

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**22nd Day**

**Tuesday, March 22, 1977.**

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**HON. H. W. LANE** (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I should like through you to welcome a group of Grade Seven students from Greystone Heights School in Saskatoon. There are 38 of them sitting in the east gallery and are accompanied by Bill Sherman and Roberta Robertson. We hope that they have a very informative stay here and a pleasant and safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. A. PEPPER** (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly, a group of 72 students, Grade Eight students, from the Weyburn Junior High again. I think it is somewhat around eleven years that this group of students, not the same individuals, but Grade Eight students from Junior High have attended the Legislative Assembly. They are accompanied by Mr. Jim Nedelcov, Mr. Morgan Williams and Mr. Jack Porter and their bus drivers, Mr. Dwayne Anderson and Mr. Gary Baniuck. I hope to meet with these students later.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, Mr. David Lange, I should also like to introduce to the Members of this Assembly a group of 15 high school students from Yellow Grass. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Allen Wagner. They are sitting in the top row of the Speaker's Gallery. I am sure that it is our wish, when I say we hope that their stay here proves educational and beneficial to them and that they all have a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER** (Saskatoon Westmount): — I should like to take this opportunity to introduce a group of students from the constituency of Saskatoon Westmount. They are from St. Gerard School, 31 in number. They are Grade Eight students and are accompanied by Mr. Murphy. I know that all Members will join me in wishing these students an interesting day in the Legislative Assembly and a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H. H. ROLFES** (Saskatoon Buena Vista): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with you in welcoming St. Gerard School. I have a particular reason to welcome the students here today. They have the honour of having as their principal Pat Murphy who used to be a vice-principal of mine at Bishop Murray School. I want to particularly welcome Pat here today.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **QUESTIONS**

### **BISHOPRIC SODIUM SULPHATE MINE**

**MR. R. E. NELSON** (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Minerals.

Did the Minister receive a letter from a representative of the Bishopric Sodium Sulphate Plant regarding the possibility of closing that plant? Has the Minister made any final decision regarding the closing?

**HON. J. R. MESSER** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I have not in any such letter. Therefore I find it difficult to answer any questions that the Member alludes to that may have emanated from that letter.

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a Minister over there who wants to get on his feet who did receive the letter some time ago and apparently hasn't passed it on to the present Minister. Maybe he could answer the question.

**HON. E. WHELAN** (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I am the Minister in charge of Sask Minerals and I did receive the letter and we did consider carefully the information that was contained in it. As yet no decision has been made.

**MR. NELSON:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister agree to meet with the employees and the two MLAs who are involved before reaching a decision on this particular closing?

**MR. WHELAN:** — I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that to both the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) and the Member from Bishopric, we had a delegation of four of them in our office very recently. The matter will be discussed at our next board meeting and we will consider carefully the contents of the letter. This is a commitment that I made to them.

## **AMOK DEVELOPMENT**

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT** (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, if I might direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We heard yesterday from his colleague, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer), that there was a good chance that Amok would be allowed to proceed with their development, notwithstanding the results of the Bayda Inquiry. I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether the Ministry of Industry and Commerce has proceeded in allowing Eldorado to sign lease agreements or whatever to move into the Warman development and

secondly I wonder if the Minister would indicate the price of that land which as optioned in the Warman land assembly by SEDCO which I gather was in large part assembled for the purposes of the development in the Warman area?

**HON. N. VICKAR** (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I would rather the Member for Regina Wascana put those two questions on the Order Paper because I don't have any knowledge of any agreements being reached at Warman at this time.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — I have, Mr. Speaker, a letter from the Minister dated the 2nd of February regarding that matter and I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether he is prepared to indicate to the House the price paid for the options in the Warman land assembly and the price for the land that is being assembled in Warman for that use? The letter, Mr. Speaker, has indicated he would not and I wonder if he would justify that position to the House.

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, again I might reply to that, and ask the Member to put that on the Order paper and we will take that into consideration.

### **PLACE RIEL PROJECT**

**MR. H. W. LANE** (Saskatoon Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to either the Minister of Education or the Minister of Continuing Education. It refers to the Place Riel project at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon campus. Now, I would ask the Minister whether this project, which has been extending now over, Mr. Speaker, some 12 years, whether he would not agree that with the increased student enrolment and changing concepts in education and a growing body of alumni from the University of Saskatchewan, whether he would not agree at this point in time that the Place Riel project is now more important or at least as important as it was some 12 years ago at the time of its inception?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Member for Maple Creek.

### **YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM**

**MR. W. H. STODALKA** (Maple Creek): — Question to the Minister of Culture and Youth. In view of the fact, Mr. Minister, that your Youth employment Services Program is rather limiting in that students cannot be employed for such clerical and maintenance tasks as library work, clean up or whatever type of works you might have, yet also in view of the fact that this summer it seems that students are going to have a rather difficult time finding employment, is the Minister willing to reconsider his program, to change his program so that employers will be able to employ people in these works, clerical work and in maintenance work and would the Minister also give some justification as to why those two areas were eliminated in his initial program?

**HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI** (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, the program this year is essentially the same

as it was last year. There have been no changes in it from last year. Last year there were changes in it from the year before. There is an increase in funding for the department as there are in other departments, but I don't anticipate in answer to the question directly, I don't anticipate any changes in the criteria as they are laid out now for eligibility.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I think when the plan was originally devised employers were able to employ these and I realize that changes were made a couple of years ago, but many people have found that since these limitations were put in, that in many communities there just simply isn't work available in some of these other areas and therefore, it's very exclusive. Certainly if the Minister would reconsider his position and allow such people as school boards to employ students in maintenance and clerical roles, then we would have more employment. I wonder if the Minister would comment on that.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — The purpose of the program, Mr. Speaker, is to provide additional work. The criteria are therefore geared in such away that it would, in fact, provide additional work. The purpose of the program is not to subsidize existing positions that are going to be available through regular hiring procedures.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether the Government would consider a change in the policy which now means that young people are paid exactly the same amount those rare occasions when they can find employment, as older employees? As the Minister may know, we are the only prairie province and indeed one of few provinces in Canada which does not distinguish between the minimum wage for young people and the minimum wage for those who are ordinarily considered to be adults within our employment standards. So that Saskatchewan, in a way, discriminates against young people in that it makes it more difficult for them to find employment.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Not at all, Mr. Speaker. I think, I take the position that Saskatchewan is contrary to what the Member says. We are not prepared to discriminate against young people by paying them less for doing the same kind of work as anybody else.

### **PLACE RIEL PROJECT**

**MR. H. W. LANE** (Saskatoon Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to have another run at this question. I direct it specifically to the minister of Continuing Education. I would ask him whether, in fact, with increased student enrolments, a growing body of alumni at the University of Saskatchewan and the fact that concepts of education are changing, does he not consider the concept of Place Riel at this point in time as important?

**HON. D. L. FARIS** (Minister of Continuing Education): — Mr. Speaker, that's a sort of nebulous question I find very difficult to answer. I don't know what the need was 12 years ago. I know that there is a variety of options that have

always been open before the students, before the universities, and now before the Universities Commission. This question is under constant analysis.

**MR. H. W. LANE:** — Supplementary question. I agree that it is under constant analysis. The project started, as I'd indicated, 12 years ago. The students have spent something in the order of a quarter of a million dollars, the students in the university, in dealing with this project. They have gone through some four or five different sets of building designs. The students have contributed \$2.2 million the Place Riel Fund and they are not getting an answer as to whether or not they will be allowed to proceed on the project. Now before an ugly situation develops I would ask you, are you prepared to meet with them and give them an answer?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Next question.

### **GRAZING RATES**

**MR. E. ANDERSON** (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the recent announcement by the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources (Mr. Matsalla), announcing the reduction in grazing, are you now considering reducing the grazing rates in the Saskatchewan provincial pastures.

**HON. E. KAEDING** (Minister of Agriculture): — No.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Mr. Speaker, you don't, Mr. Minister, you don't have the same good feeling for the industry like the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources, when he announced it because of the distressed situation in the cattle industry. He felt that they would reduce rates. You don't feel there is a distressed situation in the cattle industry then?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not entirely acquainted with how the Department of Tourism sets their rates, but I know that our pastures, we provide a lot of service for our customers in those pastures and I'm not sure that Tourism does. I think rather that they are simply providing grazing and no other services and the services are what cost the money.

### **TRACTOR DEALERS' LICENCES**

**MR. R. A. LARTER** (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In recent years we have had problems with tractor jockeys bringing tractors into Saskatchewan and yet under The Agriculture Machinery Act, they have not been forced to take out licences. Now these dealers, one for example at Speers, sells something like 150 tractors a year and the Department tells our dealers that there is nothing they can do about it, he can't licence them and yet you require us to carry parts for all machinery we sell in this province. I would like to ask you why aren't these dealers, these jockeys, licensed the way we are?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the problem that the

Member refers to and I'd certainly be pleased to check out the problem and see whether there is anything we can do under the present Act.

**MR. LARTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This is becoming quite a problem because many of these tractors are coming in new, from across the line. We do not object to farmers going across the line and buying tractors and . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'll take the Member for Saskatoon Eastview.

### **TEACHERS' MEDIATION**

**MR. G. H. PENNER** (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. I understand that the teachers have applied for mediation in provincial bargaining. Is that correct?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, that is correct. That is part of the normal procedures in negotiations as laid out in the legislation.

**MR. PENNER:** — I understand it is the first time, Mr. Speaker, it has ever happened. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment as to when the teachers applied for mediation?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, I believe they applied on Friday.

**MR. PENNER:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister give the House an indication of what effect that has had on the Government side with regard to negotiations? Or to phrase the question in another way, is the Government trustees team prepared to continue to bargain despite the fact that mediation has been applied for?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — The Government trustees team has been prepared to bargain all along, continues to be prepared to bargain and continues to accept the mediation, if that is the wish of the teachers.

**MR. C. P. MacDONALD** (Indian Head-Wolseley): — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister comment on the restrictive nature of grants, for many school boards in Saskatchewan are being given a very limited amount of grants. In fact one of them got an increase of \$16,000 yet an eight per cent increase in the grant would be over \$100,000 and how can the teachers expect any legitimate negotiation and what kind of response can be expected from the Government trustees team?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, grants to operating of schools have increased this year by ten per cent which I think is far from being restrictive. It is a very substantial increase in today's terms. The costs of education are escalating this year less than they escalated last year and just as we have provided for

municipal governments, provincial libraries and other concerns in the province, the ten per cent, we think is a very substantial increase.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Supplementary. Does the Minister expect then that if the Government negotiation team provides an eight or nine per cent increase in teachers' salaries and the grants do not cover that, that the responsibility for picking up the additional money will be an increase in the mill rate at the local level.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That's a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker. I am not anticipating what the negotiated settlements will be, that is something that will have to be determined through the free collective bargaining process.

**MR. PENNER:** — Final supplementary. I have a question I want to direct, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. He commented a moment ago that the amount of the grant increase is sufficient to give boards ample opportunity to make their payment commitments in a 1977 budget. My question is this; has the Minister examined one budget of a school board that has been put forward for 1977.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I think the Member adds a little bit to what I said. He asked the question whether I have examined school board budgets. I have examined summaries that are provided to me, I certainly haven't examined every school board budget in detail as they are presented to the department by the school jurisdictions.

### **PLACE RIEL PROJECT**

**MR. H. W. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Continuing Education. Would the Minister be prepared at this time to meet with a body of students from the University of Saskatchewan to explain to them why since 1974 the Government's contribution, or the Government's preparedness if you like, to give a contribution of 50 per cent in 1974 has now slipped to what appears to be something in the order of thirty three and one-third per cent with respect to the building of Place Riel?

**MR. FARIS:** — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared at any time to meet with the students from the university, my door has always been open to them. I have already met with the student presidents from both universities and from all the technical institutes and I told them at that time that my door was always open to them. You pointed out earlier that there has been a 12 year delay in this building and so on, and that is not the responsibility of this Provincial Government. There have been delays because of changes of emphasis and desires and relationships between the students and the university themselves and to lay the blame on either this Government or the previous government is quite incorrect.

**MR. H. W. LANE:** — A supplementary question. Would you then be prepared, Mr. Minister, to have the guts to say to them either yes or no and give them some definite guidelines at this point in time. They are not getting any guidelines from you.

**MR. FARIS:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not tell the students at the university what they must or must not do. I will not interfere with the operation of any of the universities in this province. If the Member knew a little bit more about how the universities operate in this province he would realize that we have a University Commission which handles these capital allocations and so on so as to have an arm's length relationship between the Provincial Government and what goes on in our universities, and I think that is very important.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE PROGRAM**

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister in charge of the Youth Employment Service Program. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is aware that the differential between adult workers and young workers federally is 25 cents, in Alberta it is 15 cents and in NDP British Columbia it is 40 cents, in NDP Manitoba it is 25 cents. I wonder if the Minister would explain to me at least why the rest of Canada is out of step with what is appropriate and best for young people and your Government for some curious reason is in step and the rest of Canada is wrong?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, the Member would be interested to know that the Government of British Columbia has a conservative style Social Credit Government not an NDP Government. As for the question that he raises, yes, I am aware of those differences in the other provinces, just as I am aware that once in this province we had a medicare program and it never existed in any of the other provinces either. I don't think that is an indication that we are not in step, I think rather that it is an indication that we are ahead.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **WATER BOMBER STATION**

**MR. G. N. WIPF** (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan why in establishing a water bomber station has the Government selected a site at the Prince Albert airport that will in fact mean that the Prince Albert airport will remain a northern airport and that the jet service and particularly the type Air Canada would supply will be forever able to refuse to use that airport, in the selection for your sites for your water bomber tankers?

**HON. G. R. BOWERMAN** (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — I didn't know that there had been a final decision made with regard to the location of where the water bomber site would be located on the Prince Albert airport. If that is the case it's because there has been an agreement between the city and the department with respect to it, because the city does manage the airport and is in control. Whether or not we like it if we had not located it in the right place I suppose they wouldn't have given us permission to have the base where it is.



**MR. WIPF:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry you don't know if you had a site located because tenders have been let, the Department of Highways has been in there all winter doing a survey on it. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask, obviously I can't ask him because he doesn't know, but the Government site chose is a more expensive and a more dangerous site than the alternate site at the airport which was approved by the city. Now why did the Government select a more expensive site?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — I am not sure that the department did select a more expensive site. I know that there were discussions between the department and the city. I know that there was a difference of opinion as to where the city desired the department to go. I know that the position which the city took was the more expensive proposition for us in the operation of the water bomber base. If the site in fact has been chosen, then it is on the basis of an agreement reached between the department and the city.

**MR. WIPF:** — As of last night the city still has not approved the site that the Department of Highways has been in doing the survey work on. The tenders have been let out and I understand that the tender has been accepted. Can you tell me when you are going to get some information on this? I've had a phone call from the city people.

### RENEWAL OF LICENCE PLATES

**MISS L. B. CLIFFORD** (Wilkie): — I should like to ask a question of the Minister of SGIO. I asked the other day, Mr. Minister, about the problems in the new licensing. I was wondering first, have you checked into whether or not it is taking an additional two and one half times the amount of time it did previously; also about the 18 per cent charge that some people in the department are saying it is going to cost to get the licence moved from one month to the other for renewal?

**HON. E. C. WHELAN** (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — I think in answer to the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, it does take longer because of the procedure that we are working out so that 719,000 registrations will be spread over a 12 month period and the insurance has to be allocated on the same basis. It is bound to take longer but I am pleased to report that the time for registering one vehicle has been cut drastically because of the experience that the issuers are having.

The second question, I don't think you will find anyone in SGIO making the sort of statement that you made in the House. I can't find anyone who agrees with this. I think that you are off the beam and there is no one who says it is going to cost 18 per cent to move the plate. There has been no decision made on this, we've talked to all the people handling the telephones, we can't find any substantiation for the statement that you made.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I talked to your department this morning, Mr. Minister, they do not know the answer as of yet, this is why I am asking you. The second problem that is

occurring is that you have now changed instead of gross weight on the licence plates you are now charging for the measurement of the wheel base which is taking more time again because often the make is not known for the length of the wheel base. The question is, as it is taking twice as much time have you considered giving the agents additional compensation as far as their remuneration is concerned so they can hire more people? Mr. Minister, your department says you are considering this and I would like to know if this is true?

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, it is true. It was clearly indicated by the department that we are considering the work involved, but I must find out when it has been resolved if there were be much less work for the agents spread over a longer period of time. You also indicated in your statement just now that there has been no decision made regarding the cost of re-allocating the birthday date or and you were saying the other day that we have decided that it was 18 per cent so you have admitted in your own statement and you discussed it with our people that no decision has been made. That is absolutely correct, no decision has been made yet. You misled the House the other day with your performance, you know . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order!

#### **POINT OF ORDER ON QUESTION PERIOD**

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT** (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I might raise with you a Point of Order and it deals with the refusal to reply by the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Vickar). Mr. Speaker, this is the 15th occasion I dare say when the Minister has refused to reply . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! What is the Point of Order?

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, quite clearly, if the Minister doesn't know he might say so. It appears . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, Order! I think the Member is making an argument and not raising his Point of Order. I want the Member to make his Point of Order, but I don't want him to make a speech or an argument. I want to hear the Point of Order.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Is it your ruling then, Mr. Speaker, that all that a Minister need do when he faces an embarrassing or difficult question is say he won't answer the question? If that is the position . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I have the Member's Point of Order. The Member coloured his Point of Order to the extent of saying that if the Minister is faced with an embarrassing question . . . I might state to the Member, the rules governing this Question Period in the House are quite clear. When the Minister is facing a question, embarrassing or otherwise, he has several options. He may answer the question, he may ask the questioner to put it in writing or he may do nothing. I think everybody understands

that about the Question Period in the House.

## **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

### **RETURN NO. 28**

MR. STODALKA (Maple Creek) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 28 showing:

With respect to students in Saskatchewan who applied for loans under the terms of the Canada Student Loan Plan in the fiscal years 1975-76 and 1976-77 to October 30, 1976: (1) The number of loans granted; (2) The average amount granted; (3) The average amount applied for; (4) The number of applications for which the amount granted was less than the amount applied for; (5) The number rejected altogether; (6) The number of applicants qualifying for independent status under the regulations; (7) The number of applicants not qualifying for independent status under the regulations; and (8) The average amount of parental contribution required where the applicant was classed as dependent.

**HON. D. L. FARIS:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to amend this question but it is almost identical in wording to the question which was asked in 1970 of the former Minister of Education, Mr. McIssac. At the same time he had to give a similar amendment to the amendment that I must give and that is that the questions which are asked here are not those which are ordinarily recorded in the department and I am informed by my officials that it would take two person years, two people a full year each to answer that questions by completely going through the files. Therefore, I must amend the form of the question as Mr. McIssac did in 1970.

I move, seconded by Mr. Rolfes (Minister of Social Services) that Return No. 28 be amended as follows:

That all the words after "Canada Student Loan Plan" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

In the academic years 1975-76, and 1976-77 to October 30, 1977: (1) The total amount authorized in student loans; (2) The total number of students assisted; (3) The average loan authorized; and (4) The number of applications not approved.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **RESOLUTIONS**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 3 — URGES GOVERNMENT TO TAKE STEPS TO STOP ILLEGAL DRAINAGE OF WATER.**

MR. A. N. McMILLAN (Kindersley) moved, seconded by Mr. E. Anderson (Shaunavon):

That this Assembly regrets that the Saskatchewan Government has failed to take positive action to prevent the illegal drainage of water in Saskatchewan and implement a constructive drainage policy for flood prone land at a time when revenue lost by farmers, municipalities and Provincial and Federal Governments has reached an all

time high; and that this Assembly urges the Provincial Government to (1) take steps to stop the illegal drainage of water; (2) immediately implement a plan for the constructive drainage of flood prone land.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is put before the Legislature after close to two years of frustration in working with farmers and for farmers to try and effectively bring about some changes in the Provincial Government policy for the prevention of illegal drainage of water in Saskatchewan particularly as it affects farm land.

The farmers of Saskatchewan have for the past three or four years been plagued with the problem of unnatural run-off, large reservoirs or sloughs accumulating on property that in the past has not regularly been flooded. And particularly in view of the fact that there can and have been substantial losses of revenue production. The question of illegal drainage in Saskatchewan has become one of crucial importance. It is true I suppose that the Provincial Government may have some of the pressure on it alleviated by the upcoming possibility of a dry season this year. The fact that drainage and particularly illegal drainage of water in Saskatchewan will not reach the same levels that it has in years gone by is now apparent.

It would be a mistake, I suspect to suggest that the Government has made serious attempts to alleviate the problem that farmers in Saskatchewan have faced. I have contacted the Department of the Environment on many occasions to ask about the position that the Government was taking in respect of the illegal drainage. I have talked to fellows from the Water Rights Division; I find that when I put a complaint before the Government that a farmer has raised with me that there are already 600 complaints from farmers in Saskatchewan backlogged. When I asked the members of the civil service who are in charge of handling these complaints what the problem is with getting these things ironed out, their answers are confused and I suggest through no fault of their own.

The problem seems to be that no one is really sure in the Government exactly who has the authority, firstly, to prevent the illegal drainage, secondly, in some respects even whether anyone even has the authority. There seems to be a considerable amount of confusion about if anyone has the authority to order an illegal drainage ditch returned to its original shape, to prevent the illegal drainage of water. Some people in the department feel that certainly no one has the authority to order that. Some say that there is authority there and that it is difficult to define what it means to return a ditch to its original situation.

Problems have been handled by the Government, when they have been handled at all, I think, inadequately, and I don't blame the civil service for this. They tend to be exceptionally sympathetic with the farmers who have brought the questions before them and I suspect are as frustrated in trying to carry out their duties as the farmers have been in trying to get this improper situation rectified.

When asked, what a farmer should do about a neighbour who is illegally draining sloughs onto his land, the civil servant

has invariably said take him to court. Now I found that strangely unjust. For example, we find a comparable situation in a community, if someone is driving carelessly and there is some fear raised about children being run over or property damage, it is not the responsibility primarily for citizens in that community to take the matter to court, press charges themselves and in effect make a citizen's arrest and proceed with the prosecution. That is not the case when it comes to The Traffic Act or other Acts in Saskatchewan when we deal with breaches of the law. It struck me as strangely peculiar that Saskatchewan farmers were not only being asked but encouraged, in order to rectify any breaches in the law, to press charges on their own.

I am not convinced that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) would recognize that fact, but I am sure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) recognizes the implications of trying to put farmers in a position where the only way they can rectify a breach of the law is when they personally prosecute a neighbour. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture enjoys some popularity with his neighbours in his home area and I suspect he knows how fast that popularity would be eliminated if he had to take it upon himself to rectify breaches in The Water Rights Act by prosecuting his neighbours.

That has been the position that these farmers of Saskatchewan have been in. I pursued this matter with the people in the Department of Environment as regards The Water Rights Act and they came to the conclusion that it wasn't a very satisfactory situation and that probably written in law and in The Water Rights Act was the fact that it was illegal to improperly drain water, so I pursued that with the Department of the Attorney General to find out who had the responsibility of pressing charges when a breach was recognized in the country.

The Department of the Attorney General and the people who work in that Department, after some considerable investigation, were still not entirely sure what should be done, but when they were pushed they agreed that probably that responsibility lay with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Saskatchewan. I asked them why, in fact, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Saskatchewan have not been enforcing The Water Rights Act. The only answer the Attorney General's Department would give me was that they were probably not aware that the Act was being broken or when they were not really sure it should be pressed. It basically seemed to be an area that they weren't fussy about getting into and no one had really encouraged them to, at least, enforce The Water Rights Act. I have been assured since that time by the Attorney General's Department that in a situation where farmers are violating The water Rights Act and illegally altering the course of a waterway in such a way that it affects the downstream farmers, that those farmers certainly in the Kindersley area need only report the infraction to the RCMP and it is the responsibility of the RCMP to see that The Water Rights Act is enforced. And that situation certainly alleviates the problem of having farmers prosecute neighbours.

The situation should have existed and should have been made clear to farmers in this province and certainly to the RCMP detachment for the past four years, but that was not the case. The civil servants themselves at least were reluctant to explain to an MLA that that is the way the situation was supposed to work. I fault the Government for that. It is not a problem that hasn't been brought to your attention. I said there were 600 complaints sitting in the Government offices in Saskatchewan as

regards infractions of The Water Rights Act. Your own civil servants don't know what to do about it and I am sure they brought it to the attention of the Environment Minister and the Minister of Agriculture many, many times over, yet there has been nothing done about it.

Now that was a serious problem, enforcement of The Water Rights Act. We may, in fact, at least in the Kindersley area have overcome that by bringing to the attention of the RCMP that they have the responsibility of enforcing it.

There is another problem and probably one that is more serious and that is the question of the correction of those ditches or channels that were constructed to alter the natural course of a waterway. It is one thing to take someone to court under The Water Rights Act and press for a prosecution, to fine an individual perhaps \$100, perhaps as much as \$500 for being in breach of the Act. In many instances, I suspect, the fines would be considerably less than that.

That is the one problem and we might have solved that in the Kindersley area at least. I am not confident that it has been solved in the rest of Saskatchewan. Then a farmer who has been affected by breach in The Water Rights Act is in a position where he may be suffering the bad results of that breach of that Act for years to come, because of an unnatural waterway that has been constructed. He may be put in a downstream position where he is permanently flooded every year there is excessive drainage as a result of the ditch that was constructed.

I have asked people in the Department if they have the authority to go out and order those ditches, those unnatural waterways alteration to be restored to their original condition.

The first answer that a MLA gets when he puts that suggestion to either of the departments involved is that, well the Government doesn't have the authority to order a ditch across agricultural land restored to its initial state. I pressed that matter severely with the Provincial Government, with several departments, trying to find out if anyone had the responsibility of restoring property to its original state. There appeared to be no direct law involved except someone in the Department of Municipal Affairs had suggested to me that there may be a clause in The Municipal Affairs Act which gives the municipal government the power to order those ditches to be reconstructed; gives power to a municipal body which is generally made up of farmers, neighbours other individuals who are forced to get along in an area. It gives them the authority to order that ditch re-built yet doesn't provide for them, at least not in their own administration, the necessary expertise to decide what is an unnatural waterway and what has been altered.

So, in fact, to use that as the last resort for having illegal waterways rebuilt, I say is an inadequate answer to that problem. The illegal drainage ditches have created tremendous problems with municipal governments and I know that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy) is aware of that. It means a considerable loss of taxation revenue when land assessment is reduced because of flooding. It means considerably increased maintenance costs for roads and for road allowances when unnatural waterways cause excessive erosion and deterioration of the road system.

In many municipalities the additional cost as a result of illegal drainage upstream runs into the thousands and thousands of dollars. That certainly is the case in the Kindersley constituency.

There is a considerable loss of personal income to farmers who may be as much as 30 to 40 miles downstream from an infraction in The Water Rights Act. The Kindersley constituency has probably as many, if no more, acres of land under water unnaturally than any constituency in Saskatchewan. I don't say that lightly. It has some of the most productive, if not the most productive, farm land in Saskatchewan and in the world and a considerable amount of that, thousands of acres of that land, has been put under water illegally in the last few years and yet these people have no effective way of getting any compensation from that except personal litigation against a neighbour, and they have no effective way of fixing the problem that is initiated in the first instance. They can go upstream and find where a neighbour, or someone 20 miles upstream, has illegally drained, find that if the situation continues that drainage will affect adversely every year there is a run-off and yet not be in a position to correct that, when, in fact, that ditch was in direct violation of The Water Rights Act.

This has been a seriously frustrating problem for farmers all over Saskatchewan and particularly those in Kindersley.

The Government has established an inter-departmental committee to investigate possible changes in The Water Rights Act, of the Municipal Affairs Department, Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Environment with the view of presenting, I expect, a long range constructive drainage program for Saskatchewan. Well, it is the proverbial situation of closing the barn door after the horse has got out. I think there probably were things that the Minister of Agriculture might have recommended in the short run to try and prevent some of the problems that have cropped up over the past two years. I think he is in that position now in view of the fact that this inter-departmental committee will not probably come down with its recommendations earlier than the fall of 1977 and possibly not until late into 1978.

In view of that fact, the Minister is probably in a position to make recommendations to the Department of the Environment perhaps to the Department of Municipal Affairs and certainly he is in a position to look at changes in his own legislation in order to alleviate the problem that is caused by illegal drainage and the fact that illegal drainage ditches have certainly been left for many years.

I say you have taken a step in the right direction when you set up your inter-departmental committee. I hope it is successful; I hope that the input that goes into the recommendations of that committee comes from a broad enough spectrum to reflect the interests of farmers in Saskatchewan, both those who would like to drain their own land and those who will suffer the downstream effects.

I am confident that the department and the people who are working in the inter-departmental committee are of sufficient calibre in order to bring in some worthwhile recommendations. I wanted to bring this problem to the Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Kaeding) attention and to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) and certainly to the Minister of Municipal Affairs

(Mr. MacMurchy), that there is a severe short range problem that should be looked at in the near future. There are some temporary amendments that could probably be made to a number of Acts, which would prevent any headache in the future.

You may be fortunate in that, and I would hate to suggest that the Good Lord was on that side of the House, but certainly the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) are going to be bailed out by dry weather this summer if it continues the way it is now. Don't take that excuse or that holiday to let this legislation sit by until the problem crops up again.

I urge you on behalf of the farmers in the Kindersley constituency and farmers all across this province to take immediate action to see that the illegal drainage problem is corrected and that the reconstruction of unnaturally altered waterways is corrected.

I so move, this resolution.

**MR. R. A. LARTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to talk a little to this motion. As the people in the Souris Valley flood area know that we are slated, as told by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) that we are on the next 10-year programs as soon as the Qu'Appelle project is finished with. We have mentioned before that we have many problems and they do not involve only people draining water upstream, farmers draining water from the Yellow Grass marsh and from the Creelman flats into our areas. We find that over the years the engineers who have designed the municipal roads, as mentioned previously, have impeded the natural flow of water by putting in these high grid roads and tried to push that water through an 18 inch pipe. This has contributed very much to it.

From the Creelman flats we are very unfortunate in the lower end of the Souris Basin Area that we get the results of all the drainage from the west. We have one farmer in the Lampman area who has been completely put out of the cattle business by water drainage — 1,200 acres under water as of last year and he is completely out of the cattle business. What concerns us, is that our studies with the Federal Government and with the other provinces, the Province of Manitoba, will not be completed until June. The recommendations will be forthcoming but knowing what happens when you get on a project as large as this and having to wait until the Qu'Appelle Basin project is finished, the people in the lower Souris Valley are faced with, again, many, many losses in dollars on this interference with their agricultural production and not only in hay land, but actual farm land and summerfallow land now under water. I am concerned, though, by the Liberal Motion, when they mention to take steps to stop the illegal drainage of water.

The Government has already stated that they weren't going to take any steps to stop the illegal drainage of water and I am afraid that if we leave this action up to individual neighbours to sue each other, as far as stopping one neighbour from draining onto another neighbour's land, I am afraid that this can cause many more repercussions than what we can ever imagine. Until we can get on with the project in some years to come, I feel there should be an orderly drainage of this land instead of everyone just socking to it at once in the spring. In many cases if this water was held up any length of time at



all we wouldn't be in quite as serious a problem in the lower ends. So this does concern us.

We think that the Department of the Environment should be working with the Municipal Road Authority on designing roads. It has to come all the way upstream in designing these roads so that we don't cut these stoppages and get these sudden flows at once.

We have come out with some obvious steps to be taken before this study is completed and before even the major projects can be started on in the years in the future. One obvious step would have to be agreed between the governments is the cleaning out of the funnel at the lower end of the Souris Basin. And until that is done, and that is the most obvious, and one that has to be done, regardless of what shows up in all of the studies. I believe the engineers have concurred with this, I don't think they will come right out and say it, but they have concurred at some of these meetings that this is one of the most obvious bottlenecks that we have in the flooding. I am very concurred on this Motion, the legal steps. I would be afraid that with the Government passing the buck to the individual neighbours and I would hate to see that in force too strongly.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Chairman, just a few comments on the Resolution of the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) and comments from the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter).

First of all I want to say that I think this is one of the most important resolutions that has come before this Assembly in some time. I don't think that I have heard it more adequately explained than the Member for Kindersley did.

I want to say this, that I come from my former constituency that of Milestone, on the Regina Plains, and those of you who had the opportunity to fly by aircraft to the city of Regina last spring and last summer know the extent and the horror that faced farmers last spring and spring after spring on the Regina Plains as a result of the disruption of the natural flow of water and the fantastic drainage problems that existed on the Regina Plains.

I wonder if the Minister has had an opportunity, for example, to go down to the Fillmore district and see thousands, and I say thousands, of acres of land under water that a few years ago was not normally under water despite the heavy runoff in the spring. And a farmer, who for years had farmed the land and his father before him and had never experienced the difficulty of drainage and flooding, because of the construction of grid roads and as the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) and the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) indicate, the establishment of ditches, the installation of culverts either inadequately sized or oversized and the construction of highways, construction of railways, etc. all of a sudden the natural flow of water and the normal drainage system that had existed for hundreds of years on the Saskatchewan Plains, was disrupted and changed.

Therefore, we find hundreds of farmers in Saskatchewan, through no fault of their own, who had good agricultural land, very highly productive soil, all of a sudden experiencing flooding of a major nature.

What did the farmer turn to, or the many farmers turn to? They turned to their own shovels. And farmers who all of a sudden had no flooding damage in the years previous, were experiencing on hundreds of acres millions of gallons of water on their soil and they, because the Government refused to take action, immediately turned around and they then look to their own personal interest and say to heck with the neighbour, I'll look after myself because I have to feed my own family.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of the agricultural budget of the last two or three years was the drastic cut in the conservation and development branch of the Department of Agriculture, which had the responsibility for drainage. I notice this year the budget is increased, but it was probably the worst possible cut that the Minister of Agriculture could have made last year. I will hope that something on an overall basis would be done; an assessment of responsibility as the Member for Kindersley indicated is really the crux of the matter.

You know how difficult it is to set up a conservation and development area for drainage purposes in rural Saskatchewan. First of all you have to have a percentage of the vote. The farmer has to agree to have water run over his own land, that presently he doesn't have that water run over. He has to agree to put a ditch through his land where there was no water problem prior to that. And to get the majority required for conservation and development for drainage area is almost impossible.

All that I am suggesting to the Minister, that right now it is the time that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Environment got together and really assessed the tremendous implications of this problem, assess some normal type of responsibility and then develop an overall plan for Saskatchewan as to how they will attack the problem. Because what is now happening, hundreds and thousands of acres of productive soil are completely being put out of production; there is no overall plan to solve the problem. You can just ask the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). I would think that the Member for Weyburn will probably get up and speak on what happened in the Fillmore district in his constituency.

I will tell you about the terrible tragedy that has occurred to farmers. The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley, my former predecessor, I think had 1,000 acres of his own land under water last year. He had a big farm and some of those farmers never had water before. So all that I am saying is that the Member for Kindersley, the Member for Estevan have brought to the attention of the minister, a very serious problem. Nobody is pointing to it as an NDP problem or his particular problem, but I would suggest he has failed to take action. He must not fail to sit down and try to assess what the problem is and find an adequate solution. I want to tell the Minister that last summer people from his own Department refused to come and talk to communities because they were scared to death; they had no money and no solutions and no answers and they were swamped with problems and calls and complaints as the Minister is well aware of and I don't even blame him for that. Because probably for every one they tried, as the Member indicated, they had a backlog of 600. If they tried to keep contact with

all the problems that were brought to their attention I would think that it would be in the thousands.

I can give 25 farmers in one small community who phoned your Department about a problem last year and they didn't get any answer at all and I would be glad to hand it to the Minister, because they have been trying now to get someone from your Department to go out to the community, even assess it, and discuss what they should do for two years and nobody from your Department would even go, simply because they are flooded, I suppose, with requests and complaints. Certainly the problem in the last two years has been a very extreme one.

I do think the Resolution is a good one. I hope the Minister will take it to heart. I hope the Government will assess it and see if they can't come up at least with some kind of a practical solution and plan overall which will solve this problem in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R. H. BAILEY** (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) for putting this particular topic before the House.

I should, also, like to assure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) that this is not a planned attack, we are not out to get the Minister of Agriculture, not by any means. It also seems ironic, Mr. Speaker, that in a spring such as we are experiencing at the present time that it may be an unexpected situation where we are talking about floods and flood controls in a year in which there probably won't be any at all. But people have worked in this province, Mr. Minister, for many, many years trying to solve some of these problems with the help of various governments and often what happens is, as the Member for Kindersley has indicated that it is the illegal drainage of the water that causes the problem. North of the community of Forgan which is in my constituency a group of seven farmers some 14 years ago under the Private Ditches Act working with the PFRA and the Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, formed a group known as the North Forgan Drainage Project and limited to the funds of some \$5,000 drained some very valuable farm land into a natural runway into Barber Lake and on into Goose Lake. These farmers spent a great deal of time and a great deal of energy in taking this land out of flooding and the water diverted into the natural runways so that this prime land could come under agriculture for agricultural purposes.

Now we find in recent years that the original project which was designed to just cover a few sections of land to drain, because of illegal drainage of water by other people, that the little drainage network that they had set up has been overburdened and the illegal drainage of some 17 sections of land has now caused more of a problem with their ditches and so on that we've had before.

I think, Mr. Minister, what we are saying at this particular time, and I'm sure that the people on your side of the House are saying it as well, that in a year like this, that possibly it is the best time that we have to take a look at an overall province wide flood control problem. I know that

this could be a rather extensive program and one which the Department of Agriculture itself may not feel that they've got the capacity in this particular year to handle, but surely there must be some priorities in this area of flood control and I suggest to the Minister that in a spring like the one we are facing now where it looks as if we will have virtually no runoff at all, it might be the ideal spring and the ideal summer to attack some of the problems and have them done to prevent a more serious flooding in years to come and certainly we know that we're not always going to have, and hopefully not, always have a spring like this.

I want to get back just in closing, Mr. Speaker, to this particular project. I have visited this project and I am alarmed that the Government hasn't taken action before now, alarmed to the point that here you have for almost a period of two decades, farmers have gone together and provided themselves with a drainage for their own farm lands, originally the drainage of some four or five sections but because of the illegal drainage from other farmers' land their whole project has pretty well been eroded away, the money that they have spent themselves is gone and you have more of a flood problem now than we've ever had simply because of illegal drainage of water.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**RESOLUTION NO. 4 — THE ASSEMBLY URGES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO REFUSE  
CANADIAN PACIFIC TRANSPORT'S REQUEST**

**MR. J. A. PEPPER** (Weyburn) moved, seconded by Mr. J. L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North):

That this Assembly deplores the Canadian Pacific's attempts to avoid honouring its obligation to serve Saskatchewan communities, and urges the federal Minister of Transport to refuse Canadian Pacific Transport's request for exemption from provincial regulation.

He said: Mr. Speaker, today's debate I suppose, begins on Motion No. 4 on the Order Paper. I would say that the Motion itself is straightforward and reflects the concern of this Government in terms of recent developments within the Saskatchewan transportation system.

In introducing this Motion, I am asking this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to join with me in deploring the Canadian Pacific attempts to avoid honouring its obligations to service Saskatchewan communities and further, to urge the federal Minister of Transport to refuse Canadian Pacific Transport's request for exemption from provincial regulations.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is of vital importance to each and every citizen of this province, and in order for the people of Saskatchewan to be assured of our unqualified rejection of recent developments, it is, I feel, imperative, Mr. Speaker, for this Legislature to give its unanimous support to this motion.

I recognize well that the emergence of this debate will cause somewhat of a dilemma for members opposite, however, by supporting this Motion, they will have the opportunity to

display their commitment to the people of Saskatchewan whose economic and social stability is being threatened by recent events.

I would hope that all Members of this Assembly have a common commitment to rural Saskatchewan. Much has been said in recent years about the retention of a strong rural Saskatchewan. Since 1971, this Government has brought forward a number of policies and programs which reflect our commitment. Members opposite seemingly can muster nothing more than a "me too", and somehow I get the disturbing feeling that their public statements are nothing more than, I guess you would call rhetoric, and that they are fully prepared to allow outside influences to dictate the future of our province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me warn you that this position is dangerous, it is unacceptable, and it is one which will never be accepted by members of this party and this Government.

Let's take a look at what has happened in Saskatchewan over the years in relationship to transportation. I say we cannot overemphasize the importance of transportation in our province. As a land-locked and agriculturally-based province, we are dependent on transportation to get the products that we produce out to the markets. Equally important, however, is a transportation service that brings in the consumer goods we need. The service must be regular and dependable and just as important, the rates must be reasonable.

These are the bare bones of the issues before us today, to ensure that Saskatchewan communities, in fact, received the service granted to them as a right under The Railway Act, and to ensure that they receive this service at a reasonable cost.

Events over the past months are making it difficult for anybody in Saskatchewan to believe that Canadian Pacific is prepared to deal in good faith with rural Saskatchewan. We are even harder pressed to believe that Canadian Pacific has any intention of honouring its commitments to the Canadian people, made in return for massive land grants and financial support to the railways in the early days. This assistance was eagerly accepted by the company and the entire agreement was enshrined in federal legislation.

We have just too many examples, experience upon experience, where commitments for service have been reneged on directly or indirectly. When patrons learn that they can no longer trust the service, that they cannot get information or the rates are too high, or there is no assurance the merchandise will be taken care of at the other end, they will naturally eventually look elsewhere for their needs.

Naturally it does not take long for any such service to begin losing money and the corporation, Mr. Speaker, has a ready-made case to present for withdrawal. It is a self-fulfilling prophecy, it is an old game, an insidious game, but it works every time.

So, I want to suggest this afternoon to you, Mr. Speaker, that it works for the railways only because we let it work. The railway corporations do have obligations to the Canadian people and if we will have the courage to enforce those obligations, perhaps we can turn around the well-established trend of corporate interests winning out over service to people in the

transportation field.

So I say, let us look at the trend which has been developing. Twenty years ago, or less in some areas, most freight and express was carried by train to our small towns. Both railways operated daily passenger trains with mail and freight cars attached, and in addition, way-freights ran on most lines also.

In the 1950s, the rail companies began applying to the Federal Board of Transport Commissioners for permission to drop services. Permission to drop these trains was granted on condition the railways continue to provide service by truck. This they readily agreed to do, and as recently as two years ago, Saskatchewan, Canadian Pacific was promising truck service as its station agents were being pulled out.

The commitment to truck service in place of trains is more than a concession from the railway to the towns affected. IT is a legal obligation imposed on the railway by Section 262 of The Railway Act. Canadian Pacific is required by law to serve all centres listed with the Express Transport Association. The service may be provided by train or by truck or by any other suitable means, but it must be provided.

We believe Canadian Pacific is deliberately and methodically seeking to avoid living up to the requirements of the law, and in so doing has violated its obligations to the public.

It seems funny to me, Mr. Speaker, here we have this large corporation which eagerly accepted all the concessions possible when those first early transportation links were established in Saskatchewan. At that time, they gave their word, they provided a guarantee of service. That was then.

Now we find that this same corporation finds that the high profit levels aren't so high any more and they want to get out. They want to cash in their chips, they want to slam the door on thousands of Saskatchewan people who over the years have built Canadian Pacific to the size it is today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — I contend that their position is not acceptable. I contend further that each and every Member of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, has an elected responsibility collectively, to fight for this thing to the very end.

At one time, the railways were the hub of our rural Saskatchewan transportation system. They provided passenger and express services to over 800 Saskatchewan centres. It is not surprising that they railway was considered the life blood of the community.

However, since the 1940s the railways have steadily withdrawn services to rural communities and to smaller urban centres. This has taken place through a carefully executed plan of gradual elimination of personnel and services. As an example, from November, 1954 to September, 1967, Canadian Pacific Express was successful in eliminating 212 stations from the tariff. Next Canadian Pacific applied, and was successful in obtaining approval to close another 225 stations, and operate only through customer service centres. These 225 stations have not yet been

removed from Express Tariff, but in all but 10 of these stations, the railway was eliminated the pick-up and delivery service.

It is not difficult to conclude that it is only a matter of time until the Canadian Pacific Railway will apply to remove these remaining 225 stations completely from the tariff, thus freeing themselves of any legal obligation to provide express service.

I am sure we all recall the position of the Canadian Pacific at the time that the service centre concept was being introduced. Speaking in Saskatchewan, Canadian Pacific Rail Vice-President R. S. Allison, said in Saskatoon:

Canadian Pacific Rail undertakes through the Customer Service Centre to provide a service equal to or superior to the service presently being provided under the Station Agent System.

Let us see how well Canadian Pacific is keeping its promises.

Canadian Pacific Rail assured that contract representatives supplying adequate and heated storage facilities would be provided in each community where a station was closed. That meant, Mr. Speaker, some 225 contract representatives across Saskatchewan. Our information is that only 85 Canadian Pacific Rail contract representatives have been established and these are in the process of being closed.

Certainly this is unethical on the part of the Canadian Pacific Rail, and demonstrates bad faith with the communities. We wonder, however, if this is not more than merely bad faith. Surely the fulfilment of commitments made under oath to the Railway Transport Commission by the railway are a matter of legal concern. It is hard to see how a commitment made in those circumstances has not the status of legally binding requirement.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, there's another key part of this total question, and that has to do with the rate structures. In its arbitrary withdrawal from rural Saskatchewan, Canadian Pacific Transport has indicated that it will provide highway service where alternative suitable carriers are not available, but, and here is the key, it has said that this service will only be available at rail rates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, rail rates are, on the whole, double those permitted by the Saskatchewan Highway Board for common carriers. Under The Saskatchewan Highway Board for common carriers. Under The Saskatchewan Vehicles Act, rail rates are illegal when used by common carriers, and the Saskatchewan Highway Traffic Board cannot grant franchises utilizing these rates.

While this Government has no objections to rail rates if it is a rail movement, we do feel strongly that if Canadian Pacific Rail feels that it is to its advantage to operate highway transports rather than move merchandise by train, then it must abide by the same regulations which apply to all highway carriers.

However, Mr. Speaker, the story does not end here. Last September, the President of Canadian Pacific informed the Government of Saskatchewan that Canadian Pacific Transport did not plan to renew its truck licences on rural Saskatchewan routes. The Highway Traffic Board met with executives and lawyers from Canadian Pacific Transport, and these people made it clear the company was not present to negotiate its position, but to enforce

it. They did not ask for higher truck rates. They didn't ask for changes in its routes, they didn't seek other modification of obligations. They came to Saskatchewan and stated point blank that effective April 30, the company intended to abandon its rural routes, and then they had the audacity to ask for the support of this Government in making their abandonment plans possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this Government put its foot down. They were told in no uncertain terms that we had no intention of forgetting the 172 centres it now serves and before a so-called transfer of its running rights would be approved, the Highway Traffic Board would schedule public hearings so those involved could express an opinion. Certainly one would have thought this to be reasonable, but such was not the case, at least judging from the attitude of the corporation in relationship to this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this Government does not have any objection to local trucking firms taking over much of the business now allotted to Canadian Pacific Transport. In fact, in many cases I believe the smaller truckers can offer better service than Canadian Pacific, because they will seek business and provide more personal service than a computerized national company; but given time, I am sure the province would be willing to license local trucking firms on most former C.P. routes, and C.P. Rail and the Federal Government is aware of this willingness.

However, Mr. Speaker, again the key point is this; the independent truckers are under no legal obligation to continue to serve. They have no connection to the previous service by train, and it would be unreasonable and impractical to think that they should take on the obligation of Canadian Pacific without having its resources to back them up.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — In an period of economic slow-up, the smaller operators might find it impossible to carry on, and many communities could find themselves with no service of any kind. This Government is willing to discuss the Canadian Pacific proposed changes, but only if the corporation acknowledges and accepts its obligations and agrees to stand ready to offer a back-up service, should any smaller firms fail. This Government has made its position clear; however, Canadian Pacific has responded by telling this province that any back-up service must be provided at higher express rates. This means a rate could be charged roughly double the present truck rates, meaning higher cost to small businesses and more cost to the people like farmers, who order parts, etc. Obviously, the Canadian Pacific position would undermine even more, the viability of smaller centres and the businesses in them, and I say this is unacceptable, by any standard, Mr. Speaker.

On April 30th of this year, Canadian Pacific abandoned its 31 in-province routes. In response, the Highway Traffic Board moved again to cancel all its operating authority to prevent province to province and inter-province runs, on the grounds that abandonment of part of its authority contravened the entire authority.

A court injunction, Mr. Speaker, prevented this Government from acting before trial, as of June 21st, this New Democratic Party Government requested the C.T.C. to require Canadian Pacific



to restore train service now that trucks are off.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting.

This is all very interesting. The Highway Traffic Board's control over extra-provincial trucking derives from The Motor Vehicle Transport Act, which delegates authority to the province. Under The National Transportation Act, however, this power may be taken back by Ottawa by Order in Council. Any carrier, in whole or in part, may be exempted.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, this Government has been more than fair with the Canadian Pacific. The Government offered to deal with them, and to reduce the list of routes requiring service, but C. P. has refused to budge from its April 30th position.

C. P. does not want to be bothered with the smaller runs, that's plain, regardless of whether they make money or not, and their goal is nothing short of total abandonment. This is clear from the fact that they did not request higher rates or fewer routes, but no routes at all. The loss of C. P. service has disrupted the whole provincial truck system. And I say, to replace C. P., many small independent truckers must be licensed, buy equipment, and learn the routes.

The Highway Traffic Board must now ensure enough volume on each route to make it profitable, for the small truckers have no cross subsidy from the lucrative runs. This will mean an overhaul of the entire franchise system.

This Government again has made its position clear. We feel the C. P. has made a commitment to this province, and we do not intend to let them get out from under that commitment without a fight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — While this position is unequivocal, we have offered to compromise and negotiate. That, however, is a far cry from the position the C. P. has taken. They refuse to budge and when they get challenged, what do they do? Mr. Speaker, do they say, "Okay, let's negotiate?" Do they say to this province, "Let's see if we can work something out?" No, Mr. Speaker, they choose rather to run to the steps of the Federal Government, where they know there are some friendly faces.

And, sure enough, one appears. Last November, C. P. President Mr. F. S. Burbidge,\* wrote to Transport Minister the Honourable Otto Lang, asking the Federal Liberal Government to exempt Canadian Pacific Transport from provincial control.

Now, one might have thought that the Hon. Mr. Lang, being from Saskatchewan and presumably, Mr. Speaker, knowing the situation respecting past commitments by the corporation, would use this opportunity to stand up for Saskatchewan. But, what does he do? Does he remind Canadian Pacific of its past commitments? Does he use his office to outline clearly the need for continued service to the people of Saskatchewan, while emphasizing the important social and economic implications of this issue?

No, Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary. Rather than side with Saskatchewan, Mr. Lang fires off a letter to my colleague, the

Minister in charge of Transportation, and warns him that he may grant Canadian Pacific Transport its exemption if Saskatchewan denies Canadian Pacific the use of highways for inter-provincial truck runs. That's what he offered.

According to Mr. Lang, he is considering such an exemption because our move restricts inter-provincial trade. Needless to say, that argument is weak and indeed contrived. Even though Canadian Pacific Transport could not operate, many other truckers would continue to service inter-provincial routes, and C. P. R. would be free to ship goods by train, if it so wished.

Mr. Speaker, it is so obvious. Mr. Lang's warning reveals that he consider the inconvenience to Canadian Pacific Transport more important than the inconvenience caused to dozens of small businessmen and their customers, by C. P. R.'s abandonment of rural services.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — I say, Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue. It has broad implications, and this Assembly should spare nothing to ensure that everything possible is done to ensure that commitments to the past are honoured, and the legislative authority of the province is assured.

With that, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move Resolution No. 4.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. L. SKOBERG** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of this House must feel a little blue, and somewhat disappointed, and maybe guilty, not having participated more fully in the debate that went on in the past year before the Railway Transport Committee relating to the application of the Mr. Speaker for the abandonment of their truck service in Saskatchewan. I might say that the decision of the Railway Transport Committee here, within the last day or two, which really means that if any truck runs down any highway, at any time, then the communities and the people of this province are obtaining satisfactory service, must be considered an unsatisfactory type of decision, to say the least.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that it's rather disappointing, and I stand to be corrected on this if, in fact, any Member from either the Conservative or Liberal side appeared before the Commission, that it's rather disappointing that they did not take the opportunity to appearing before the Commissioner, Mr. McGee,\* at the hearings. It would appear to me, that if they are concerned about rural Saskatchewan, and I am thinking of the Hon. Member for Swift Current, I am thinking of the Hon. Member for Regina South, who purports to represent the Hon. Minister of Transport in Ottawa; the other ones in the various other parts of this province, including Shaunavon and other point; why did they not appear before the Commission at that time, and make their views known, if they are really concerned about this type of service. When I read the terms of reference, and in fact, the hearings were held almost one year ago, and now we find a rash of results from the Railway Transport Committee coming out on rail passenger abandonment.

Now of course, the trucking proposition is before us, but I am wondering why it took almost one year for the Commission to come out with the decision insofar as this hearing is concerned. It would appear to me that the real concern of that Commission is in hand completely with the Minister in charge of Transport at Ottawa, and there had to be some decisions handed down before that type of decision could be sent out to the people of this province.

In the official notice that went out to all MLAs I might say, it is not restricted to any particular party in the Province of Saskatchewan, but it suggests in this request for a hearing, that the C. P. R. did have an obligation, and in fact under Section 315 of The Railway Act, it suggests that the Railway should be obligated to reinstate rail service if they were not prepared to meet the obligation that they originally took on, when after the hearing on October 30, 1970, they did approve — the Commission approved — the application of the Canadian Pacific for authority to set up a proposed customer service centre at Moose Jaw, and they laid down certain conditions.

I am utterly amazed, Mr. Speaker, at that type of a decision coming out this week, that entirely forgot about the history that is involved in this application and the application of the Canadian Pacific when they did get out of the customer service plan.

I am almost certain, Mr. Speaker, that those who did find time, and were concerned about rural Saskatchewan, would have heard some of the representations made by small trucking firms that indicated at that time that they were forced out by Canadian Pacific, they were forced out and were not able to remain in business because of the magnitude of that company. They will also find out that even in the areas — I sue Shaunavon as an example — in the area at Shaunavon, when that small trucking firm tried to make use of the customer service facility there, the station in Shaunavon, they were told they could not use it, and they then had to go to the town of Shaunavon and try to find a place that they could operate out of; and as the Hon. Member opposite says, “Ah, he probably is not really concerned about rural Saskatchewan and not concerned about the people of Shaunavon and the district that is represented there.”

Mr. Speaker, in going back just a few years ago, I think that all of us have to realize that it was well known that the intention of the Canadian Pacific was to drop its intra-provincial trucking services, April 30, 1976, using as a basis of argument, before the Railway Transport Committee, using alleged, but unsubstantiated losses in a three-month period of 1975, and multiplying by four to come up with a loss of \$2 million. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in the hearings in Moose Jaw, it was clear that there was not that type of a loss that could be substantiated, and in fact, it was again a situation where they use a period of time that could not be used as one of the most economic months in Saskatchewan.

The C. P. Limited made it very clear that intra-service is not economically viable, as the rates were too low, so they said; but they did not tell the Commission that the Saskatchewan Board then, at that time, had increased the rates and they did not use those projections in their calculations.

Everyone in this House, Mr. Speaker, I am certain, is well aware that we really do not have access to the profitability of the company's inter-truck routes, any more than we have knowledge

of the intra-truck profits or losses. It is most interesting to note the desire by both C. P. and C. N., for now we have the C. N. into the picture as well, to acquire the inter-city trucking industry, while at the same time not fulfilling their obligations and commitments for intra-trucking requirements. It would appear in the recent case heard by the Commission which I have just referred to, that the acquisition by C. N. of a trucking firm based at Joliette, Quebec, the railway companies were not concerned over private, small operators having a piece of the profitable pie, when it comes to the inter-city trucking, while at the same time, they purport to be the friend of small operators by handing over truck routes not particularly known for high returns on their investment. Mr. Speaker, in that particular case, the C. N. took over the operation of a trucking firm in Joliette, Quebec, and then we hear at this time, of course, that really they are friends of the small operators as the C. P. were some years back, full well knowing that when the time came, they would turn back again to those people and have them take over their not too lucrative runs.

I suggest it is an unfortunate position for the Canadian Pacific to take and tell these small operators that they can be economically viable, and at the same time provide the type of service to rural Saskatchewan which was promised by the C. P. before the Railway Transport Commission a long time back.

I ask whether any real attempt was made by the Canadian Pacific to solicit business through the use of the customer service centres, and mobile supervisors, or whether it has all be a far sighted plan of events aimed at the abandonment of the more labour and administrative intents of inter-trucking industry in all of the province. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan was, and probably still will be the last stronghold which is demanding that the people of this province are provided adequate service by a company which committed itself to that purpose at that time, and still should do so.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SKOBERG:** — Mr. Speaker, going back a short few years ago, in the judgement of June 27, 1968, having to do with the removal of 41 agents and 15 caretakers in the Medicine Hat division, it was noted the town of Leader Board of Trade expressed a fear that the railway proposal was a foot in the door to the eventual abandonment of all service in their area, and that came to pass. The town of Empress expressed fear over a possibility that the intra-line carrier might discontinue its operation, leaving them with no delivery service at all, and for those that were interested in the hearings in Moose Jaw, that's exactly what those people came back and said just a few short months ago.

Mr. Woodward, the Commissioner at the time of the R. T. C. hearings, concluded his decision on these two applications when referring to the role played by the mobile representatives, by saying this portion of the proposed plan would be kept under continuing review, to ensure adequate service to the users of the railway facilities. I am wondering what continuing review was ever carried on by the Commission, or in fact, if anybody was really that concerned about it at that level.

In this past hearing in Moose Jaw, I have heard of reductions of mobile supervisors, and wonder whether the Commission was aware of such reductions, considering the fact there was concern

over this as far back as 1968. I think the answer is very, very clear at this time. In fact, the company is quoted as saying, "Company representatives will continue to be available in each community in both places daily to provide personal service." At the same time, representatives were being reduced to centralize, such as appears to be the case at Weyburn and other points in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that anyone in this House who has taken the time to watch to see what is going on for the provision of service, will realize that the mobile supervisors were not in most cases, daily. They did not provide essential services that were necessary in that community, because they were told not to and they spent more of their time in an area that was located with the movement of grain and pretending that they were taking the numbers on the box-cars and really fouling up the whole operation of the movement of the grain at that.

At the hearing in Medicine Hat, the then Member of Parliament, Mr. Olson, had this to say:

I also think that commendation is in order for the arrangements and the agreements that were made with the unions prior to the application being heard.

Mr. Speaker, I can say without any hesitation there were commitments made to the respective unions that were involved in this application, that were never honoured, to say the least. These commitments were made back in the days of Mr. Olson and he himself then commended the company for the type of action they had taken. Now we see people with 20, 30, 35 years service, with no job and suggesting in one letter saying they will find other employment for these people. I would suggest to the Members in this House that they ask some of the ones who have spent their lifetime in this service, and see where can they go at this particular time, at their age.

Mr. Speaker, it seems indeed that company witnesses indicated on April 30, 1976, a deadline while at the same time referring to the letters that there was nothing of the sort that they were worried about that deadline. They pretended they had notified those employees to be affected of that deadline and the evidence that was produced in Moose Jaw at the hearings here last spring proved beyond question that did not happen.

Mr. Woodward had a further statement, which I think is worthwhile repeating, Mr. Speaker:

Of continuing concern to me is a role played by the mobile representatives of the proposed plan, particularly in the territories allocated to them, the miles to be travelled each day, and the number of contracts to be made to ensure good and adequate service to all customers. I would remind the railway of its assurance to the Committee that this portion of the proposed plan will be kept under continuing review to ensure adequate services to the users of the railway facilities.

I was wondering whether or not those farmers in the small localities that were promised that the trucks would bring in the supplies, the repairs that were necessary, on a guaranteed schedule, whether or not those people now know what really is the benefit of trying to trust the commitments that were given by the railway when those hearings were held.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SKOBERG:** — Mr. Speaker, in the hearing held in Moose Jaw on February 25, 1969, for the removal of 43 agents, and the one caretaker, and 22 caretakers from stations in the Moose Jaw division, including a number of other positions at that time, the hearing was chaired by the same commissioner who heard and did receive briefs in Moose Jaw this last spring, Mr. Commissioner John McGee. Mr. McGee made it very clear, non-carload merchandise shipments are handled exclusively by highway transport, serving the various communities along the line:

These highway transport services are provided directly by the Canadian Pacific Transport Company, the wholly-owned trucking subsidiary of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or by independent trucking firms with which Canadian Pacific Transport Company has contracted on the Railway's behalf.

Later it was shown that there have been complaints about the standard of service provided by an interline, and a witness for the company admitted there had been complaints and the Railway in turn had complained to the Saskatchewan Highway Traffic Board. The same witness testified there was nothing in the contract dealing with standards of service:

No, we have no control over the standard of service, this is vested in the Saskatchewan Highway Traffic Board. But still when the Saskatchewan Highway Traffic Board took issue with the service being supplied by Canadian Pacific they were told then there would have to be a public hearing, we'll have to look into it, and really it is out of your jurisdiction/

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian Pacific assumed responsibility for providing services either on its own or by interline and then passed this commitment on to a provincial regulatory authority. I further suggest Canadian Pacific was the prime responsible party in contracting interline on its behalf, and as such, must assume the control over the standard of service instead of investing that authority with a provincial body that was not responsible for the decision-making policy under The Railway Act in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Chief Commissioner McGee was very correct when he said, the railway may carry and deliver traffic by a mode other than rail to points along its railway line, but when it does so, the obligations imposed on it by Section 350 in The Railway Act remains. I would like to ask Mr. Commissioner McGee at this time what happened to his original observations in this regard in the most recent decision that he handed out on this last proposal? If for any reason the railway found itself unable to provide by other means of transport, a system adequate for the carriage and delivery of traffic, responsive to the obligations imposed by Section 315, the Committee's responsibility would be to direct the railway to reinstate rail service.

Mr. Speaker, I said at that time, and I say again, that I believe that this time was the crux of the entire hearings held, when Canadian Pacific Limited unilaterally terminated their intra-trucking service in Saskatchewan. An immediate board order should have been issued instructing them to reinstate rail peddler service. I can assure you C. P. would not have done that

at that time. They would have put the trucks back on, as they had obligated themselves to do many years before.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to understand how any company can flout the laws established by Parliament when the positions are so clearly enunciated. I also question the right of the company in reducing mobile supervisors without the consent of any public agency or governmental body. Mr. Speaker, there was lots of evidence that was produced to indicate that is exactly what happened.

I should like at this time to quote the position taken by Mr. Gordon Blair, speaking on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, as he put on record the established proposition of the Railway Transport Committee following the hearings in Moose Jaw. The Hon. Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) is suggesting probably, there is good legal counsel, Mr. Blair. He said at that time:

The railway itself elected to cease handling non-carload traffic by rail. The railway may carry and deliver traffic by a mode other than rail to points along its railway line, but when it does so, the obligation imposed upon it by Section 262 remains. If for any reason, the railway found itself unable to provide by other means of transport a system adequate for the carriage and delivering of traffic and responsive to its obligations imposed by Section 262, the Railway Transport Committee's responsibility would be to direct the railway to reinstitute rail service.

The Railway Transport Committee would have been derelict in its responsibility under Section 192 and 262 of The Railway Act, if it reciprocally authorized Canadian Pacific to remove station staff while shippers of interline traffic received inadequate service.

Mr. Speaker, that was the position of the Government of Saskatchewan as enunciated by Mr. Blair at that time, I am suggesting that decision and that position has never changed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is no question now that the decision that has been made now is a very, very regrettable decision by the Commission. I don't think here is any question as my honourable colleague for Weyburn has suggested, that the firm commitments given by Mr. Allison, the vice-president of the Prairie Region at the Saskatoon hearings, when he said that there would be competent and responsible representative available. He said that they would supervise the L. C. L. Interliner; he said that they would ensure adequate facilities for storage purposes of L. C. L. freight. When all of these things were said and we realized that the promises and obligations were never kept, then I am suggesting that the Railway Transport Committee were derelict in their duty when the supervision was not evident, in order that the people of this province would be protected.

In the observation of Commissioner Woodward and his recommendation when he made a statement as well, he said:

I am satisfied that if C. P. Rail lives up to the firm commitments made at the hearings and a review of highway services promised by the Government of Saskatchewan is carried out with a view to overall railway highway

interline needs of northern Saskatchewan, implementation of the C. P. Rail customer service centre on the Saskatoon division will provide service as good as, or better than, that presently provided.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that that service was not provided. There was no supervision or policing of that agreement and I am questioning now whether those commitments were given in good faith.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that when we look at the overall transportation system and the obligations that the suppliers of transportation have to the people of this country, not only in Saskatchewan, I am suggesting that we have to look at an observation made by the then Montana Senator, Lee Metcalfe,\* when he said:

The question of carrier's income as part of its entire financial position is pertinent to any discussion of government's transportation policy and more particularly so if the carrier also happens to be a conglomerate.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that those people supplying the services to this country at this time and to this province should have been obligated and should have kept their commitments and the Railway Transport Commission's decision most recently handed down is a far cry from obligating those people to keep those commitments. I am sure that the Hon. Members opposite will join with us on this side of the House in supporting the resolution before us. I am sure that they will join with us in taking issue and being very disappointed in the findings of the Railway Transport Commission. I am also certain that when the opportunity does provide itself once again that all Members of the House and official opposition parties in this House, and particularly the points known and let the people of this province know whether or not they are interested in the welfare and well-being of the rural communities right around this province.

It is rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Minister of Transport talks about the user pay policy, I am supposing now that he is very happy with the decisions being made, because that decision is in line with what he has been saying for a long time now. I am suggesting that the type of support that the Canadian Pacific has received from the Minister, is right in line with the decisions being handed down. I am sure that there will be other comments that should be made in that regard. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 6 — REGRETS THE REDUCTION OF REBATE UNDER THE FARM COST REDUCTION PROGRAM**

**MR. R. E. NELSON:** — (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) — moved, seconded by Mr. McMillan (Kindersley):

That this Assembly regrets that the Saskatchewan Government has posed a further hardship on the farmers of this province by reducing the rebate under the Farm Cost Reduction Program to 4 cents per gallon with a maximum of \$100 at a time when there has been a decrease in the net farm income as a result of declining wheat prices and unstable livestock markets, and urges the



Government to: (1) leave the rebate at 7 cents per gallon, (2) remove the maximum, (3) apply the rebate at the dealer level, thereby allowing farmers to obtain an immediate rebate and relieve them from having to make individual applications for the reduction.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in this Resolution I am asking the Minister of Agriculture to stop discrimination against the agricultural sector of our province. Not only is the discrimination but it is a hardship brought on by the Minister at a time when farmers' incomes have been drastically cut by lower grain prices, lower cattle prices and increased costs. The Minister tried to justify his action in this Assembly by saying the Government was spreading the money among more small farmers in the province.

Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister knows that 4 cents spreads less dollars than 7 cents a gallon does. And nothing at all doesn't really spread too many dollars among any farmers. The Minister also stated the maximum limit was placed on the rebate so that large grain farmers would not receive much help. In the same breath, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan said 83 per cent of the farmers in 1975 received the maximum rebate. Well, the Minister then tries to tell this Assembly that 83 per cent of Saskatchewan farmers are large grain farmers, he then lowers the maximum to \$100 and the rebate to 4 cents. Now he has removed it entirely. This undoubtedly increased the number of farmers who were getting the maximum at \$100 maximum.

Mr. Speaker, the proof of the gross discrimination is made clear by the fact that the 7 cents a gallon was not charged at the gas pumps for cars and trucks, commercial or pleasure. Nor was there any limit on these purchases. Similarly this 7 cents could have been rebated at the dealer level and the Government would have saved much office space as well, in expense in rebating this to the farmers. The farmers too would have been spared the time wasted on filling out and filing the forms for the rebate. While this Government squanders their money on potash mines in the hundreds of millions of dollars, they steal the 7 cents a gallon from the farmers who run the most important industry in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up, I should like to say the Minister of Agriculture of this Government is completely out of touch with reality; he knows little or nothing about the farm problems in this province. I suggest this Government and Members of the Cabinet have completely shafted the minister and the farmers of this province on this program, as well as the entire agricultural budget. The Minister has yet to wake up and realize just what has happened.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — If he listens to you . . .

**MR. NELSON:** — I hear curly chirping in his seat again. Positive proof of this is shown in the elimination of the rebate program for this year. I would ask the Minister to reconsider withdrawing this program. Surely it would be much more positive than spending the \$272 million on potash mines and continuing to chase to foreign countries to spend more money on more potash mines.

I so move, seconded by the Member for Kindersley.

**MR. A. N. McMILLAN** (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members of the House and particularly those on the Government side recognize the fact that Members on this side of the House, and particularly our rural Members approach our agricultural issues with enthusiasm.

I should like to suggest that in listening to the speech that our Minister of Social Services has just delivered from his chair, that one would look at the legislation that has been passed in this Province and the regulations that have been enacted in the past few years, and think that all Members on that side of the House, indeed, come from a city like the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes), and certainly that all Members on that side of the House would carry his awareness of the degree of importance of agriculture in Saskatchewan. And I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. It has become obvious in the past two or three years that Members on that side of the House have adopted that attitude that farmers find so distasteful in many members of the urban public, and that's the assumption — and I suspect that all Members on that side of the House have adopted his attitude — that's the assumption that because someone is in the farming business and has a large capital investment in farming equipment that he is wealthy.

I'll tell you why the people in Saskatchewan get that impression. That's because while the farming community recognizes that the most significant problem in agriculture today, and in the general sense, is the cost-price squeeze. At every turn this Government fails to take into consideration the cost-price squeeze in the rural community in Saskatchewan.

This price increase, and that's what, in effect it has been to the farmers of Saskatchewan for their fuel is one example in many where this Provincial Government had the opportunity to alleviate some of the pressures that the cost-price squeeze has put on Saskatchewan farmers and has ignored their responsibility to do so.

We have seen, over the past few years, lease rates to our Saskatchewan cattlemen increase substantially. We have seen farm power rates as other rates have increased substantially. We have seen telephone rates in Saskatchewan increase substantially. At every turn we have seen cost to farmers that are controlled by the Saskatchewan Government increase substantially and in many instances, far more than that allowed by the Anti-Inflation Board.

The Provincial Government has had the opportunity over the past two years to hold back the increase in costs to farmers in Saskatchewan and have consistently ignored the opportunity to do that.

Those people on that side of the House some time ago got up and preached to us about the fact that agriculture in Saskatchewan commands about 54 to 55 per cent of our provincial economy. Really it is dependent entirely on agriculture. Those people have undoubtedly been convinced, in view of the Budget Speech, that the Saskatchewan economy is heading for trouble. I should think more than anyone, you people should be concerned about maintaining a vital and vibrant economy in Saskatchewan. And yet when faced with the opportunity to take some of the economic pressures off the Saskatchewan farmers and

certainly take some of the pressures off the Saskatchewan economy, you turn around and increase effectively the cost of farm fuel to farmers by four cents.

I am surprised at the Members and I'm not surprised at the city Members taking this lightly and my fuzzy headed friend opposite, the Government Whip, seems to take it as a big joke.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . fuzzy headed friend . . .

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I'm not surprised and I suggest that farmers in Saskatchewan get the impression that all Government Members have the same attitude as you do, Mr. Whip. It's no wonder they get frustrated with the Provincial Government.

I can only urge you, as the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) has done, to reconsider the action that you have taken in increasing the cost to farmers and try and take some of the pressure off caused by the cost-price squeeze.

**HON. W. A. ROBBINS** (Saskatoon Nutana): — I resent the remarks from the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan). I am just as much a farmer as he is. I can run a tractor in a field just as well as he can and I do regularly.

First of all the Resolution doesn't look at the facts at all. It talks about the fact that the farm cost reduction program at one time was seven cents a gallon. In 1974-75 the tax on a gallon of gasoline in the Province of Saskatchewan was 19 cents a gallon. That's what it was under the Liberal administration in 1970-71. We reduced that tax by seven cents a gallon. Obviously when the price of gasoline came down seven cents a gallon at the pumps it was reasonable to institute a rebate program for farm fuel because the cost of fuel was rising. And we did institute the seven cents rebate program.

In the 1976-77 Budget the gasoline tax went up by three cents a gallon, up to 15 cents a gallon from 12 cents and therefore diminished the rebate to four cents a gallon. This year the gasoline tax went back to 19 cents, exactly the same as it was 1970-71 and the rebate program is wiped out. That's realistic, that's facing facts.

The fact remains that the percentage of gasoline tax today, related to a price of a gallon of gasoline is much lower than it was when your administration was in power back in 1970-71 and you know it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Agriculture would like to make a few remarks with respect to this particular resolution and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 8 — DISPUTE OVER CABLE TELEVISION POLICIES**

**MR. W. H. STODALKA** (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to provide a quick settlement to the dispute with Ottawa

over cable television policies.

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT** (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might say a few words in seconding this Motion.

The cable situation that now faces Saskatchewan, I suggest, is a very serious one and some brief historic review is important because I think the people of this Province should be made to realize that it is in large part the fault of the NDP Government that we do not have cable here today. Indeed, that may be an overly generous statement, it is almost exclusively the fault of the NDP Government that we don't have cable here today.

The Government nationally, when the old Board of Broadcast Governors was in power, had a rather stupid policy which said that they could not provide cable unless they could pick up that cable through the air so that for many years it was not possible for Saskatchewan to have cable whatsoever. And during that time areas like Estevan, which could pick up cable through the air, could pick up the signal through the air, then purified and improved the signal and delivered it to people in their area so that in Estevan they have cable provided by the CRTC with a CRTC licence. In Prince Albert, for instance, there is a CRTC licence.

During the years that the Liberals were in power provincially and it would have been possible to comply with the CRTC regulations as they now exist, CRTC regulations precluded an application from Saskatchewan because it wasn't possible to pick up the signal through the air.

Then the BBG ended and the CRTC took over. Unfortunately for Saskatchewan people, that happened almost concurrently with the election of the NDP Government in Saskatchewan. The Government Ministry responsible, first under the current Speaker, and latterly under the Minister now in charge and other Ministers took a very strict position and said that they weren't prepared to have cable in this province unless they had absolute control over that cable. I suggest, indeed, Mr. Speaker, that the position of the NDP Government hasn't changed, although they now try to argue with the people of Saskatchewan that their position has changed.

The Government then moved to subterfuge to do the things they found they had been incapable of doing directly. By 1975 the Government stated that they were prepared to have cable come into this province provided they had control through Sask Tel of the hardware and secondly, they said, provided companies or provided co-ops I suggest, had control over the provision of the signal in Saskatchewan.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, you may recall the strict rule of the CRTC was that provincial governments could not get involved in cable television. The applications were made well over a year ago. Sask Tel applied for control of cable in all four areas that the CRTC has indicated that they were prepared to hear applications upon. Co-ops applied, those co-ops having been funded in large part by the Provincial Government, with one exception, I suggest that those co-ops were little more than fronts for NDP activists perhaps in their community. That exception is the Regina Cable Co-op Company.

The Regina Cable Co-op Company very early realized that having too much to do with the other three cable co-ops would not only hurt their ability to apply before the CRTC and appear credible to the CRTC but secondly, would, perhaps hamstringing their ability to deal at an arm's length relationship with the Government once they got the cable licences they hoped to get.

Indeed, developments since the Regina Cable Co-op received the licence would indicate that they were unfortunately only too right about the intention of the Government having fairly strict control over the operation of cable if it came to Saskatchewan through the co-op.

The application was heard, a decision rendered and the ink barely dried on the decision of the Boyle Board saying that two cable co-ops would get licences and two companies when the Provincial Government changed their position.

Indeed, we on our side, thought that the granting of licences to two companies and to two co-ops was an ideal opportunity for the people of Saskatchewan and perhaps the people of this country to discover whether cable co-ops would adequately handle the responsibilities of providing services to an area. We thought this was a good opportunity and a fair decision by the CRTC Board to provide the provision of cable between co-ops and private companies. The decision was not sooner rendered, then the Government then changed its decision.

The Government said then, we won't be prepared to deal with these licensees. Then before the application expired, the Government indicated that they would be prepared to deal with the licensees. Then they said that they wouldn't be prepared to deal with them because they still were going to demand absolute control over the head ends, amps and drops. That was over a year ago.

Meantime, the Government, hell bent for leather, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, was laying all the cable it could. And why as it doing that? It was laying all the cable it could, particularly in Regina, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw so that at some point later on the Government would be able to argue clearly that it would be ridiculous to have a cable company when we, Sask Tel already have all of that cable laid.

There's nothing that the CRTC could do about that, but similarly there was nothing that your Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, could do about the fact that the CRTC would not grant the licence to this province to the companies and the co-ops in the way that the Government wished.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba agreement was developed. Some of us, I included, thought that that was almost a sell-out by the Federal Government that the Federal Government had gone a long way towards losing control of the cable by saying in the renewal at Portage La Prairie and Brandon that they would allow Manitoba Telephones to have control of the cable hardware.

I thought that was a mistake by the Federal Government. But surely, Mr. Speaker, your Government should have thought that it was all that they could possibly want. They then were faced, when the Manitoba agreement was offered to them, as I say it was, though the Minister denies it, they then were faced with an opportunity of controlling all of the cable

March 22, 1977

through Sask Tel and that had been their alleged reason for refusing to co-operate in allowing cable to come into this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister repeated to me, in answers to questions which I posed in the House that the Manitoba agreement had not been offered to him. He repeatedly said that it couldn't be resolved but, that he would only be too happy if Mr. Boyle would agree, as I said Mr. Boyle had agreed.

On the other front, Mr. Speaker, when we went into Crown Corporations, Mr. Cowley, the chairman, was kind enough on March 23, 1976 sitting on Crown Corporations to rule that no questions could be asked in Crown Corporations other than questions regarding the laying of hardware and then . . . there's a misprint . . . no, no, I'm afraid that Mr. Koskie hasn't impressed the reporters sufficiently, and I'm not sure it wasn't you, in fact, because as I recall I was at that meeting and you may have been talking over, in any event, the minutes of the Select Standing Committee on Crown Corporations, minute No. 5 indicates that you ruled that hardware . . . that only questions regarding hardware could be asked.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, however, the Government used their majority in the Crown Corporations to pass a rule clearly designed to restrict information to the Opposition and to the people of this province. they did so rule and we were cast back into trying to get this story before the people of this province solely through Question Period in the kind of skimpy questions that could be asked.

Over a year ago, Mr. Speaker, I moved a resolution in this House asking that the Government move to declare its willingness to co-operate in providing Sask Tel communications facilities at reasonable costs, to move on this matter to get the matter resolved. The Government has done nothing.

All, Mr. Speaker, the Government has done is repeatedly put before the Minister, notwithstanding the fact that he flips back and forth from Ottawa from time to time to discuss the matter, repeatedly denies that any progress is being made and repeatedly denies that he had any kind of settlement with the CRTC.

In the first week of February for the first time officials from Sask Tel, officials of the Minister's department, and CRTC officials met, furious that though there's been a dispute in progress ever since this Government was elected, since 1971, that only then did the Government finally get around to even bothering to even sit down and meet the CRTC at some kind of administrative level to find out whether the problems could be resolved.

The department officials, the Sask Tel officials were told in that meeting that there would be absolutely no problems in getting the Manitoba agreement for Saskatchewan. I asked the Minister about that meeting, and I asked the Minister about a meeting in early February when he flew to Ottawa and met with Mr. Boyle. The Minister told me in this House in Question Period, that he would be only too happy if Mr. Boyle would agree to the Manitoba agreement for Saskatchewan. I suggested to him that he had done so. the Minister said, n he had not done so.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have now spoken to Mr. Boyle about that same meeting, and I have also spoken to Mr. Boyle's executive assistant, who was present at that same meeting, and curiously, Mr. Speaker, the recollection of Harry Boyle, the Chairman of the CRTC is very different from the recollection of the Minister.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the press have any questions about Mr. Boyle's understanding and recollections, or any questions about the recollections of other people who were at that meeting, they will take the time I am sure, to check those recollections, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what the Minister was doing when he said that those were confidential meetings and he couldn't give any information about them, was he was hiding behind the confidentiality that he decided would be a useful tool to avoid giving further information to the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — The Chairman did tell the Minister that he could not speak for other Members. He said that, in fairness, the CRTC as a body, would have to make these decisions, but that clearly it had been indicated to the Minister that the ownership question could be agreed upon the lines of the Manitoba agreement. Now, the Chairman and others who were at that meeting, are willing to concede that Mr. Shillington, the Minister of Government Services, has special problems with the Manitoba agreement. Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that the Government necessarily is going to be convinced by my little address to change their approach and their policy. All that I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is that they be a little more candid and a little more honest with the people of this province.

The problem that the Government appears to have with the Manitoba agreement, as far as the CRTC can see, is that the Government opposes the explicitness of the Manitoba agreement, with regard to the federal jurisdiction over pay television and other such facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Government could enter into the agreement. They could have all of the control over the head ends, and amps and drops; all of the control over the hardware that they have said was the reason they were delaying cable to this province, except ownership over all of the hardware exactly what the Government said was the problem at the CRTC hearings; can you have your cake and the candles on top of it, and provide cable to this province, but you can't have as well, the next step, which is control over pay television. Mr. Speaker, your Ministers I regret to say, are sort of like five-year olds trying to negotiate over a division of lollipops. First, they started off and said we want our fair share of the lollipops, and then they said we want 90 per cent of the lollipops, and now, Mr. Speaker, they say they want the whole lollipop, everything. All of the candy on the table. Even though they know that that's impossible.

The CRTC now believes, and I've not been of that impression until I spoke with those officials, that CRTC now believes that the core of the problem is support for the co-ops. You know, it was my colleagues who tend to be more suspicious of the rather badly-motivated approach of some of your ministers, Mr. Speaker, who have been assuring me for some years that the only reason that there was a delay is because that Government,

for whatever doctrinaire reasons, are determined to have the co-ops in operation in this province, have been assuring me that we'd never have cable until the co-ops could provide it, and I don't think that was the case.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that your Minister has now convinced the CRTC that that's the case, and frankly, I'm becoming convinced as well.

**MR. MOSTOWAY** (Saskatoon Centre): — You've got an in with Otto. You see, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Centre isn't very busy so he can engage in idle conversation with his brother-in-law about, no doubt, all kinds of things, but I and my brother-in-law are rather busier than you are, I'm sure and . . .

The core of the problem, Mr. Speaker, appears to be the rather curious determination by that Government that the co-ops are going to be supported, as though having tried to help them in the first place, though the CRTC could clearly see that they were not the best applicants before the CRTC, though the CRTC could clearly see that better applicants would do a better job of providing cable to the jurisdictions, to the areas in question, notwithstanding that, your Government, Mr. Speaker, is determined to foist off those cable co-ops, whether they are adequate or not. The result has been that the Government wants to have something — pay namely — as a sop for the cable co-ops, and though they've been told that that's not possible, the Government goes on insisting that this sop be given to the co-ops.

Even then, Mr. Speaker, the problem could have been resolved. The next step by the CRTC, by Mr. Boyle and by his executive assistant, was to suggest to the Minister, why not leave pay out of the fight? Why not resolve cable, and leave pay out of the battle? Let's get cable into Saskatchewan, little enough to ask when the rest of this country has had cable for years and years and years; let's get cable into Saskatchewan, and we'll solve the pay dispute at some later time. Pay, Mr. Speaker, is a long ways away. This Government will be gone and buried by the time we have pay in Saskatchewan, yet they are determined to have a decision over pay, because they want to have some bone to throw to the cable co-ops. The Government has suggested that they have some control over education. Well, Mr. Speaker, education and the educational network must, by federal regulations be provided by the cable companies and given to the Provincial Government so that the Provincial Government can provide the education network. Television Ontario, in that province for instance, is provided by the Ontario Government, and paid for by the cable companies, and there are a myriad of cable companies.

Again, Mr. Speaker, that's an argument presented in this House and to the people of this province, as a reason for the delay, but it's an argument that really doesn't hold water.

CRTC officials believe that the Government is using the co-ops as a means of having control of the provision of cable in this province. They want to combine control through Sask Tel and through the cable co-ops, and that just isn't going to be allowed, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when this province doesn't



have an independent public utilities board as other provinces have.

I think, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the most honest, if not only fully honest thing that the Government has said about cable in their whole discussion, may have been the letter of the Premier to the Prime Minister, asking for a cable review. I think, Mr. Speaker, none of us should forget that the first ground raised by the Premier, the primary complaint to the Federal Cabinet, was that the cable co-ops had been passed over; that the Government thought that it should be the co-ops who had control.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding the motion, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that only in two eventualities, will cable be provided in this province. First, is that the Government is defeated. But, I am hopeful that cable can be provided more quickly than the couple of years that we might have to wait for a new government in this province, and that's only going to happen as there is a greater awareness of the people of the province, of the difficulty – a greater awareness of the fact that the NDP are determined, for whatever reason, that they will have all four cable co-ops, as well as control of the hardware, so that through those cable co-ops they would hope that they can exercise the kind of control over the media that most right-thinking people in this province would deny to any government, whether it were an NDP Government or not, and particularly hope to deny to a government of an NDP strain.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few remarks in reply to what the honourable gentleman who just sat down, has said.

As far as I am concerned, it's a usual distortion of the facts.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Phone Boyle!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — No, I don't even know his telephone number. I have no intention . . . Well, that's fine, if you want to run an extension cord here . . . probably. But I want to point out certain things. The honourable gentleman talks about how this Government wants control, control, control . . . What a bunch of gibberish that is. Have you ever taken the bother to look up at the make-up of the cable television co-ops, for example, the Saskatoon one? Are you trying to say that the Government of Saskatchewan is trying to control the various Catholic Church groups of Saskatoon, or Presbyterian, Baptist, you name it? Is that what you are trying to say? Well, it seems to me that's what you are trying to say? Well it seems to me that's what you are trying to say, and I say that's a slap in the face to those particular church-affiliated organizations, all the elderly groups – organizations, the various youth organizations, and the school organizations. Now, if you think the Government is out to control, and that they are going to be controlled, well, then you have a pretty low opinion of the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Now, you talk about these various co-ops as being fronts. Fronts for what? We've heard that before.

**MR. PENNER** (Saskatoon Eastview): — Control!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, control. How can we possibly control? I give you for example, if you are talking about control through hardware, I give you for example, Saskatoon. There are a number of private organizations, whereby they rent the hardware from Sask Tel or from the people of Saskatchewan. Now, no one would ever accuse us of trying to control those organizations that are involved in the news media. No control there. I want to also mention the fact that I happened to be in the Mid-town Plaza in Saskatoon a couple of weeks ago, and this private cable television outfit set up shop. It seemed they were every place I was going to for two months. Here they were with their leaflets and brochures, etc., peddling their literature around. And, I said to the fellow, I said: “Well, now, just what are you really after?” And he said: “Well, we’re after giving the people cable television.” And so is this Government. They’ve gone on record as favouring that. Well, anyway, it boils down to I said: “Well, what are you really worried about,” and he said: “control.” I said: “Well, how come control? How can we control?” Well, he said: “You subsidize the co-ops a little bit.” So then I said to the gentleman to whom I was talking: “Well, are you trying to say that every time the Government of Saskatchewan subsidizes an individual or an organization that it’s going to control?” And I happen to have said: “Did you happen to attend the University of Saskatchewan?” He said: “Yes, I did. I got my couple of degrees there.” I asked: “Were you subsidized?” and he scratched his head and said: “I guess I was.” I said: “Did the Government ever control you?” and he admitted right there – no control at all, so that kind of nonsense doesn’t wash down well with people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to dwell on one other point. It’s quite simple why the Government has always preferred control of cable, of closed circuit, of pay television, why they want people control there. It’s quite simple. They would charge a reasonable rent in regard to the hardware, and ensure that people in the rural areas, the smaller centres of Saskatchewan, will get cable television. And I ask the hon. gentleman there, how come your little private outfits, how come they haven’t made application for cable television in the Watrous and the Humboldt areas?

**MR. PENNER:** — Well why not?

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, I’ll tell you why; because there isn’t enough money in it for them.

As far as I can see it, Mr. Speaker, what that Hon. Member said on behalf of the private outfits, he would want to see things wide open. He would want to see the kind of smut that you can see on cable television in Toronto, Montreal, you name it. This Government certainly doesn’t want to see that.

I have a few other choice words of wisdom, words that will enlighten the Members opposite, and, consequently, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER**

**RESOLUTION NO. 13**

He said: I have a statement with regard to Resolution No. 13 which is on the Order Paper as item 12. Members will note that Resolution NO. 13, standing in the name of the Member for Moose Jaw North, deals with the same subject matter as that of Resolution NO. 8 which has already been moved by the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) and on which debate has been adjourned. I would draw to the attention of the Assembly to the Anticipation Rule which is outlined in Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Procedures 17th Edition, page 339, as follows:

A motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the House, whether it be a Bill or an Adjourned Debate or a Motion.

And further in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, page 116:

The Anticipation Rule is dependent on the same principle as that which forbids the same question being twice raised in the same session.

I must, therefore, rule Resolution No. 13 out of order since the subject matter is substantially the same as Resolution No. 8, which the House, by adjourning the debate on it, has already appointed for consideration at a later sitting. No Member is thereby deprived of the right to speak because the subject matter of Resolution No. 13 is already under debate in Resolution No. 8, and any Member who wishes to speak to it providing of course that Member has not already done so.

**MR. SKOBERG:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may Resolution No. 13 deals with the extension of cablevision to the smaller centres, also the whole area of . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I believe what the Member is doing now is in effect questioning the ruling, and the ruling is not subject to questioning.

**MR. SKOBERG:** — On a Point of Order, then Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What is the Point of Order?

**MR. SKOBERG:** — The Point of Order is that I suggest there is no anticipation for the placing of the Resolution on the Order Paper, as it was placed on there exactly the same time as the previous Resolution that you have in question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I accept the point of explanation of the Member that there was no anticipation in his mind. I am suggesting that probably the anticipation factor was a coincidental one and is not within the control of the Member or myself, it just happens that that's the way the order of business proceeded and I find my ruling to be a proper one.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 15 — CONDEMNATION OF OTTAWA'S CENTRALIST POLICIES**

**MR. R. L. COLLVER** (Nipawin) moved:

That this Assembly condemns the Liberal Government in Ottawa for its centralist policies which are encroaching on provincial jurisdictions, against the spirit of Confederation; which fail to recognize, in a meaningful way, the regional, cultural and economic differences in Canada and which have now placed the very essence of Canada in uncertainty.

A Member requested that the item stand whereupon an objection was raised.

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT** (Regina Wascana): — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. We do not accept that the Motion by Mr. Collver be stood, and as I understand it though the motion “stand” is not something that comes up in the Rules and Procedures as such. By the practice of the House it is possible to allow these matters to stand from time to time, and where it is opposed that a Motion of the House has to be heard. It is our view, Mr. Speaker, that a matter of that seriousness which takes a relatively damning view is a Motion where the Member should be in the House to deal with the matter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The question before the House was whether item No. 14, Resolution No. 15 should stand. A Member has asked that the matter stand. Now Rule No. 9 says:

Questions put by Members and motions not taken up when called may upon request of the Member (this used to be upon request of the Minister) be allowed to stand and retain their precedence. Otherwise, they will disappear from the Order Paper. They may, however, be renewed.

The Member has requested that the item stand.

**MR. J. G. LANE** (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think, with respect, it says ‘upon the request of a Member’. I think The Interpretation Act governs the rules that is precisely what it means ‘a Member’ of the Assembly. It is quite clear and the request for stand has been made.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't think the point made by the Member for Wascana is a legitimate point. ‘May’ allows the Member the opportunity to say ‘stand’. But the Member doesn't have to say stand; the word isn't ‘shall’.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that ‘may’ in this manner, and I point out to Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you know, it does not appear to be covered in Erskine May nor in the other books which I have just glanced at. ‘May’ would appear to me to indicate that it then becomes at the pleasure of the House, that if it were the intention, Mr. Speaker, that a Member could say ‘stand’, and notwithstanding the view of the whole House stand a motion, then it would say that when called upon ‘shall’ upon the request of a Member be stood. But

it doesn't say that and clearly it wouldn't have been the intention that it would. It says 'may' because then it is up to the House to decide if there is a dispute and that's the way, Mr. Speaker, with respect, it operated before we had Rule 9, which is a new rule. I think that Rule 9 was intended to operate as we operated before, and Mr. Speaker, I recall in this House a vote on whether a matter would be allowed to stand I think we are exactly in the same situation now. There's a request from a Member, it's not unanimous and then the question goes back to the House, will the matter stand or not?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think I am going to stay with my ruling and my ruling is that the Resolution No. 15, which is on the Order Paper as Item 14, is the property of the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) and the Member has requested that the matter stand. Until such time as the Member for Nipawin moves that Resolution no one can discuss the matter.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 18 — ESTABLISH A POLICY FOR HIGH SCHOOL MATRICULATION**

**MR. R. H. BAILEY** (Rosetown-Elrose moved, seconded by Mr. Larter (Estevan):

That this Assembly urges the Department of Education to establish a policy that would require a minimum of 24 credits for high school matriculation; seven of these credits must be at the 30 level, two of which must be English and one Canadian History at the 30 level.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to support this particular Resolution. I have had the opportunity to discuss this with a number of different organizations within the province, including organizations such as the high school principals' group and various school boards across Saskatchewan. You will find within the province a variety of opinions in regard to this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded Education Week in Saskatchewan and this year we had adopted a theme for Education Week as being "Our Schools are Better than Ever", and I am not here, Mr. Speaker, to dispute the slogan for Education Week in one way or the other but I do believe that in supporting this Resolution we would be doing something of a service across the Province of Saskatchewan. Most of us who are in this House recall the days in which you had the necessary requirements for matriculation which were in fact a minimum of eight classes or eight credits for each of the final three years in high school.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question as you go about Saskatchewan today that the amount of money that has been spent on education, the buildings, the staffing, the textbooks, the libraries, we have put millions and millions of dollars into education and all this Resolution does, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a minimum sort of way the requirements so that those students in Saskatchewan will take advantage of the huge expenditures that the people in the province have placed in the schools.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that in the Province of Saskatchewan the majority of

students who matriculate from our high schools do in fact take more than the 21 credits. The majority of students in Saskatchewan are in fact matriculating out of Grade 12 with more than 24 credits. However, it poses a real problem to local boards in having the minimum set at 21 credits. Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with some neighbouring provinces which have in fact placed the minimum of matriculation even at a lower level than Saskatchewan.

At the present time one of the problems encountered in certain areas of Saskatchewan, and particularly in rural Saskatchewan, is the fact that school boards have, by resolution, asked that the number of credits be a minimum of 24. Now the idea behind asking for a minimum of 24 credits is to make sure that the student has a variety of programs from which to choose that he can gainfully occupy himself during each semester of the particular school year. Now what happens in so many cases is that the student goes into the final year, he has already to his credit probably 16 credits at least and so he then decides, in the last year of school, not to take full advantage of the services which the school is providing. Not to take advantage in a very specific way in that he can gainfully attend school for two semesters and, therefore, completing his matriculation participation. Across the province you are finding cases in which a student will take four classes in the final year in one semester and maybe only one class in the last semester. Now I know that there are many people who will argue and say what is wrong with that? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have done some statistics on this particular topic and I have carried them on for the past three years.

Students who take five credits, or five subjects each semester obtain a higher grading than the same student who takes four, or if you follow that same student through he gets a higher rating with five than when he only takes three. I've done this three years in a row and it has been my experience that the more that the student participates at school the better for that student. I am not the only one who has conducted these particular surveys.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible to me, it is absolutely incredible when the amount of money that is being spent in the Province of Saskatchewan on public education to have students not avail themselves of the terrific amount of expenditures that have been placed at their disposal and to only really avail themselves for only half time during the school year.

I want to suggest that if we were to go back (and heaven forbid we know we won't go back to that type of thing), but in the publicly supported education system which we have freed textbooks, everything is laid out before the student, I wonder how many would approve of the type of arrangements that are made for students going to school if in fact there was a direct charge to them. I wonder how much longer the textbooks would last; I wonder how much more care would be given by parents in making sure that certain grades and subjects were attained. Now, Mr. Speaker, to ask for this, to ask for a minimum of 24 credits is not asking very much of the students in today's high school program. And to me I think we are wasting taxpayers' dollars and we are wasting teachers' time and we are wasting the students' time not to require this same minimum as we required 10, 15 years ago. If we are going to live up the slogan that "our schools are better than ever" then surely we should have at least the same minimum of matriculation standing as we had ten years ago.

Mr. Speaker, there is another problem that is encountered with this and it is a very personal thing with me. I find it incredible that in Saskatchewan that we can matriculate a student (and we are not the only province, there are other provinces which have fallen by the wayside as well) that we could actually have a student leave our high schools without a detailed study of Canadian history in the last three years that he attends school. I know that some will say, oh but we've got Canadian Studies. Yes we have many varieties of . . . and that encompasses a huge area. But I am talking about the chronological study of the development of our nation and to me, I think, it is inescapable, I think it is unpardonable, I think it is a great mistake in the field of education not to have that and not to have a good course during the last three years of school.

Mr. Speaker, we have developed within the Province of Saskatchewan a kind of defensive mechanism that has been built up in education.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, to continue on with the discussion that we were having in support of this Resolution just before time was called at 5:00 o'clock, I have a few more things that I should like to say hoping to get the support of this Assembly on this particular Resolution.

I want to assure this House that this Resolution has a great deal of support outside this House, a great deal of support, Mr. Speaker, from people who are in our classrooms, particularly at the high school level., the principals, trustees and I am sure the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, we in Education are too often a little bit slow at listening to what the community and what the public has to say. Really what I am saying is that we are not really good listeners. Some 28 years ago, not too far from this particular building, that is when I was first involved in education and I want to tell you that things have changed a lot since then. Over the years in the parts of four decades that I have been involved in have watched many changes, some for the betterment of education and I am sorry to say that some features not for the betterment of education.

Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at the school day in itself that basically hasn't changed over the years. We have approximately 300 minutes in a school day and just doing very simple arithmetic, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the disadvantage we have in this low minimum standard here in the province.

Let's take, for example, that a student gets into his last year or enters into his last year in high school and he has eight credits at the 10 level and eight credits at the Grade Eleven level. This leaves him, if he chooses the path of the minimum number of requirements, that he is automatically going to be tied into only 50 per cent of his maximum time, 50 per cent of his school instruction time is free time for him.

Now I mentioned before this Session started, to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) that we would like to see that we get our money out of something. Mr. Speaker, the cost that we are paying, that taxpayers along with Government grants to keep our schools open, is measured on a per student basis. That is

how the grant formula is decided; that is how we decide our budgets and that is how we take a look at it.

In some cases, Mr. Speaker, it is costing us an expenditure of \$10 per day to have a student at school. Now if we are going to expend that amount of money to have a student at school it seems reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that we have a level of time in which that student should be profitably subjected to instruction at the school. If the student chooses to take but three credits in the first part of the year, he is automatically guaranteeing himself 40 per cent of the time free. If he takes two, then he has 60 per cent of his time free.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier we are not very good listeners. We, in Education, sometimes have tunnel vision where we only look in our own little arena; where we only look in our own little world and we are not listening to what the other people have to say.

To get back to the slogan that we had for Education Week. We said our schools are better than ever. Mr. Speaker, I would be the first one to agree to that in many aspects, certainly in the physical arrangements of the school over the 28 years that I have been in the business there is a tremendous amount of improvement. But, Mr. Speaker, does it make sense in this day and age where we have more credit offerings, we spend more money, we have more resource material, we have more highly trained teachers, that we should, at this particular time lower the minimum standards for accreditation. It doesn't make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest that if the parents of the students in high schools were paying the total cost per day, directly out of their pockets, that there would be, indeed, a different attitude towards the attendance at school and towards the number of subjects which a student would be taking. I think we should be better listeners in Education. I think we should listen to what the people are saying at this particular time. We have had more criticism in education in the last five years than we probably had in the previous 50. I don't think anyone will dispute that. We have more criticism levelled at us from almost every area within society. Our schools are bigger than ever, nobody will deny that. Our schools are bigger than ever, certainly everybody knows that. Why then, at this particular time, should we, like some other provinces have done, lower the matriculation standing to the point that it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should be listening to what industry has to say. They are not saying that our schools are better than ever. I am not going to agree with them in total, I am not going to agree with any of the criticism in total, but I think that we have to listen to what they have to say. Certainly business isn't saying that our schools are better than ever. Most of the colleges and universities certainly aren't saying that, so I think that we need to listen.

Mr. Speaker, to have the House support this Resolution which I have brought before it at this time, would mean a number of advantages, a number of distinct advantages.

First of all, all this Resolution is asking is that you increase the number of Grade Twelve credits from two to five that is all that it is asking. Overall it is asking to increase, in the last three years of school, only three credits, from 21 to 24.



I should like to stress some of the advantages. First of all I believe it will be a distinct advantage in the organization of our schools and in discipline. I believe that it is going to help a great deal to have more students taking and availing themselves of more classes while the school is in operation. Another very distinct advantage is that it is not going to cost people one cent more money. All of the facilities are there; all of the teachers are there. It doesn't cost one more cent. I see the Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) shaking his head – it doesn't cost one more cent to have the students at school. Now he may be thinking of systems that I am not aware of, but certainly in the system that I am aware of it doesn't cost one more penny if you have 12 students in a physics class or if you have 15. It doesn't cost a cent more.

The second point I want to make is that it definitely will increase the level of competency with our students graduating. I think that three more subjects is that much more for the betterment of our students and I think that is what we should be aiming at.

I think, too, that the public will accept our educational system much more approvingly if they see that the schools have, in fact, raised their standards for matriculation from the point which we have today.

Mr. Speaker, from everything that I have said, I would hope that Members of the Assembly would treat this particular Motion, not on a political party basis or in that fashion at all. I would be criticizing the Alberta Government, which is even worse in their matriculation standards than ours and if I were standing in the Alberta Legislature today I would be doing the same thing, because I think that education is failing and it will continue to fail society, which supports it, as long as the educators are not going to listen to what the taxpayers, to what those paying the shot have to say.

Somehow, in education, we have those who think they are immune, that they are totally immune from society altogether.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move this Resolution.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI** (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make the resolution and on some of the comments made by the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) and then I shall adjourn this debate because I have a great deal that I want in fact, to say on this Resolution, because it is not a simple, a straight-forward matter that can be simply agreed upon without considering all of the implications, because they are great and fairly vast.

I will argue against the Member's — I don't want to use too harsh a word – indictment of educators saying that they don't listen. Nobody pretends that our education system is perfect. I don't think that I have ever done that as a Minister and I think most teachers don't do that, nor do school trustees and neither does the Department of Education.

We are constantly in a situation where, I think, we have to adapt to changing circumstances. We have to change our curriculum as our society changes and as the needs of society changes. In Saskatchewan we have the structure and the mechanism through curriculum committees to do that. This is vastly

different from what is the case in most provinces.

The interesting thing about this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, is that as the situation now is there is a great deal of local discretion and a great deal of local autonomy that is involved in deciding the questions of such things as whether it is going to be only 21 credit minimum or whether it will be necessary to have a minimum of 24 credits. That spread there, Mr. Speaker, is something that any school superintendent who may be seated in this House or words for a school board can decide on now. I think there is a great deal of listening that goes on.

Our Government, Mr. Speaker, has listened to the public on every major issue, or every major program change that we have implemented in the field of education. I can give you the examples of our kindergarten program or the physical education program. You can list them and the list is much longer than that. Before anything was done in those areas, Mr. Speaker, the public of Saskatchewan was listened to. There were Minister's advisory committees, there were public meetings and I think that they were worthwhile.

I am not going to suggest that it is something that we invented, that has always been the case in Saskatchewan. That has been the case in Saskatchewan since the days of Woodrow Lloyd in 1944, when education really began to progress in Saskatchewan. The involvement of the public in decision-making in the area of the educational system is important. That is why, Mr. Speaker, our education system in this province is without, any doubt, one of the superior educational systems in Canada today and I don't think that anyone would question that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I want to make it clear, and I don't want to be misunderstood, I wouldn't want the Member to understand me, that I don't oppose the 24 credits in Division 4. I think you would have to go a long way to find someone, in fact, who does in Saskatchewan in the educational field. And the fact of the matter is that most schools, or many schools, do now require 24 credits as a minimum. So the real issue, Mr. Speaker, can only be identified if you consider those facts.

The minimum 21 credit requirement is only a minimum and any local school board, with their superintendents, with their teaching staff can, in fact, require that their credit requirements be 24. That is now possible. There is no change needed to bring that about.

Mr. Speaker, Members should know that our high schools are intended to serve all the students, not just those who are university bound. To set the minimum requirement in terms of matriculation requirement, which is really determined by the university, may deny this fundamental fact and I don't think that that may necessarily be wise. That is one of the things, in considering this Resolution, I think we seriously, as legislators, have to consider.

The Resolution, Mr. Speaker, seems to infer that our standards are low and consequently that those standards should be raised.

I have already indicated that I don't pretend that our educational system is perfect and that is why we constantly bring about changes. But, I don't agree that our standards are low especially if you compare them to other provinces in western Canada. In terms of requirements for high school graduation, Saskatchewan's demands are far more demanding, our requirements are far more demanding, than our neighbouring provinces Manitoba, Alberta or British Columbia.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the minimum requirement or the minimum credits for a high school graduation in the other provinces is 20 credits. That is the minimum and in Saskatchewan it is 21. It can be 24 if the local school board so decides and requires, which many have done.

The minimum in the number 30 level courses for high school graduation in the other western provinces is 4, in Saskatchewan 5. The number of compulsory subjects in Division 4 before high school graduation in the other provinces is 9, in Saskatchewan 11.

I just want to say, as I have said before, it is not a question of dealing with this in a simple way. I think there is a great deal more involved. There is also evidence that refutes and the inference made by this Resolution; that our students are lazy and irresponsible. I don't think the Member means that, I am not saying that he means that so he shouldn't get excited. I am saying that he means that so he shouldn't get excited. I am saying that the inference can be read into the Resolution. Some people can. I hope that you don't.

I want to, just before I close, give you some indication why that is just not the truth, Mr. Speaker, for those who may read that into the Resolution. For example, of Grade Twelve students in 1975-76 in our schools, 11 per cent of those graduates had only the 21 credit minimum requirements; 89 per cent had more than 21 minimum credits; 66 per cent of our graduates, Mr. Speaker, had 24 credits, the maximum that the Member talks about; over 50 per cent of our graduates had more than 25 credits; over 36 per cent of the graduates from our high schools in that year had over 26 credits and over 27 per cent had over 27 credits.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are and in closing just let me summarize them, the 21 credits minimum is a minimal requirement. Our schools, as I said earlier, are intended to serve all of our students. I don't think that we should straightjacket our schools to prevent them from doing that. Our requirements are more demanding than any in western Canada and our course in Canadian studies is a compulsory requirement.

The present policy, and I think that this is something that is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that establishes the 21 credit minimum requirement is a policy that was established because of the urgings of the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association and because of the urgings of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. I don't think that we, as legislators, should be falling all over ourselves making a major change until we have thoroughly discussed them with those people, Mr. Speaker.

With those few comments, because I have a great deal more to say and I want to provide some information to the House which I think will be useful and interesting, I adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**HON. E. C. WHELAN** (Regina North West): — I wonder with the indulgence of the House if I could introduce to you and through you to all Members of the House 20 cubs from the 77th Cub Pack at Ruth Buck School in Regina North West. These young citizens are seated in the Speaker's Gallery with six adults in that area who are interested in the Speaker's Gallery with six adults in that area who are interested in the cubs; Don and Maryann Copeland, Ken Blumenart, Lorne Danielson, Brian Cox and Marcia Shalley. We congratulate the citizens who have taken the time to bring the 77th Cub Pack here tonight and we welcome the young people to the Legislature.

Members, I am sure, hope that their stay with us is informative and educational.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## RESOLUTION NO. 20 — SPECIAL GRANT TO SPECIAL CARE HOMES

**MISS L. B. CLIFFORD** (Wilkie) moved, seconded by Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that the Department of Social Services make a special grant available to Special Care Homes, to be paid on behalf of the private-paying residents, in the event that rents are increased as a result of the recent proposed wage settlements of unionized employees of these homes in the province.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I have put forward this motion in order for the Government to consider a special grant being made available to private paying residents of Special Care Homes, and as you well know, in a number of my speeches the latest in the Budget, I have indicated that I feel that there is a great need for some type of assistance to the private paying residents. I even think the Minister of Social (Mr. Rolfes) would agree with me that this is indeed a crucial situation, so I'll be very brief and just outline the points why I think this is necessary.

I indicated a number of days ago that Saskatchewan has to one of the highest paying costs for nursing home care, west of Ontario. I think the reasons why we have one of the highest paying, and I have the figures for the Minister, I hadn't mean to go through them for your information.

British Columbia as you know, goes between \$4 and \$10 a day, per day. That is the range for their nursing home care.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — How many nursing homes do they have?

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — I can give you that information.

Alberta is \$5 a day for all levels of care. Manitoba, \$5.75 per day and in Ontario the Government pays \$13.40 and I did admit that even their highest paying which is a private ward, which we rarely see here, does cost more than our normal fee after the subsidy which is \$510 a month.

Now as I was going to indicate before the Minister started shaking his head, was that I found that the reason for their lower care is that they are now, I think, heading towards the type of care where it is under hospitalization or a greater government subsidy, rather than the types of care and costs that we are going towards in Saskatchewan.

The Motion that I've put forth here, it is based on the time when there were a number of raises and strikes going on in the nursing homes. I felt that there should be some special grant in the event that the rents were increased due to recent wage settlements. Now I hope the Minister when he gets up to speak, won't beg the question as to the fact that this isn't why the costs are raised. This is not the important issue. The important issue is that the senior citizens in these homes, the private paying residents in these homes, are having to pay too much to get the nursing home care. What I mean by too much, the Federal Government yes, does give a pension and I'm sure you'll mention that. Yes, but it's equal all over Canada, is it not? So therefore, when we have one of the highest going rates for nursing home care in Saskatchewan, then that means that our residents are being put to very much of a disadvantage and it should be considered. This is all I'm asking you to do. So please don't beg the issue by saying that this really isn't the reason for increased costs. The fundamental statement here is that they have increased cost, whether it be for light, whether it be for heating or food and the important thing is that we look into this situation and do something about it.

Now, I commended the Government for previously trying to get their home care program instituted and this is a program by which the Department of Health and the Department of Social Services have got together to try to alleviate some of these problems. I do agree that it is a very important program and I commend you for it. I wish both these departments would get together and do something more constructive as far as trying to help these private paying residents pay less for their home care. Because 56 per cent of your residents, Mr. Minister, in these private care homes do not get Saskatchewan Assistance, 56 per cent of them. So that some of them are paying, they get their \$210 pension or whatever it is, but they are still paying over \$400, \$450 after your subsidy to get their nursing home care and it is indeed a problem for them.

Besides the people, the residents in the nursing home care, I am sure you received a letter from which I will quote briefly from, from a special care homes association. They are asking you, Mr. Minister:

We the members of the Special Care Home Association are in dire need for more money to care for Level I, II, III, patients. We care for Level IV and V patients and only receive Level III payment. This is a fact as many of our patients die in our homes and have required 24 hour care. This requires staff which we have to pay wages to. We require an increase of levels of care consisting of Level I, \$200 per month, Level II, \$250; Level III, \$325; Level IV, \$450.

Now, I agree with you that this can be debated because under your classification they aren't even supposed to be there.

At a present rate of pay for Level I, this works out to be about \$5 more a day. This includes room, three meals, two snacks, laundry, ironing, mending, administering cars and our time to take patients to and from destination required and on call for their needs 24 hours per day. Often special diets are required. With the present rate we are unable to supply these services which are required by the patient. We feel this is unjustified compared to the large community nursing homes. We have had patients brought to our homes from large nursing homes in a neglected condition.

It is felt by different agencies and patients that we have better nursing home care. Our concern is, why is there a big difference regarding rates of pay for levels of care between the private homes and the large nursing homes? We often receive patients from hospitals placed by social workers who say they are Level I and II and after caring for them for a day or two we find they are Level III.

I won't go on with the rest of the paragraph, but the point they are trying to make is that they would like to have some negotiation where the patients will be admitted in the homes, only on the doctor's admission and not on for instance, a social worker's admission.

We feel that there should be a cost of living rate increase built into the rates. Since we received our last increase in April, which was like a slap in the face, the cost of living has jumped so high the raise wouldn't even begin to cover it. Electric power, Sask Power, car, gas, eggs, coffee, flour, sugar and other things too numerous to mention, have all gone up. Our taxes went up from \$60 to \$100 jump. Please remember that we have to make a living and so many of the operators are depending solely on the patients for their income. If some of the large nursing homes get over \$600 per month, surely we deserve better than we receive. The large nursing homes won't accept the patients we are expected to keep in our homes.

Now I admit that some of that is at their own discretion, but the Special Care Homes Association does feel that there is a problem and I'm asking you to consider the problem, not only of the residents, but also the nursing people of these special care homes.

Now, if I were on the other side of the House I would end my speech by saying that this is crucial, that something must be done. If you want to look after the poor and the sick and the pioneers then do not try to turn it back on the tables of what the Liberal Government had done previously. I hope, Mr. Minister, you will face the fact that there is a problem, that something should be done, that you will put your priorities where your money and your mouth are. I'll take no excuses. It's a time for action.

I therefore move this resolution.

**HON. H. H. ROLFES** (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome the opportunity to

once again praise this Government for the tremendous programs that we have implemented for senior citizens. I always appreciate when the Liberals move motions like this which give me this opportunity.

I want to remind people of this province as I did on Sunday, in Moose Jaw, that when we came to power in 1971, there was no program for senior citizens. None whatsoever. Oh, pardon me, Mr. Speaker, there was, I'm sorry. They did have a program. They had a program of deterrent fees for our senior citizens. They taxed our senior citizens to a tune of \$5.5 million. That's what their program was and I know the Member for Wilkie says, well I shouldn't go back to what they did, but you know I have to, Mr. Speaker, because I think people have short memories and we want to make absolutely certain that the people of this province don't put those Members opposite back on this side of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — They might look a little bit younger on that side, but their philosophy is still the same.

Their philosophy is not for the individual, it is not for the senior citizens, it's for their big corporate interests, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I said last year that in my department alone, we spent \$40 million on senior citizens. This year in my department there is \$49 million for senior citizens. Well over 25 per cent of my budget and much of that is in the Sask. Assistance Plan which you people go around this province criticizing us for. That's the one you criticize us for.

In that particular allowance, Mr. Speaker, we have included subsidies to people in special care homes and we will continue to do so.

Let me just give a little bit of history as I did in the Budget speech, because obviously the Members opposite didn't catch it. In 1971, when we came to power the average rate for Level III was \$310. There was no subsidy from the Members opposite when they were the Government, none whatsoever. The Old Age Security was \$135, leaving the private citizens to pay out of their own pockets \$175.

Let me turn to the situation as it is today and you would expect because the Members opposite say that senior citizens are in such dire straits today as compared to when the Liberal Opposition was the Government, that you would expect that the senior citizens would be paying much more today out of their savings than they were in 1971-72.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Did I say that?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Oh, well you certainly by inference you say so. But, Mr. Speaker, let's have a look at the facts. In Level III today the rate is, the average rate is \$775. Certainly that's high, but it's not higher here than it is in Ontario and Alberta. The rate isn't any higher. Mr. Speaker, the average rate is \$775 for Level III. Of that we pay a subsidy of \$362 right now. That will go up to \$398 as of April 1st. But if

you subtract the Old Age Security, Guaranteed Income Supplement and the supplement that the Provincial Government gives today, the ordinary resident doesn't pay \$175 as he did in 1971-72, he pays on the average about \$153. Twenty-two dollars on the average less than he did in 1971-72 and that is in spite of, large increases in salaries and a fairly hefty increase in inflation. Those senior citizens are better off today than they were in 1971-72. Just in case people are of the opinion that all the senior citizens in Level III pay this I want to inform the House that 50 per cent of the people in Level III are completely paid for under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. The very program that you people and especially the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) go out and tell your farmers that that is the money that we spent on "those bums, those transients". But you don't tell them about the \$19 million that goes for senior citizens in our special care homes. You won't tell them that. The Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) did exactly the same thing in the last by-election. Exactly the same thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I said on Sunday, I get angry when Liberals tell me that we don't do enough for senior citizens, because that's sheer hypocrisy on your part. Absolute hypocrisy.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — The truth hurts.

**MR. ROLFES:** — The truth hurts all right when it comes from those people who have never recognized the truth. Yes, I can well understand why the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) gets riled up because he was the Minister in charge at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue this debate at another time because I have lots more to say on this particular area and I should like to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Order! I wonder if the Members from their seats could disabuse themselves of comments such as 'coward' in this Chamber. If they want to test that on someone here, perhaps they should step outside and . . . Order! I think it lowers the decorum of the Chamber if Members are sitting in their seats and yelling such phrases across the House. Next item of business. What's the Point of Order?

**MR. C. P. MacDONALD** (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, if you want to pick out one isolated phrase pick out all the garbage that they throw across the House, Mr. Speaker. Don't pick on one Member of this side.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The Member is out of Order. Next item of business.



## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

#### **RETURN NO. 16**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. MacDonald that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 16 showing:

Under the Saskatchewan Succession Duty Act: (a) the quarterly collection during the year 1975; (b) the number of estates that were involved; (c) the number of beneficiaries that were involved; (d) the number of estates that were valued between \$200,000 and \$500,000; (e) the number of estates that were valued between \$500,000 and \$1 million; (f) the number of estates that were valued over \$1 million.

**HON. W. E. SMISHEK** (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate on this resolution the other day, I indicated that I had a discussion with the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald). We discussed the problem there was in providing this particular information in the way it was requested. I have discussed this particular amendment with him that I propose to move and I think he is in agreement with it so I move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Whelan):

That all the words after the word 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

- (a) The quarterly collections during 1975 under The Saskatchewan Succession Duty Act; (b) The number of estates that were involved; (c) The total number of beneficiaries that were involved in estates where succession duty was assessed; (d) The number of estates that were (i) of value between \$75,000 and \$200,000; (ii) of the value between \$200,000 and \$500,000; (iii) of the value between \$500,000 and \$1 million; (iv) in the value in excess of \$1 million.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **SECOND READINGS**

**MR. L. E. JOHNSON** (Turtleford) moved second reading of Bill No. 45 — An act to amend The Engineering Profession Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill amends Section 15 of The Engineering Professions Act by inserting after 'Saskatchewan' in the second line the following:

And the councillor who is a member of the Faculty of Engineering of the University of Regina.

What had happened is that in Section 14, there was a member from the University of Regina placed on the council of the professional association. There was no method to appoint this particular member. By adding this line to Section 15, there is now a method of appointing him.

I move that Bill No. 45 — An Act to amend the Engineering Professions Act be now read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — CULTURE & YOUTH — VOTE 7**

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI** (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Before we begin, Mr. Chairman, I should like to introduce my staff. I think Members will probably know, most if not all the members of my staff that are here. First of all, Mr. Don Morose, the Deputy Minister, who is seated here on my right. Mr. Jim Benning, the Executive Director of Administration and Central Services, immediately behind me. Mr. Bill Clark, Executive Director of Sports . . . he is not quite here yet . . . yes, he is, he just walked in; sorry about that. I thought he was supposed to be late but then we are starting late. Mr. Louie Jule, Executive Director, Cultural Activities Branch. Mr. Murv Baker, Director of Heritage Museums. Mr. Glen Tuck, Director of Capital Grants. Mr. Roy Ellis, Director of Regional Services and Mr. Ron Borden, Director of the Youth Employment Services.

### **ITEM 1**

**MR. R. BAILEY** (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Chairman, before we get into the Estimates of Culture and Youth, there are a few questions that I should like to direct towards the Minister and his group.

Mr. Minister, this is one of the areas of government that I believe we should have a discussion from you and a few answers this evening. I hope that you will be able to provide those answers. If you can't certainly your officials can.

When we look at this particular Department of Culture and Youth I want to present to you a particular problem that I see across Saskatchewan. I would like you to comment on it. The problem is basically that the Department of Culture and Youth is a branch of the Government which expends funds for the various community activities; that is the service which it provides.

These funds are based on a per-capita basis, as I understand it, and I am sure that you would agree. One of the problems we have in the administration of these funds, Mr. Minister, is that you are dealing in Saskatchewan with some urban centres of considerable size and at the same time you are dealing in the rural areas where you have the sparsity of population. Mr. Minister, is there any way in which your Department has considered or will be considering the graduating of funds whereby the smaller communities will be able to get slightly more per capita in order to facilitate them in the planning of some particular development? I think this is extremely important in this Department. I would like to have the Minister's comments on that.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI**: — First of all, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to comment on that. With regard to the expenditures or allocation of funds through the Department to the communities or community groups,

some are on a per capita basis, some aren't. All of the funding is not on a per capita basis. More directly to the question that the Member asks, certainly I don't argue against the principle, in some cases of providing funding on a staggered kind of basis where the funding may be on the per capita basis escalated as the community gets smaller. I don't argue against the principle. As a matter of fact we do that under the Regional Services Branch where we provide funding for recreation boards which exist in almost all municipalities today; certainly most of the urban and many rural municipalities. Funding is provided on that kind of a basis as a matter of fact; something that we initiated two years ago because of the kind of problems that the Member for Rosetown-Elrose identifies.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Another question I should like to direct to the Minister. A question came out earlier today on the YES program. You had mentioned at that particular time that there was a change, I believe it was two years ago, whereby in order to employ the students under this program, that there were certain criteria which they must be associated with, certain work in regard to being related to culture or recreation and so on.

Mr. Minister, two years ago, three years ago and four years ago, I was in a position whereby I took advantage of the YES program to employ students, people who had just finished Grade 12 and employed them in a very productive program. They were working under the foremanship, you might say of our own crews. This proved to be a very good program. Now you have limited this program whereby local governments, local RMs, school boards, town councils and so on can no longer take advantage of the unemployed youth in their community and employ them in this way.

I question that Mr. Minister. I wonder if the Minister could give the reasoning behind the decision which was made not to extend the YES program in those areas.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — First of all let me point out that the vast majority or the greatest amount of the money is going to local governments. If you look at the reports — when we get to the subvote, I think I will be able to provide you with that information in more detail. The fact is that most of the funding, in fact, goes to local governments. There is \$660,000 budget appropriation for the Youth Employment Service this year. We have to establish a criterion in order that we can accommodate living within that budget or appropriation. I think that is fair and straightforward.

The major basic thinking behind the criterion is that we are trying and I think we should with an employment creation program, create additional work beyond the jobs that would ordinarily be in existence already. That is what it is all about. That is what the program was when it existed in a different form under a different name, even under the former administration. That is the basic principle under which we try to work. Maybe we don't succeed 100 per cent, I am not going to argue against that, but we certainly try to as best we can.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA** (Maple Creek): — I started these questions today as the Minister is probably aware. To me, Mr. Minister, it does not necessarily mean that these jobs are still going to be available to these people within these communities. The argument you are using is indicating that people are going to employ these people anyhow, regardless. This doesn't happen. There are many small communities which don't hire recreation directors during the summer, who don't need people to look after swimming pools during the summer. These are the spots we have in which there is probably a need to employ some of these people, and I speak as the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) has done as well, that there are a good many places and a good many opportunities for more additional jobs and we could supply these if actual funds were available. I feel very strongly that your elimination of these particular programs or putting in that particular regulation, has the effect of actually reducing the total number of jobs that would be available here in Saskatchewan. I would urge you to consider your position on this matter.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — We are not reducing the number of jobs. I think it is clear from all statistics that are available that the level of unemployment in Saskatchewan is at a pretty low level. There are job opportunities available in the private sector as well as there are in the public sector. I don't think we are approaching a sort of crisis kind of situation, that he may be suggesting that we are. The Youth Employment Service program is only one program that exists. It is not the only one to assist communities and organizations in providing employment through subsidization from the public sector. Other programs are the federal job creation programs that have been recently announced. Just like our program they are certainly not perfect but I think communities you talk about in my constituency and they are certainly taking advantage of that program. We provide unconditionally, to local government, funding as operating funds. We don't tell local government how they want to utilize them; they may appropriate some of those funds for special projects that maybe they are able to establish during the summer months. I don't think we can take the Youth Employment Service program in isolation and say that that is the only avenue available. That is not what you are suggesting, I know that. But I wanted to make that point.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA:** — What I was suggesting though is that the amount of money that you have available for these programs, that local governments have available for these programs, is a limited amount and if you are going to spend all that amount of money on two or three people, your funds are going to be exhausted. Under the old program there was a way of spreading the amount of money amongst four or five people instead of the two or three that you have.

Is the Minister suggesting in his comments, which sort of disturbed me, that he doesn't feel that there is going to be any problem with youth this summer finding positions?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I don't think that there is doing to be a major problem. I think as I see it that there is a good level of employment available in the private sector and sure some students may have to look around but I think that certainly in Saskatchewan the

availability of jobs is at a pretty high level.

**MR. R. BAILEY** (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question, and I know it is really an unfair question, but I will come back with another one a little later on.

One of the criticisms that we hear, not just in this province, but which is almost a universal criticism within democratic countries is that as the number of programs continue to grow, the cost of getting the dollar to the benefactor, shall we say, often is equal to the cost of the administration.

Mr. Minister, I want just through this question to point out to you, and I don't expect an answer right now, but perhaps you could have one of your consultants answer. What is the total cost of administration of the Department of Culture and Youth? What actual amount of money goes to it? What is the ration between the actual administration and the amount of money that goes to the benefactor? I will use that word. I just want to ask that question, and I know that it is unfair for you, Mr. Minister, to have an answer.

I want to deal with something else, Mr. Chairman, at this particular time.

In Saskatchewan over the years, and certainly some of your people, I know that are sitting there are well aware of this, in areas where we did not have certain facilities, that is say, in a smaller town where there was no school auditorium, there was support from the Department of Education at one time for it to share the costs of operations and so on, say of a community hall where the high school kids can do down, play volleyball and so on.

In the town where I live there is a big project underway; it was used this winter, and yet we get two conflicting reports. Very disturbing, very disturbing to me as a school superintendent.

First of all the reason a superintendent comes and lays out a formula, is so that, if it is on a school program, the school submits it to the superintendent. The superintendent then submits it as part of the program to the Department of Education and there is a grant coming back. And the figures, I think I can remember what they were, \$1 per hour, per sheet of curling ice providing it was between the hours of 9:00 o'clock a.m. and 3:30 o'clock p.m., and it was \$5 or \$10 per hour for other use, I just can't remember what it was.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Minister, is this. That somehow, I don't say that the members of the Department of Culture and Youth deliberately, I don't think they were trying to undermine school systems or anything else, but somehow this information got out to the various recreational boards and they were told that all you had to do was figure out the total cost of operation and whip it into the department and back comes a cheque. Now it was very disturbing, it was a very difficult thing to handle. As a matter of fact, Mr. Minister, I suggested to one of the finance people with the department that maybe he should call the three departments together and we will have a little in-service training, so we get the same facts and get the same figures going out to the same people so that we know what is going on.

I wonder if the Minister would care to comment about this discrepancy that arose last winter?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — The Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) is the only one who seems to be so concerned about this; maybe there are others but I don't know. Obviously he has misinterpreted something. We send out memos from the Department of Education. I can recall a memorandum to all district superintendents, including yourself sir, which clearly spells out, the policy in education. It clearly spells out the policy under which school boards can lease facilities in the community for the purposes of providing a physical education program for the students in their schools. Clearly stated, there is no question about it; it is there on a nice one pager that everybody can understand, I hope! Therefore, I don't quite grasp the misunderstanding that you are talking about. Maybe in the discussion there may have been misunderstanding, and if there was certainly we would be most happy to correct it.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Minister, this is exactly the point I am trying to get at. We have one set of memos that comes out from the Department of Education, and it states very clearly what the policy is, gives the amount of money and so on, but members of your department obviously did not have that information and they in fact went and told people entirely a different story, and it made it very difficult indeed. And I think, if the Minister is not aware of this then he should have been informed of this, because it did in fact happen.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — As a matter of fact it was brought to my attention. I think a Member brought it to my attention earlier, so in fact I was informed. There is dialogue between the Department of Education and the Department of Culture and Youth, and any information that goes out to regional superintendents that deals with the question of recreation facilities, will also go out to the other department. If there was a misunderstanding, I hope that we have corrected it and if we haven't we certainly will but it would certainly be just a misunderstanding on the part of people involved. I will, at any time, say that the officials in the Department of Culture and Youth are very capable and dedicated people. That is one of the reasons why when we get the answer to your initial question you will find that as it concerns the ration of administration costs to the cost of programs, the grant programs, it is very low, as a matter of fact one of the lowest in the Government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I know that we are just starting off on the Estimates for the first time and I suppose sometimes we forget the proper procedures, but I would like to remind all Hon. Members that if they would please address their remarks to the Chair and not to the Members across the room, please.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I have a question and I am sure that the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) has some questions as well.

The question I have at this time is, how much of your program or how much of your attention is your department giving to the youth among the native people in Saskatchewan?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — In the same way as youth in general. Native people and band councils are eligible for the same grants, the same kind of assistance, the same programs as any community. They are treated as a municipality, so there are those kinds of opportunities that are available to them.

**MR. MacDONALD** (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, I just have a very brief question. Originally when the youth employment program was originated its specific purpose was to create jobs for young people. The Minister has indicated that he is interested in the creation of new jobs. One of the major concerns of the people of Saskatchewan is the expansion of the bureaucracy. The NDP saw fit to restrict the employment of youth in the youth employment program in the summer months to government agencies or local government. Originally it was designed that any free enterpriser, or any business which would be willing to create a new job for a young person seeking employment to provide additional income in the summer months, to go to university, would be considered. I want to ask the Minister if the artificiality of bureaucracy, and the creation of youth employment in the bureaucracy is not a farce in comparison to the creation of youth employment opportunities in the free enterprise system, or in the business community, where the dollar and cent makes a difference of profit and loss? Why has this Government decided that the only young people whom they will employ is within the Government of Saskatchewan and local government and have denied the opportunity for the agricultural industry and business in general to employ young people and receive assistance from the Government?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the purpose of programs such as the youth employment service program is to provide additional employment, and I stand by that. That is what I am all about. In no way should it take away from the opportunities provided by other sectors in the public sector, the Crown Corporations, be it the Department of Highways or any other department. That has always been a source of employment during the summer for students, and it should be, it should continue to be. But let me correct an error that the Member is making and I don't think he means to make it. The youth employment service program provides funding not only for local government and municipalities. Let me read you what is written in the regulations and what is also written in the brochure that has been sent out to every municipality and every school board. If you are a municipality or a local government body, a municipal recreation authority, a band council, a provincial sport, recreational, or cultural organization, a benevolent society or a legally registered or constituted non-profit organization then you are eligible. That certainly extends a great deal beyond what the Member defines and I think, in an unfortunate way, as setting up a large bureaucracy or whatever you want to call it. It does not only apply to municipal governments, it is also available to those other kinds of organizations.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Minister, I am very well aware of what the program covers and maybe I didn't elucidate it very clearly. But the point is, whether you like to realize it or not, that the opportunity to create jobs for young people in Saskatchewan is not restricted to Government, and to private non-profit organizations. In fact, the initiative and

imagination to create jobs and opportunities for young people is very often really directed to the free enterprise system or our businessman who is trying to provide a worthwhile community activity or expand his business. And will you as a Government deny the opportunity to farmers and deny the opportunity to any business man to expand his business or whatever it may be to provide additional employment? What you really did was restrict the opportunity for young people in the province to supplement their income to go to university or post-secondary education. And let's not kid ourselves that when you start adding to the bureaucracy you are piling one on one on one that is already there, and there are many people in this province who do not believe that the only opportunity for bureaucracy or to add job opportunities for young people lies with government. And I ask you the question why did you deny the opportunity to farmers, to businessmen, to other people in this province to dedicate themselves to expanding the opportunity for young people to earn money to go to university or to improve their post-secondary education?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I really have to disagree with the Member, I don't disagree that it is certainly the role of the private sector; I think it should be to provide employment for students. I think they have a responsibility to do that, and I think that they have done a very adequate job in the last several years, because of the economic state of our province. But I don't think that we, through the public tax dollar, need to be, subsidizing Dominion Stores to employ students in the summer. Surely we don't need to do that. The difference in the additional jobs created, were very, very marginal, experience showed that. As for providing the program as it is provided now, it is shown that the additional employment created is fairly substantial to the extent that the program is within the limitation of the program. The thing I want to argue is that, surely no one in this House would suggest that providing, funds to the Plunkett Recreation Board, the Colonsay Recreation Board, to hire a lifeguard or an additional lifeguard to expand the period of time in which the swimming pool is opened, surely that can't be a terrible growth of bureaucracy. I don't think the municipal council or the Recreation Board in Colonsay would think so. And I certainly don't think so.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Briefly, that is where you and I differ. I think it is a heck of a lot better, if you will pardon the expression for Imperial Oil to provide employment and add additional cost to their expenditure to provide employment for young people than you and I as taxpayers to see that young people have jobs when the free enterprise system will do it with no cost to the taxpayer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — That is the difference between you and me. And when you turn around and deny the opportunity to Imperial Oil if you want to call it Imperial Oil, or the hardware store down the street or Simpson-Sears or Eaton's or Hudson's Bay to turn around and provide additional employment for young people



at no additional cost to the taxpayer, and then suggest that the taxpayers, you and I and everybody else in the Province of Saskatchewan should provide out of the tax dollar the opportunity for somebody to mow lawns, or to sit in your office, I disagree and say that that is a very bad policy on behalf of this Government.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, obviously the Member opposite and I don't agree. I am sure he is not speaking on behalf of his caucus, when he says there ought not to be a program, with that kind of rationale. I don't agree. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have some responsibilities to provide some assistance to creating additional employment for our young people during the summer months, our students, so that they can earn some money so that they can do some worthwhile, meaningful work and so that those who wish to can return to their education endeavours. So I guess that is where we differ, Mr. Chairman, on this particular issue. I don't think it is throwing good money after bad, and I don't think it is throwing away the taxpayers' money, if it is money that is used to assist that taxpayer in his community to provide additional, or to expand its service to himself and his neighbours. I don't think that is a waste; I think it is a terrifically good way to go.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to be mealy-mouthed as my partner says here. The only difference I want to tell the Minister that you and I have is who is going to pay the cost? See, I kind of agree that a farmer, who would be willing to hire a young person and put him on his farm in the summer, and add to his opportunity to pay for his university expenses is a heck of a lot better than asking the Department of Culture and Youth, to ask the taxpayers of this province to pay that bill. And the only difference between you and me is who is going to pay the bill, not who is going to provide the job opportunity. There are many private citizens, and many private corporations in this province and this country who have a very great willingness to assist young people in the summer months. In fact, there are many major corporations in this country which have a special youth employment program in the summer over and above their normal requirements. And that particular company has one desire, not only to provide services for the company and the corporation but also to provide an opportunity for young people to earn the opportunity to carry on post-secondary education. And that is the difference between a socialist and the NDP. I believe that those private corporations have the willingness to contribute to post-secondary education of young people in this country as well as Government, and I believe that they have sense of responsibility and are willing to pay that bill instead of having it come out of the taxpayers' pockets. And the Minister of the NDP Government over there has a feeling that the only people who can pay that is the Government. These people will do it and I suggest to you that you could double the employment opportunities for young people in this province in the summer months or triple it, if you gave the opportunity to the private corporations and gave them a little assistance with a heck of a lot less expenditure of public funds in this province.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, I tell you I have never been so pleased since we introduced the rule that these debates in Estimates are to be recorded than I am at this moment. It is clear to

me now, Mr. Chairman; it shows that there is a pretty wide difference between the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party. Surely, surely there is nothing in this world that prevents Exxon from providing employment for students in the summer time. With the kinds of multimillions in profits that Exxon makes, our Government and the New Democratic Party is not prepared to subsidize them. The Member says the Liberal Party is prepared to subsidize Exxon for this kind of purpose, but we're not and I am not in any way hesitant in saying that. We are prepared to help people to provide themselves in their communities with certain services that I think they have a right to have and if we are going to be spending the taxpayers' money it is a good place to spend it.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I just to reply and then I am going to keep quiet. You know when I listen to that googly guk which is all it is . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! I would just like to remind the Members, I don't think I should have to do this, particularly to senior Members of this Government, that they are setting an example here at the start of our Estimates which I think should be looked at very carefully. He asked me to pardon the word, I cannot pardon that word but I will let it go for this time and I would emphasize to all Members to please be careful of their language.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Chairman, I will never use the word googly guk again.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to suggest to the Minister is that that's a bunch of nonsense. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I hope the word 'garbage' is not out of line with you. Simply, the fact is that we are not talking about Exxon. What we are suggesting is that many of the corporations in this country put on a very effort to assist young people in employment opportunities for the summer. All I am suggesting is that at one time I happened to be the Minister in charge of what the Minister is now responsible for and I found that the private sector bent over backwards to assist young people in this country and this province to find employment opportunities. And where they normally might have employed 20 in the summer, with an additional expenditure directed towards the advantage of young people, with an assistance program they said if the Government is willing to venture into that kind of a program for the assistance of young people we will double it or triple it, which they did. So what happens now? We find that the Government says, "Oh, No;" that the taxpayers of this province would bear the entire burden. And I suggest to you that that is a faulty, faulty interpretation of the public interest of the private sector of this country. I am suggesting to you that your particular philosophy that only the Government can hire young people and only people that work for the Government in the private sector of the non-capital associations will reap the benefits of this program, is a bunch of nonsense. I would hope that the Minister would re-examine the figures and go back to 1967 or 1968 when that program was originated and find out exactly the contribution of the private sector and then re-examine the whole program.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, I guess we are going to have to agree to disagree. We are beginning to repeat ourselves because I have basically stated the position of the Government. I don't consider, as I said before, that providing subsidies or grants through the Youth Employment Service Program, to a voluntary organization, a non-profit organization to municipal governments, to school boards as a waste of money. I think it is providing a very essential and a very important and a very significant service to the people who live throughout Saskatchewan. I think that that is a good program and I am prepared to defend it.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA** (Maple Creek): — Mr. Chairman, in the last year before you eliminated employment opportunities in the clerical and the maintenance area, can you give us some idea as to what percentage of the assistance was given? Was it 25 per cent, 20 per cent, 10 per cent that was given to job opportunities in the clerical and maintenance areas?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Can I make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman? We are now getting into details of a subvote. I think maybe it would be more useful or probably more accommodating if those questions were asked when we get to the subvote on the Youth Employment Service Program because then we will have all the information available.

**MR. BAILEY:** — We have been talking here and there has been a dialogue back about employment during the summer months. I want to raise a particular problem to the Minister and I realize that this is not entirely within his department but I think that I would like to have some comment from the Minister of Culture and Youth in regard to this particular problem which I am about to give you.

Mr. Minister, we have the Federal Government coming in looking after young people in what is known as the TOJ, Training on the Job. This cannot take place, if my memory serves me correctly, until that individual is 18 years of age and what happens, Mr. Minister, I am sure you are aware, is that an agreement is reached with a business whether it be a garage or a grocery store or whatever, and the amount of funds in support of the employment of that youth diminishes as the year goes on and they get, you know what the name stands for, training on the job. We have a problem here in Saskatchewan in that occasionally you will find a young person at the age of 16, sometimes he is not quite 16, who has never really had an opportunity to train himself. Most of these students don't have the ability to train themselves in school and yet they want to and they have a great desire to learn a particular skill or a particular trade. Now, Mr. Minister, I know that this overlaps perhaps to other departments but I wish that the Department of Culture and Youth would think about these people, think about employment beyond the summer months in a program which could be on a provincial level by which we could provide employment for these people until they reach say the age of 18 and we can find places at the federal level. You see I happen to be one who believes that a lot of character in this country was built on the end of a thick short handle. I happen to believe that a lot of character was built on tossing some bales around. I happen to believe that a lot of character was built in picking rocks and good hard

work. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that we should take these people and give them these types of jobs, but at the present time, Mr. Minister, occasionally you run across an individual like this who needs, in the worst way, training on the job. The Federal Government won't pick it up until they are 18. I wish the Department of Culture and Youth would give some consideration to these few people to assist these people in making their mark in society and getting their way into this world.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, the post-secondary education programs are in the Department of Continuing Education and I will certainly refer these points that the Member raises to the Minister of Continuing Education, Mr. Faris. You may want to bring that up again during the Estimates of Continuing Education when it is considered in Committee. I want to say one thing about the issue that the Member raises dealing with the question of the student who is in high school who obviously could gain a great deal from, maybe on a part time basis, working in some community business place. That opportunity now exists and I think the Member knows that a school superintendent and a school board, in consultation with a teacher, can provide an exemption for attendance for a student who is in that kind of a situation. There are many such students who are involved throughout Saskatchewan in those kinds of situations. I don't think, as far as I can recall, that there is pay involved because it is still considered to be part of his educational training, he's still going to school. If you are talking about post-secondary education programs we do have a department that focuses in that area; that's the Department of Continuing Education and the Minister in charge of that department could probably give you a great deal more detail on the programs available there now than I can, programs which extend beyond even the Training of the Job Program which, in fact, are solely provincial programs.

**MR. BAILEY:** — I think the Minister has raised the very thing that I wanted to draw to his attention. I am not talking about what is commonly known in the province as the Co-op Work Training Program where the student who is not the academic type gains a great deal of education by mixing work with some basic teaching at the school. I am talking about the student who has reached the age of 16, who can no longer profit by the school system itself, and we have a few of those people. This is an opportunity for your department, along with any other department, to provide assistance to the employer to start these people on a program of working and you can do it in exactly the same way as the Federal Government does on a graduating scale and we could solve a lot of our social problems. Surely the Department of Culture and Youth should be as much concerned with these individuals who want to work and train as just give solely in the field of recreation. I am suggesting to you, Mr. Minister, that you consider this and maybe the Minister of Continuing Education and maybe the Minister of Labour, should consider this. But in the situation we have in this province at the present time many of these students who reach the age of 16 have never worked before, and that's unfortunate. They want to work; they don't want to become parasites; they want to provide some income for themselves and their families and if you are going to spend money I am just saying that this is a very, very good way in which that money can be spent. We do not have a program as such in the province at the time. No program exists and I am suggesting that we should have a program of this type for

such individuals in our society. They are worthy individuals and they deserve our attention.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, these kinds of programs are programs that our Government has placed in the Department of Continuing Education. I am not in a position to discuss those programs, some of which may in fact, to some extent accommodate what you are asking. I think when we get into those Estimates it would be a better time to provide you with the details on them. I am not arguing with the Member. I am just saying that as policy is determined by this Government that kind of work is stationed in the Department of Continuing Education.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA:** — Mr. Chairman, just one more question. I noticed the Minister is reducing his staff from five people to three which is a reduction of about 40 per cent. Maybe we can get back to Item one and ask you what the change in staff is all about.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — It is economizing on the part of the Government. Let me tell you that when I was the Minister in charge of the Department of Culture and Youth and some other departments, my staff was located in the Department of Culture and Youth. My secretary and my executive assistant are not located in the Department of Culture and Youth, and the two positions are one, the Minister's secretary, who is now in the subvote of the Department of Education and the executive assistant whom I don't have at the present time.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA:** — How does the Department of Culture and Youth stand?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I am taking out very essential staff that was necessary to assist me in carrying out my duties simply because that provision is made in another department.

**MR. L. W. BIRKBECK** (Moosomin): — I wonder, could the Minister tell us tonight if those reductions in funds paid out in permanent positions actually reflect the salaries that the permanent positions are being paid? You have a decrease of two, Mr. Minister.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, the 1976-77 base, I think will probably be in the Blues \$79,600. The deletions, total \$27,180. So, therefore, what do we have in the Blues now, if you delete that is your new base of \$52,420. Then there is a provision for salary adjustments because of increments because of the increase in salaries in the last contract and so, therefore, we get a total of \$53,820. But you are asking are the deletions indicative of salaries that are actual salaries? The answer is Yes and I don't know whether there is provision there for other services.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I hope I am going to get my answer to the original question, Mr. Minister. In the Public Accounts as it is related to Culture and Youth, what determines, Mr. Minister, when a grant is made by the Department of Youth and when a grant is made by say the Social Services Branch? I am looking at some of the items here — a grant to a senior citizens

group. I think I would know the answer to that but there are sizeable sums here and I would like an explanation from the Minister?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, one can say there are fairly strict germs of reference or criteria that are applied. In the question you asked specifically that applies to senior citizens. I know this assistance pretty well in all cases is under the Recreation for the Handicapped Program, which was established about two years ago. We provide funding under that program to all kinds of organizations including senior citizens organizations if the project they have in mind, or maybe the piece of equipment they may need, is such that it would provide recreation to handicapped senior citizens in that particular organization under that program.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, one of the projects of the Department of Culture and Youth has been the Mobile Counselling Unites which you now have. I would like to ask the Minister this question, Mr. Chairman. We have a number of similar activities now within the province; we have Canada Manpower; we have Culture and Youth; we have some services coming from the University itself. Would the Minister agree that in some cases there is a certain overlapping of the services that you are attempting to provide which are in conflict with other organizations or other bodies? Would there not be some overlap there, Mr. Minister?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — We try to co-ordinate these activities as much as we can and I would submit that as far as the provincial agencies are concerned, to put it in the words of someone else who outlined it to me, we have put our Act together. There is a co-ordination as far as Canada Manpower is concerned, which is not within our jurisdiction. We try to co-ordinate with them the best we can. Unfortunately from time to time it does not work 100 per cent successfully because we do find there is some duplication at times. We are undertaking a major program project now in the Department of Education along with the Department of Continuing Education to establish a one co-ordinated career guidance counselling program for the province. Naturally all of those existing programs that are now in place such as the Vocational Service thing that you mentioned, is one of the things that can be considered in that package.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I am assuming that the basis upon which a grant is given to an organization is without fear of criticism for anyone within the province, that it is non-racial, non-religious; it is just a grant on that basis.

I am interested in some of the money expended. We have the Chinese Free Nations Athletic Association, and not that I am criticizing the fact that they received a grant of \$1,000, but I was wondering about the origin of this particular grant of \$1,000.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Under what program is it?

**MR. BAILEY:** — Multicultural.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I can assure the House that whatever the program was for there are so many of them that we provide funding for there is no way that I can tell you precisely what it is for. But they had to meet the outline, the regulations which are clearly spelled out in the Gazette, passed by Order in Council. The organization, before it could qualify would have to meet those requirements. Specifically what it was for I can't tell you offhand, but maybe we can find it in the process of this evening.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — On page F.71, 72, and 73 of the 1976 year end, I notice there is a large amount of \$140,132. Are these all accounted for in this year's Budget? I believe these are the grants for power, for hockey rinks and so forth. And where have you got them in the Estimates this year?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — They are under Regional Services subvote.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I am wondering. Am I going to get my answer to that long, long question?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — We want to make sure it is correct and accurate.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Well, within a few cents. Yes, I would like to have that please because I think that it will not only do your department a lot of good, but I think it will dispel a lot of fear which you happen to have.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — To give you a real precise answer is going to take a lot of calculating so I don't think that even working for the next two hours would enable us to figure that out. Mr. Chairman, 67.7 per cent of the Budget is in direct grants. That is not the true figure in trying to answer your question because much of the other funding that is identified here is provided in consultant services through our regional staff, consultant services that we provide to things like the Saskatchewan Games, Regional Games, and so therefore, 67.7 per cent in grants alone does not give you the accurate ratio of the cost of administration of those grants, because there are many other services provided as well to recreational boards and to organizations in the province which obviously have a value but which cost nothing from the point of view of the organization for which, for the municipality which receives that service.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Just one more question. The reason that I asked that question is because I think the Minister realizes that sometimes in a department like the Department of Culture and Youth we find some criticism which is generally unjustified criticism about the high cost of administration. But even so, Mr. Minister, with 67.7 per cent in direct grants and let's say that you throw in another 10 per cent for consultant fees, you would still have in the neighbourhood of 25 per cent of cost of your particular department in administration alone. Would the Minister not agree that that is a fair ratio, one to four? Is that not a fairly high ratio in the expenditure of government funds?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — No, I can't necessarily agree. The Member is not counting, for example, that there will be some advertising; which the department does a great deal of, the preparation of brochures and information and guides and so on. So I am not prepared to say that it is four to one because I don't have the figures that tell me that precisely. Like I said, it would take some considerable time to work that out.

**MR. BAILEY:** — I want to invite the Minister after the House closes tonight, to become a member of a particular club, which has absolutely no administration costs whatsoever. All the work is done on a voluntary basis and all the funds which are collected go overseas to needy individuals and I will show it to the Minister later. Perhaps he would like to become a member of that club?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I will be interested in knowing what the organization is. To give you an indication of how quick . . . the Member asked about the Chinese Free Nations Athletic Society and my staff have found the answer and I wanted to tell the Member that it was a grant which was a contribution to workshops dealing with folk dancing.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 and 3 agreed.

#### **ITEM 4**

**MR. W. H. STODALKA:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister indicated earlier that this was the section under which amounts of money are paid for electricity rates in curling rinks, skating rinks and the likes, these types of grants. Because of the increased price of power are you considering revising some of the rates that are paid for these facilities?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — No, we are making any changes in the formula as it is applied now.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA:** — Would the Minister care to indicate why not? With these tremendous rates and particular the increase of power rates for artificial ice plants, it would seem to me to be advisable at this time to review existing rates.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That is not the only funding that is available to municipalities which they can provide or take and utilize towards those kinds of expenses. We are living within our Budget and to live within the Budget we have decided that we are going to stay the same on that particular item. In favour of providing funds for other purposes such as the Recreational Facilities Grant Program, the program funding that is available to recreation boards becomes much more unconditional than it used to be. I think there is some opportunity for utilizing some of these funds, but it is something that the recreation board and their municipal council will have to talk about. I don't argue that power rates, gas rates have gone up. I know it as



well as anybody else does, but that is the appropriate we are able to provide this year.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Could you explain to me why the approximately \$100,000 additional cost with the same number of employees?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — You are speaking of the salary component, are you, because in that is worked in the adjustments that have been made for salary increases and so on and once again I will go through what I did previously on another item.

In 1976-77 the base was \$302,650. There were salary adjustments of \$69,980 because of increases and increments so that we are working from a new base of \$372,630. Then there is provision made for anticipated increases in salaries because of negotiations which will provide anticipated increases and that is an additional \$29,810 and comes down to \$402,000 and there is your \$100,000.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Are you suggesting that increments are up 20 per cent? They move up approximately 20 per cent with an increment?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I am sorry. There is one thing that I failed to mention in this particular item. There were adjustments made for some of the personnel because of their new qualifications. They achieved master degrees so therefore there was significant change in their salaries. The increments were 5 per cent and then there were 18 per cent increases that related to those things that I talked about plus the increases in the salaries because of negotiations.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — What you are saying then is that a 5 per cent increase plus better qualifications moved them to a different scale?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, those points plus the facts that there were two members who had been regional coordinators for quite a number of years, who had been appointed by an Order in Council and they went into the regular service and there was some back pay involved with that and that is also included in that amount of money.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Basically you evaluate a lot of jobs and therefore the increase is due in some of them because of qualifications or because of the length in the department?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — There are salary ranges. There is one salary range if you have a bachelor's degree and there is another salary range if you have a master's degree. That is part of this package. There was change because of that.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Could you by chance at a later date send me a copy of how one employee has changed through different qualifications?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I will get the staff to find it.

Item 4 agreed.

Item 5 agreed.

## **ITEM 6**

**MR. BAILEY:** — We have here an increase in the expenditure of \$10,000 for the same number of people involved. Do you anticipate an increase in the amount of activity in the Youth Vocational Service, or does this take this amount for salary only?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I am not sure whether I have the complete question the Member asked, but I will try this answer, then he can re-ask the part I don't answer.

There was a reclassification of a driver position to a professional position which changed the salary level by about \$4,000 and that is one of the major significant changes beyond the regular increase because of a negotiated settlement and because of the increment costs.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, that only partly answers my question. Do you anticipate with this \$100,000 plus increase in this particular category, an increase in the counselling services?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, we anticipate an improvement in the service because it is used to work in such a way that there was one driver plus one professional and we have changed that now so that there are two professionals in one unit driving their own van.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me, and I am sure he has these figures really available, how many people avail themselves of the counselling services last year?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — We don't have the 1976-77 completely compiled but I think I can give you a more accurate indication by giving you 1975-76 figures and some explanation.

In the 1975-76 period the Mobile Counselling Unit travelled to 71 rural communities and saw 8,438 high school students who utilized the service. Because of the change of format in the service, I am told that that 8,000 will have increased quite significantly in 1976-77.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, the Minister has given us a figure here. It travelled to X number of communities and the figure I have is that they provided counselling services to 8,430 students, am I correct with that figures?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — 1975-76.

**MR. BAILEY:** — You provided counselling services to 8,430 students. What I am attempting to do, Mr. Minister, I might as well tell

you in advance. I am attempting to take the total cost under this particular section, under Youth Vocational Services and see how much money was spent per student for counselling services. I want to have something to say at that particular time. If the figure is correct, 8,430 students in that period of time, and you have an expenditure there of, for 1976-77 of \$45,540, I think we have to draw some conclusions from those figures, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I am informed that with the change in the program in the last fiscal year, that the figure or number of students who utilized the service probably is between 12,000 and 13,000. Is that what you asked in your last answer?

**MR. BAILEY:** — Between 12,000 and 13,000, Mr. Chairman, I have to come back to this question, because I was involved myself very personally with the very first of the projects in the extension from the University in this type of thing. I want to suggest to the Minister, that perhaps we should have a brief explanation as to the type of counselling service that is available, the type of counselling service that is provided. I would like to have an explanation before I move on out of Item number 6.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — This is provided, I think it is worth making clear, in rural Saskatchewan only, that's rural small town Saskatchewan, the information that is provided, pertains to educational and career guidance, existing employment opportunities, job content, skill requirements, job finding techniques, training opportunities and available financial assistance, in a nutshell.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Would the Minister not agree that in Item number 6 you are dealing with somewhere between 12,000 and 13,000 students and as he has mentioned, with an estimated expenditure for this year of some \$55,000. The type of service that is being provided would have to be more than just one student at a time. If you take that figure, Mr. Minister, and if you take the time it takes to travel, and say that you are to give them in a eight hour day, you would give each of these students ten minutes, you couldn't possibly see that number of students ten minutes, you couldn't possibly see that number of students. This must have been group guidance.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — If I may answer the question, Mr. Chairman, there are mixes of approaches which are taken. In some cases it is individual, some cases they are in groups of students. Let me point out that the demand from communities is greater than we are able to meet under the program. We are going to be doing considerably more in 1977-78 than we did in previous years, because it is projected that the van and the people with it will be in 140 communities, and will probably provide services to up and above 16,000 students.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Final question, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am not criticizing the service that they are bringing to rural Saskatchewan. I think the Minister can readily understand that rural Saskatchewan does not have some of the facilities which are to be found in the larger urban centre. That's the question I want to leave with the Minister, what vocational services will you provide or have you provided that is not

provided at any high school that has, in fact, a full time guidance counsellor at the school? What service do you provide?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I have already outlined the kind of information that is provided. I think the Member will agree that in most rural schools, there are no guidance counsellors. The Member should also know that in many cases if not in most cases, correct me if I am wrong, the van and the service comes to a school on the invitation of guidance counsellors in places where there are some. I think that that speaks well for the service. We try to fill a gap, and I think commendably well in rural Saskatchewan where there is, I admit, a lack of the kind of guidance counselling services that we probably need to have.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — You said earlier that the driver was reclassified and it came to \$31,000 for the two gentlemen. Then you increased the wages by approximately \$6,000. For two people, that is a very large percentage. I don't know what percentage that is, but it is an awful large one.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, \$6,930 of the increase is due to salary adjustments. Included in that salary adjustment is the reclassification which I mentioned earlier, which included the reclassification of the driver position to the professional position. There is also a provision of \$2,750 increase in anticipation of increased salaries because of contracts which are not yet negotiated.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — You are telling me that the \$4,000 that you gave, plus another \$2,009 are the adjustments for a higher rating, better qualifications? Then above that the additional amount left over.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Let me start right from the beginning. The 1976-77 base which is in the blues is \$27,440. Salary adjustments, \$6,930, about \$1,372 of that is because of reclassification, therefore leaving you \$4,490 for adjustments. There is another 4 per cent that is part of that, \$1,070 is for increments. Then there is the \$2,750 which I mentioned a little earlier, which is provision for anticipated increases. That will add up.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, in the previous year that you have that wide jump also, approximately 25 per cent the previous year, when you are moving from 1975-76 budget to your 1976-77, are you making big adjustments for two years in a row?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That initial base of \$27,440 was established September, 1975. There have been adjustments in October, 1975. There were further adjustments in October, 1976, so it is covering a two-period of time. It is true that the total percentage works out to about 25 per cent, but that's why.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — That means you have a 45 per cent increase, 20 and 25?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — No.

Item 6 agreed.

## ITEM 7

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Chairman, I've been trying to get up for a long time, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister tell me if the blue movies now being shown at some of the local hotels comes under the jurisdiction of the film classification division of the Department of Youth and Culture?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I have never seen any of those movies, Mr. Chairman, that are alleged to be shown in our hotels, and that are blue. Putting the humour aside, can you be more specific? I am not sure that I know precisely what you are talking about?

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Chairman, to be perfectly specific to the Minister, there are some local hotels that are now showing what is normally classified as a blue movie. I want to know if the film classification of the Department of Culture and Youth has the responsibility of supervision of those particular closed circuit movies in the Province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — the answer is, No, we are not responsible for situations where there is private hotel closed circuit. There are not licensed under the Film Classification Board under the legislation.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Is the Minister trying to tell me that, or could he tell me what branch of Government has the responsibility for supervising the quality of movies on closed circuit television with a hotel?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I can answer the question in the way the Member would like. It is not covered under the Film Classification Board. It may be covered, and I am not positive on that. We may have to verify it with some consultation with lawyers but it may very well be covered under the Criminal Code which is really the legislation under which obscene movies, or exhibitors of such movies in theatres are prosecuted. I can't say that that's absolutely the way it is. I just say that that's a possibility.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Is the Minister trying to tell me that a local hotel, or any hotel in the Province of Saskatchewan can show all the sin and sex it wants that may be interesting to many people? Let's be factual. Is the Minister suggesting that all the sin and sex that a local hotel wants to show on a closed circuit television circuit within that hotel boundaries, is under no jurisdiction by the Government of Saskatchewan, no jurisdiction by the Film Classification Board, of the Department of Culture and Youth, and if there is carte blanche or whatever the word is, for that hotel to show whatever it wants. I want to suggest to the Minister that all of a sudden a lot of "blue movies" are creeping into Saskatchewan and into a lot of Saskatchewan hotels. I have seen them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — And enjoyed them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Minister, I am not right now going to describe what went on. But I would like to tell you . . . what I am really trying to say that despite all the humour and despite everything else, I just don't think that the Province of Saskatchewan should close its eyes and that particularly departments of government who have the responsibility of supervising or are responsible for film classification in this province, should close their eyes to close circuit television in hotels, simply because of the fact, I really meant this, that other provinces have become very concerned about this and set up regulations and legislation to prevent it. All of a sudden we find in Saskatchewan that no one has the jurisdiction and no one has the responsibility, Mr. Minister. I think that is a very serious thing. I would like to ask the Minister, does he intend to do anything about it?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, quite frankly this is the first time that this has been brought to my attention. The provisions in the Film Classification Board legislation, Mr. Chairman, provide for the licensing and provide for the classification and all the other provisions under that legislation that deal with public buildings, public halls, public theatres and those kinds of facilities. Hotels are obviously private establishments and so, therefore, that particular legislation does not apply. But as I indicated in a previous answer that I gave to the Member, it is my understanding and I think that that would be the case but I would have to check with the Attorney General's people, that that would come under the obscenity provisions of the Criminal Code.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Minister, I hop that that is not the answer that the Government is going to hide behind. I am not trying to be sanctimonious, I am not trying to be over critical . . . despite the comments . . . I am being very factual and let's not hide behind the Criminal Code because the Criminal Code has jurisdiction over the Dominion of Canada and blue movies are show in many, many provinces in Canada and are not normally classified under the Criminal Code. I think it is the responsibility of the Department of Culture and Youth. If they are going to be responsible for film classification in this province they should take an interest in what goes on outside of public houses as the Minister indicates, which is the public theatre. I suggest to him he had better look into and something better be done or the first thing we know we are going to have a wide-open opportunity for anyone to see any kind of a movie regardless of its filth, regardless of the depth of degradation that it wants to go if the Government of Saskatchewan isn't willing to accept some kind of jurisdiction over it. I say this in all honesty. If you don't do something and if somebody doesn't assume responsibility for it we are going to have blue movies in every local hotel and every closed television circuit in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think the Government should take some responsibility in that regard.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. chairman, I would not want it to be thought that we are not interested . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — . . . take it in the way that it is really meant. I want to make that clear because of what the Member is saying. We are certainly interested if that is the situation that exists. We are interested to following it up. I would like to talk to the Member afterwards, because this is the first time that this matter has been brought to the attention of my officials; it is the first time it has ever been brought to me. I have yet to receive a letter or telephone call or any other communication from the public on it. I appreciate the Member for whatever his reasons are for bringing it forward. He says he is sincere about it and I believe him.

Another thing I would like to know and he doesn't have to give it now. I will talk to him after these Estimates are completed or after 10:00 o'clock whichever comes first, which other provinces are in fact doing something about it. We have no knowledge of any action being taken in any other provinces in Canada.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Minister, in all honesty I can't tell you what any regulations or legislation are in other provinces. I can tell you that it was wide open in the Province of Alberta and now it is being restricted and I don't know how. I will try and find that out for the Minister and he may be able to enlighten some of his officials, or some of his officials may be able to. I can give him the name of a couple of hotels that are showing blue movies, on closed circuit television, I am not intending to point the finger at any one hotel, because if there are no regulations and no supervision and no requirements within the Province of Saskatchewan to prohibit it, I don't blame the particular hotel, I blame the Government of Saskatchewan or the Film Classification Board. All I am saying to you is this is a brand new problem; perhaps somebody should look at it, but I would be glad to discuss it with the Minister at the conclusion of this particular Estimate.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That is perfectly O.K. with me, Mr. Chairman, except I have to say that I don't accept the argument of putting the blame on the Government of Saskatchewan. The Government of Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman acts when we are knowledgeable of a situation. We are now knowledgeable of the situation as the Member has outlined it and we are prepared to consider what we might need to be doing. I don't argue with the concerns of the Member. I happen to share those concerns. But to make the allegation that somehow the Government of Saskatchewan is responsible because some hotel, whether it is in Regina or where, has been showing those kinds of movies, is not quite short of being nonsensical.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Just one further comment, Mr. Chairman. To suggest you don't do anything about the law until the man is lying dead on the floor is ridiculous. The job of the Government is to provide the regulations and the rules to prohibit abuse. That is your job and that is your responsibility. And to suggest that until after the offence, or the sin and the sex is committed that that is when your first responsibility is, is nonsense and the Minister knows it.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Is it your duty to classify films like the Daisy Chain and The Stewardess that came into Saskatoon against which charges were laid?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — All films as I outlined which are shown in public places are classified by the Film Classification Board and there are some films that come through and are viewed and are considered. Either the film in total or in part are viewed and are considered. Either the film in total or in part will contravene the obscenity provisions in the Criminal Code. Then the distributor and the potential user will be so informed that if in fact that is the case, they are subject to being picked up by the police and are subject to prosecution.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Are you suggesting then for example, let's use Daisy Chain when it arrived in Saskatoon at the Cinema Twins and charges were laid, that film was seen before and classified? Why were the sections that were obscene allowed to be shown?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, the film was viewed, and yes, it was classified "special X". It was so noted to the people concerned with it, because in the view of the people who are involved in prosecution it was considered to be a contravention of the obscenity section. It was picked up.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — What you are saying is that you approved that film to be shown as "special X", knowing that these scenes were in it and allowed the people to be charged as is what happened.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — No, not at all, Mr. Chairman. We don't approve films, we classify films. We inform the public about the films as to whether there is violence and whether there is bad language, you name it. There is a classification. Then the distributor is left on his own after that classification to some extent to show the film. But if the film contravenes the laws of this country, in our judgement or in the judgement of the people who prosecute or lay charges, then that is in fact what happens.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Let me get this straight. You are saying you classify the film, even though you know there are certain sections against the law, you allow them to be shown without a written warning to the theatre saying that we think these sections are against the law of the land, and then they are charged for showing it. Do you make recommendations to take certain parts out of the film?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — When the film comes in, when the film is viewed obviously there is some judgement that has to be made. If it is clear in the mind of the people on the classification board that the film contravenes the Criminal Code, the film is sent back to the distributor and it is so stated to the distributor that in the opinion and the judgement of the Film Classification Board, that film will be illegal as far as the law is concerned.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — What you are now saying is and I am using the film again as I said the Daisy Chain film which was prosecuted in



Saskatoon, that your people viewed it. You did not instruct the Cinema Twins that that film may controvert the law and therefore they may be charged or you could have sent it back to the distributor and say, we don't think that film can be shown in Saskatchewan because of the law, because it is obscene. You have left me wondering . . . there is a section of the film that they said was obscene and should have been removed. Yet your department didn't tell this to the theatre people and the theatre people felt since your people allowed them to show it without any recommendation as to removing scenes why should they have been charged when you have approved the film?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — From the comments of the Member for Indian Head I think there are certain members of the public who would like more approvals of this kind.

It is a matter of judgement. The Film Classification Board will view a film and in particular, this film you talk about obviously was viewed and in their judgement they felt that it was not contravening the obscenity section. It is a judgement call they had to make. So therefore because of it being fairly . . . I don't know the right words, but exaggerated or whatever, that is as good a word as any I guess, because of that, it was classified as "special X" which is out of the extreme classification, a very strong restriction as to who can go to see this film on age and so on.

In the judgement of some members of the public who laid the charge, they decided that it did contravene the obscenity section of the Criminal Code, as they can do and should be able to do, and therefore the charge was laid. It is strictly a question of judgement.

**HON. E. L. COWLEY** (Provincial Secretary): — I have listened, with interest, Mr. Chairman to the comments that have been crossing the floor from one side to the other. Of course in the interests of being a good public citizen certainly which side of the floor they come from is not relevant. I listened to the Hon. Minister there, the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) saying that the Film Classification Board did an excellent job in trying to discern whether or not these films sort of crossed the lines of what was discerned by the public to be in the interests of the public to be shown. I have been interested that the Government side of the House has tried to categorize the films, some of the Government side of the House saying and the Minister for Humboldt and I congratulate him on this, saying that these films were very border line and he categorized them as category X and the Attorney General's Department thought they were on the other side of the border and I think they perhaps rightly said that these people should be charged. I am wondering if the Member could answer this question, the Minister in charge of the Department of Culture and Youth and these agencies whether or not any of the Conservative Members who have obviously seen all of these films several times complained to the Minister in charge of the Department of Culture and Youth?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, that is very good question. As a matter of fact, No, not one single Conservative Member, including the Leader has ever raised this question to me or the Film Classification Board. I don't know when the film was picked up.

It must have been some time ago. But it has taken a long time for the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) to become concerned about it, obviously.

**MR. COWLEY:** — I wonder, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is the appropriate time or not or whether I should place a question on the Order Paper, but, whether or not the Minister could inform me now, and if he can't I will certainly place a question on the Order Paper, as to how many times each of the Conservative Members saw the film in question that was raised by the Member for Rosthern.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — The Member may consider putting that question on the Order Paper. I wouldn't want to interfere with the individual rights of the Conservative Members or others and I am not sure whether I have access to that kind of information.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, there is a question . . . not any accusations about the Conservative Members, as an individual I am extremely interested in some of the questions that have been raised. I am certainly no expert on movies whatsoever. I don't mind admitting it. I believe it is six years ago I was last in a theatre. However, I would like to ask the Minister this question because, while we may be standing here in the Assembly and having some good humour about the various types of film, I want to say this to the Minister, that a large section of Saskatchewan society is extremely concerned about the film classifications and the type of films which are shown. I wonder if the Minister could provide me with some not absolute cold, hard statistics but, in this film classification what is now the ratio between films that are coming in and labelled, classified as "general" compared with those that are classified "special X"?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — We are just checking the annual report and other information we have. We don't have that with us. If you want I can provide it for you later. But it's easy for us to put it together. We just go down the list and we'll add them up. We don't have it right here.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd be very pleased, at the convenience of the Minister, to get that information because I am concerned. I might be surprised when the Minister supplies the information but from what little I see on the television, it would appear to me that the vast majority of films being shown are, at least a warning part to the film. I'm wondering if this is the demand of the theatre as such, are these the only films that are being shown? We see very, very few films advertised categorized as "general".

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I can't tell you that because we don't have the information here, but I'll give you something which may be of interest to you. There were nine films between January 5, 1976 and January 17, 1977 that were considered in the category which I indicated earlier that were sent back to the distributor because it was considered that they would contravene the Criminal Code.

**MR. S. J. CAMERON** (Regina South): — Mr. Chairman, I'm asking the question on behalf of my colleague the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley), who didn't want to ask the question himself, but the Member for Biggar would like to know of the Minister, where in his office does he store those portions of the films that they cut out before the showing is permitted?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI**: — We don't cut out, but I'm sure we can arrange a showing for interested Members in the basement of the Court House.

**MR. CAMERON**: — You'll want to tell the Member for Biggar that, Mr. Minister, because he was the one who wanted that question asked.

**MR. BAILEY**: — Mr. Chairman, I don't object to the humour back and forth, I'm speaking as an individual now. I do consider this film classification as a responsibility of the Department of Culture and Youth, a very serious thing and I think that what we are talking about here is a bit in contradiction to a motion which is now on the papers, where we are attempting to . . . Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) to exercise a little bit of discretion. I am trying to get a question across and I'm very serious.

**MR. CHAIRMAN**: — Order! I'll ask the Members to please take a . . . we'll give them an opportunity to rise and speak as the occasion arises, but the Member for . . . Order! You can have that chance again. Acknowledge the Member for Rosetown-Elrose.

**MR. BAILEY**: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question, Mr. Minister, I'm trying to pose to you at this time is that we have a resolution coming up on the Order Paper, condemning the amount of violence and what have you on our various television programs. I believe it came down today. Is it not a bit of a contradiction when we, in fact, have, and I'm saying this just on the basis of advertising alone, when, in fact, we are having shown in the theatres within the province, the majority of films which do contain a great deal of violence and obscenity and a number of them have these special ratings. Would the Minister not consider that a contradiction? Both are forms of entertainment, television movies, and yet on one hand we, in this Assembly, are being asked to condemn the violence and what have you on television and on the other hand, we are allowing greater violence, greater obscenity to be shown in the theatres across Saskatchewan.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI**: — I think no, Mr. Chairman. Television is in everyone's home. Television is regulated by the CRTC. It's certainly not a provincial responsibility, although I think we can share some concerns. But television is in everyone's home. The time that certain movies are shown will determine whether children are around the television set and I know that it's the responsibility of parents to determine whether the children watch that, but the fact of the matter is, there are certain

kinds of pressures on parents because of the television and because of community and because of associations and peers and so on, that make it very difficult.

Movies shown in theatres on the other hand, are shown in public places, where people have to pay their way. We try and I think, do an excellent job through the Film Classification Board, to inform people what the content of those movies are. That's why we have the classification system. It's not a censorship system. I don't think I could be, or someone who is chairman of the Film Classification Board, is in a position to make a judgement on behalf of everybody that he can or cannot see. I don't agree with some of that stuff. I wouldn't walk across the street to see some of the movies that are showing, simply because maybe they are bad productions or because they are junk. But we clearly inform the public what the content of that movie is, so that the public can decide, whether it wants to see it or not.

**MR. BAILEY:** — I'm not criticizing, Mr. Minister; I'm not criticizing the Film Classification Board. I drew to you attention that we are going to be asking, in the next few days, to debate this resolution about the violence and so on on television. I think that there is a relationship, however; the Minister doesn't quite see it that way.

I'd like to point out something within our society concerning films and so on. Would the Minister not agree that ten years ago, a number of films which were allowed to be shown in Saskatchewan under the various classifications of the Film Classification given at the present time, that ten years ago, that we, and I mean we, when I'm talking about the Government, would have rejected those films and they would to have been allowed in the province?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — There's an element that involves the obscenity provisions in the Criminal Code that's there and it doesn't change over time, much. But there's also the other element of the Board having to judge and having to decide what the attitude of society is and that certainly changes over time. Ten years ago, maybe the attitude of society was, not maybe, it likely was different from what it is today. The Board has, in its judgement, to try to keep that in mind in making the decision that it makes in the classifications.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Chairman, a serious question to the Minister. I'm wondering whether he has the power to not only classify films in a broad sense, but classify them as to the theatres in which they are shown? I ask the question because in my constituency we have a drive-in movie theatre the screen of which is, I suppose, visible to 15 to 20 per cent of the constituency and which is in the habit of showing series upon series of "X" rated films in the summer months. Those films are not only visible to the people that are patronizing the particular outlet, but they are available visibly to many other people, including children in the area. I'm wondering if you have authority, therefore, to classify as to the theatre in which they are shown and if you do, why you are permitting category "X" films to be showing in drive-in theatres in those circumstances?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I don't think that there is provision to do that now. It's unfortunate that the screen is so visible to the constituents the Member talks about. We have a regulation that prevents the screen from pointing towards the highway for obvious reasons and I suppose that's one of the reasons why when the housing developments took place after the theatre was there that this takes place. To the best of my knowledge, I don't think there is provision to say you can show it in one place and not in another, vis-à-vis closed in houses and drive-in theatres. Milton Parker who is the chairman of the Board happens to be in Saskatoon tonight and has not been here. He'd be able to provide me with the information specifically and I'd better be able to answer the question. But I don't think that we can at the present time, under the present legislation, make that kind of a differentiation.

**MR. CAMERON:** — May I say to you and I say it again in a serious way, that the fact of the matter is, that that particular drive-in theatre is so located that what is shown there is readily seen by people living in the area, including children and people under the age of 18 years. If you don't now have the authority, may I please ask you and your department to direct your attention seriously, to looking at this question. Firstly, see whether you do have the authority and if you do to try and put a stop to it. Secondly, if you don't seriously consider bringing before us, by way of legislation, if necessary, but by way of regulation if possible, some means to prevent drive-in theatres from showing these types of films in the circumstances which I mentioned.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, I can assure the Member because once again it's just been brought to our attention and we'd be most happy to follow up on the concern that he has and do what we can to get things clarified, and to solve the problem that he talks about which I happen to agree with.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — On your personal services again, we see a \$13,000 increase for the same number of employees, five in both cases; previously you've set a five per cent increase for increment, plus a basically ten per cent for wages which makes \$9,000. Again you have a \$4,000. Before you had \$2,000. You've had figures all through your permanent position, that have not balanced no matter what explanation you've given. You've got \$4,000 here, you had two in another one. Could you try and explain them once again.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, I could try. Mr. Chairman, once again let me go through it from the base.

In 1976-77 the base was \$60,280. There is a salary adjustment included which is added to that of \$7,330, which includes ten per cent of \$6,160 increases, two per cent, \$1,170 in increments for the total of \$7,330. There is also a provision of \$5,410 for, I guess the contingency subject to negotiations that will be, that are taking place. That accounts for all of the money that you are talking about. It changes it from \$60,280 to \$73,020.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — You are saying there are two increases built into this, not one, plus an increment, is that what you're saying then.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Why didn't you explain that three positions ago?

**MR. BAILEY:** — I'd like to ask a question of the Minister. After a film comes in and is reviewed by the Film Classification Board, does the department have or place a restriction on that particular film as to what portions of that film may be shown on the television in lieu of advertising?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — No, because we have no jurisdiction provincially over the television. The CRTC is a federal jurisdiction and we cannot in any way control that.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, the reason that I asked the question, again I come back to this area of contradiction, is that, at any time during the day and I think the Minister will agree, that portions of a film will be shown on the television, where it's playing and so on and so forth, which obviously is not in good taste for the audience at that particular time. As "X" rated film, a portion of that film, may well be advertised, just as soon as those students are home from school. You have no restriction on time in which the portion of the film will be shown in the way of advertising on television?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — We have no jurisdiction over television. The Member knows that. Television is regulated by the Canadian Radio and Television Commission which is federal and we don't control it.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:48 o'clock p.m.