his activities in developing the Eston-Elrose School Unit, along with various other people. Hayden was active in the school unit for a long time. He was active also in many other community events, always participating with the chamber of commerce or board of trade.

Hayden had a very viable business in the town of Eston that, I think, the Premier referred to. I believe he held that business up until two or three years ago when it was sold. That business still carried the name of Owens and Sweitzer — Owens, referring to Hayden. It was a Massey-Ferguson and a General Motors dealership and it was a very viable operation. Hayden was always regarded as a very solid businessperson in the town of Eston. He had a brief sojourn in politics (I believe he sat for one session) and he served his community well in business, in voluntary organizations and in his involvement with the church. The other thing about Hayden is that he was always prepared to stop to talk to you. Once I was elected to the legislature, Hayden often came and discussed how it was going, dealing with the nature of politics, how it affected him.

On behalf of the opposition, I would like to join with the Premier and will all the members of the Assembly in expressing our condolences at the passing of both of these former members., Mr. Foley and

Mr. Owens, acknowledging the people who have served in the legislature, have served in that way in serving their province.

**MR. HAM:** — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join the Premier and the official opposition, on behalf of our caucus, in recognizing these two deceased members. Although the member for Nipawin and I were not acquainted with Mr. Foley, from the information and history that the Premier has put forward, he was obviously an excellent Saskatchewan citizen doing a part to maintain our political system, contributing to his community and the life of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Owens was known by Mr. Collver and me not all that well. But from the information we have heard today, both these gentlemen should be honoured and recognized as being outstanding individuals in our province and contributing to our Legislative Assembly. On behalf of this caucus we wish to express our sincere sympathies and condolences to their families.

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to express my feelings, with respect particularly to Mr. Owens. I didn't know Mr. Foley other than I met him at the time of the homecoming. I remember him playing the piano down at the Hotel Saskatchewan, and a lot of people gathering about him to sing at that particular occasion.

I had the privilege of having Hayden Owens as my seatmate from 1971 to 1975 in this Assembly. However, I had known Hayden Owens a long time before that. Other members have made reference to the fact that he had a very solid success in the business community of Eston, not only in farming but also as a business entrepreneur in the town of Eston related to the GM dealership and the Massey-Ferguson dealership. I first met Hayden Owens back in 1942 when a credit union was being organized in the Eston district. I had the privilege of travelling about that district with Hayden Owens at that time, trying to interest people in the formation of a local credit union. I was impressed by the sincerity of the man. I was impressed by his diligence in presenting the arguments to the people of that district with respect to forming their own locally controlled financial institution. My respect for Hayden Owens was confirmed when he came to this legislature in 1971.

He was one of the founding board members of the Eston Credit Union. He was very active, as other members have intimated, in church affairs, in business affairs and also in the farming community of Eston. Eston will very much miss a fellow like Hayden Owens. In fact, I think the day before his death he attended a hospital board meeting in the town of Kindersley. I was coming from a meeting in Maple Creek the day before and stopped in to say hello to Hayden when I found he had passed away. I went back to his funeral a day or two after. I very much appreciated Hayden Owens as a person and most of all as a friend.

I too would like to join with other members of the Assembly in sending our condolences to Mrs. Owens, to members of his family and to his relatives and friends throughout the Eston district and elsewhere.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with other members of this Assembly in expressing my condolences to the family of Frank Foley and the family of Hayden Owens. I didn't know them as well as members of the Legislative Assembly as I did as members involved in the education sphere. Frank Foley was the superintendent of education in Kerrobert and in that capacity I had the opportunity to work with him many times when I was with the trustees' association of Saskatchewan.

Frank Foley was a man you could always count on to make very serious commitments and comments about education in Saskatchewan. I don't think there was ever a meeting which I attended, at which he was present, when you wouldn't hear his booming voice raising an issue which was of concern to the students of the province and, more properly, of his own area. I concur that he was often the centre of attraction when at a social gathering. His talents at the piano were enjoyed by many of us many times over the years when we would get together.

When I first became involved in the political arena, he was one of the first people to phone and congratulate me on my win. He suggested that if there was any area in which he could be of assistance that he was readily available and would be pleased to provide whatever assistance he could.

I have known both Frank and his wife and I would like, at this time, to express my sincere condolences to Mrs. Foley. I know he was a real community worker, a man respected by all who knew him and he will be sadly missed by that community.

Hayden Owens was a man with whom I worked a lot. I worked with him for a period of about 15 years on different occasions. I knew him very well and I appreciated his approach to life as much as anything else. He had high moral principles and was recognized by the community in which he lived as a community leader and a man who would accomplish things.

He went on to the Eston-Elrose School Division Board in 1953 and served a good long term there as both member and chairman of that board. I think he gave excellent direction to that board by establishing a very sound school system. I would say he was one of the early ones to recognize the need of having more than just the academic classes in the school system, and moved to put in workshops in a number of the communities in the Eston-Elrose system that I believe have been of real benefit to many of the students of that area.

He was highly respected by the school trustees in the province and many times when he spoke to resolutions at conventions you would see the direction of the convention change because of comments that he made.

I have known some of the members of his family briefly but not well. I have respected each one of them. I believe that Hayden can be justifiably proud of the family that he had around him and of the wife who supported him. I would like to offer my condolences to the family. I know that he will long be remembered by the people of the Eston district and by the people around this province.

**MR. JOHNSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with colleagues in the Assembly to express my condolences to the Owens family and to the Frank Foley family. I will restrict my remarks to Mr. Foley as he was a former representative of the Turtleford constituency, the constituency which I now represent.

Mr. Foley was well-known in northwestern Saskatchewan for his contribution to political life on the local level as well as for being a member here in the Assembly from 1956 to 1964. He was also recognized, I believe, throughout the province when he sought the leadership of the provincial Liberal Party in 1960. He was not successful, but I think he demonstrated that he was a very strong individual and expressed his political point of view very effectively.

Mr. Foley was born in Saskatoon, raised and educated in the Marsden area where his father had a homestead which he had taken out in 1910. He completed his schooling at St. Thomas College in Battleford and graduated from the Moose Jaw Teachers' College in 1940. In 1950, after having taught and been in the air force, he received a bachelor of education from the University of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Foley was always interested in community affairs. He liked to help people. At the drop of a hat, he was prepared to sit down at the piano, as other members have pointed out, to entertain or open a meeting with 'O Canada' or 'God Save the Queen.' Mr. Foley taught school first at Turtleford and then at St. Walburg. For 15 years he was principal at the Glaslyn school, individuals who went to school there while he was principal and who worked as teachers under him said that he was a very easy person to work with.

In 1969, Mr. Foley became the superintendent in Kerrobert, and was then employed by the Kerrobert Board of Education from 1977 to 1980.

The community of Glaslyn recognized Mr. Foley's talents as an excellent speaker and chairman and asked Mr. Foley to return to Glaslyn to act as chairman when they celebrated the community's existence for 50 years. I had the opportunity of being on the platform with him at that time. I can well understand why the Premier indicated that he was an individual one had to observe.

It was understood by the people in the village of Glaslyn and the surrounding area that Frank Foley and his family would retire in Glaslyn. They were in the process of acquiring a residence there. His untimely death has probably changed that. Most people were very pleased that he was doing that.

Frank, as most people knew him and as I knew him, enjoyed the North and he lived a full life. He was a traveller and took many short and long trips in the North and in Saskatchewan. He liked to hunt and fish and he golfed. He appreciated the tranquillity of a cabin at Turtle Lake and visited there on a very regular basis.

One of his political foes, Bob Wooff, who disagreed with him on many issues and considered him a friend, recognized Frank as a very talented individual. He said that he could make the ivory talk when he sat down at a piano. I agree with that; he could most certainly play.

Mr. Foley's life was one of service — service as a young teacher, service to his community through volunteer work, and service to everyone in Saskatchewan during his time in the Assembly. I was privileged to have known Frank Foley. I can say that this well-respected man will be missed by a great many people.

It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that this Assembly express its condolences to the Foley family.

**MR. PEPPER:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my condolences and remarks to those of Premier Blakeney and other members of this legislature for the family and the friends of Hayden William Owens. Had I known Mr. Franklin Foley, I am sure, from the remarks which have been given here today, my condolences and my remarks would apply to him equally. My comments will perhaps relate more to a personal view I have always held of Hayden, first, because I admired his character and style and, second, I feel he was a clear example of the best that is in Saskatchewan public life.

Hayden was not an emotional man, not because he felt lightly but because he felt deeply. He most sincerely loved his province and his goals as a member of the legislature always had to do with what could be accomplished for Saskatchewan and its people. I also believe that he had the right attitude of mind: that democratic government is not simply this or that economic structure or political machinery, but that it has to do with setting policy by the free discussion of issues among people who on all sides respect one another.

Mr. Speaker, it is people like Hayden Owens who show us how worthy a call in public life can be. As a gentleman and a fellow member, he demonstrated the fact that politics is still a great and an honourable adventure. Our roll of honour in this Assembly is long, but it holds no nobler figure. Hayden Owens will stand, to those of us who are left, as an embodiment of the spirit of the province he loved.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my condolences to those of the Premier and the members of this legislature for the families of the two bereaved that we are talking about today, particularly for my good friend, Hayden Owens.

I had the privilege of serving with Hayden from '71 to '75 as has been already mentioned by the other members here. He was a valuable friend and I admired his courage and his conviction. Hayden was motivated by a deep religious conviction and of him we can truly say he practiced his beliefs. Whether he was serving on a committee (we travelled together on the agricultural committee) or meeting people, wherever Hayden was, his quest for the reasonable, thoughtful approach to problems always came through loud and clear. Right up until his passing, Hayden continued to be concerned about his community and the people he loved. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him cherish rich memories. We will always miss his quiet, compassionate presence.

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** —Mr. Speaker, along with Premier Blakeney, The Leader of the Opposition and the other legislative members who have just spoken, I would also like to add my personal regrets on the passing of my former colleague and good friend, Hayden Owens, just a few months ago. The one term Hayden Owens spent in this legislature, as a New Democratic member for the then constituency of Eston-Elrose earned him many friends and a lasting and deep respect from all members of this House, government opposition alike, as well as that of every individual who had contact with him during his four years here. Those of us who were on the committee on foreign and corporate ownership of Saskatchewan farmlands in the early '70's (and there are just a few left in this House of that group) found Hayden to be most honest, sincere, direct, yet firm in the deliberations leading to the final report on that very important issue. I personally liked Hayden Owens very much. His commitment and responsibility to his constituents, the people he represented, and to the people of Saskatchewan and Canada, firmly guided him in his decisions. Hayden was a kind, considerate and understanding person, as the people of Kindersley and Rosetown recognized and appreciated. They appreciated his services on the school unit board over the many years and then as a worthy member of this Saskatchewan legislature.

I want to offer to Mrs. Owens and the family and friends deep regrets at his passing and most sincere sympathy to the bereaved.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not have the opportunity to be in the Assembly when Franklin Foley was a member. I'm sure that it was lively, because any time I was with him he was a lively fellow. I knew him through education affairs as the member for Rosetown-Elrose when I was a

school trustee, when he was often the centre of attention at the piano, as has been pointed out, and also in the business meetings themselves.

The thing I will remember, Mr. Speaker, about Frank Foley, when I was Minister of Education, was his giving me advice. We argued sometimes about that, for obvious reasons, because Frank, of course, was a fairly strong Liberal and I was not a very strong Liberal — still am not a very strong Liberal. We argued about that, but the most important thing I shall remember about Frank Foley is that he was always ready to give me encouragement in the tasks I had a minister of education. I think I can say, along with an awful lot of people whose lives he touched, I'll always remember him.

Hayden Owens, Mr. Speaker, was a builder. He was a builder of the co-operative movement; he was a builder of small business in rural Saskatchewan; he was a builder of education in rural Saskatchewan; he was a builder of his party. Most important, Mr. Speaker, I think he was a community builder. He built in his community and he carried that building kind of feeling and commitment into this legislature. I'm glad that he was elected and did sit in this legislature. I think, because of his community commitment which he carried forward, he was a valuable member.

Members on this side of the House have, I think, been trying to make another point about Hayden Owens. I can best put it, from my feelings, that he was simply a prince of a man. It showed up in his community out there, and it showed up in this Legislative Assembly. There are a great many people of whom you can say that this province is a lot better because they were here. I put Hayden Owens in that category.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Kindersley:

That the resolution just passed, together with transcripts of oral tributes to the memory of the deceased members, be communicated to the bereaved families on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

## **MOTIONS**

### **Radio Time**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to move, by leave of the Assembly, seconded by the hon. member for Moose Jaw South:

That the matter of division of radio time arranged for the current session be referred to the standing committee on communication, the said committee to report its recommendations thereon with all convenient speed.

Motion agreed to.

### **Public Accounts**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood, by leave of the Assembly:

That the public accounts of the province of Saskatchewan for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1981, be referred, as tabled, to the standing committee on public accounts.

Motion agreed to.

### **Report of Provincial Auditor**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon Nutana, by leave of the Assembly:

That the report of the provincial auditor for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1981, be referred, as tabled, to the standing committee on public accounts.

Motion agreed to.

### **Annual Reports of Crown Corporations**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saltcoats, by leave of the Assembly:

That the annual reports and financial statements of the various crown corporations and related agencies be referred, as tabled, to the standing committee on crown corporation.

Motion agreed to.

### **Retention and Disposal Schedules**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, by leave of the Assembly:

That the retention and disposal schedules approved by the public documents committee be referred, as tabled, to the standing committee on communication.

Motion agreed to.

### **Composition of Select Standing Committee**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Finally, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, by leave of the Assembly:

That Messrs. Allen, Berntson, Birkbeck, Byers, Chapman, Nelson, Rousseau, Solomon and Tchorzewski be constituted a continuing select committee with the power to call for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath and whose duty it shall be to establish, from time to time, select committees with the power to call for papers, persons and records, and to examine witnesses under oath, with the power to travel and to hear testimony away from the seat of government; and that the

continuing select committee have the power to set the terms of reference for each select committee; and that each select committee shall report directly to the Legislative Assembly from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:39 p.m.