

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**41st Day**

**Tuesday, April 19, 1977.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to welcome from Sutherland School in Saskatoon, a group of 27 Grade Eight students, accompanied by Mr. Hill and Mrs. MacMillan, to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly. I hope that they have a very informative stay in the House and that they have a pleasant journey back home. I would ask all the Members to help me welcome them.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. N. VICKAR (Melfort):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Legislature, 58 Grade Five and Six students from the Brunswick School at Melfort. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Biggdon and Mrs. Gilmore and their chaperones, Mrs. Koraluk and Mrs. Ross. The bus driver, Lyle Cox happens to be in the group as well. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome them here this afternoon and I hope they enjoy their stay in the city this morning and I hope that their tour in the Legislature, as well as the education derived, will be fruitful. I wish them a safe journey home and I'll be meeting them around the well about 2:30 this afternoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Education, the Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski, a group of Grade Twelve students from the Ursuline Academy from Bruno, Saskatchewan. They are accompanied by their teacher, Sister Julianna Weber and Sister Delores Moorman, Sister Ria Kaal, and Mr. Dennis Cohlman. They are in the Speaker's Gallery. I am sure it is the wish of all Members that I extend to them a welcome to this Assembly. May their visit be both educational and pleasant and may they have a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM BOARD**

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Attorney General? Are you aware of receiving any correspondence from the Moose Jaw Branch of the Western Development Museum Board, with regard to the situation in Saskatoon?

April 19, 1977.

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — No, I haven't received any correspondence.

**MR. PENNER:** — Is the Attorney General, if I may ask a supplement, aware of any correspondence from the city of Saskatoon with regard to the same matter?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that I have received any correspondence from the city of Saskatoon, but it's possible. Of course, I can't speak for all the Ministers of the Government. I just don't think that there is anything that has yet arrived or has arrived on my desk in this regard.

**MR. PENNER:** — Final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Attorney General is aware that at the time Mr. Wilson was dismissed as chairman of the board or director of the Western Development Museum in Saskatoon, that the Western Development Museum Board was illegally constituted, having had at that time 12 members, when the maximum allowed by Section 3 of the Act is 11? Would the Attorney General not, therefore, agree that the actions of the board at that particular time were illegal and secondly, that Mr. Wilson should immediately be reinstated as a result of that?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with that. I have no legal information, no legal opinion to that effect one way or the other, so therefore, for the second question, it naturally follows that I cannot agree to the suggestion that he be reinstated. May I say in passing, that this is a matter between the Western Development Museum Board, Mr. Wilson and the local Saskatoon people. I really think that the Opposition is not playing fair with Mr. Wilson or the people of Saskatoon by trying to politicize the matter.

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — A further question to the Attorney General in the absence of the Minister responsible, with respect to the Western Development Museum. Is it not a fact, I ask the Minister, that the Western Development Museum is directly responsible to the Minister under the terms of this legislation?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the legislation. The Western Development Museum, I suppose, reports to the Minister and the Minister reports, therefore, to the Legislature in that mechanism. The question of being directly responsible may, or may not, be in the legislation. I don't have the legislation in front of me, but I think that is a question of words. I view the Western Development Museum Board to operate with the same degree of independence and autonomy as most agencies and Crown corporation boards and commissions of the Government. The Minister takes the position that he reports to the Legislature with respect to the actions of the board.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I will take the next question.

### **“G” ON GOVERNMENT OWNED VEHICLES**

**MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of SGIO with respect to motor licensing in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Until now the Government vehicles in Saskatchewan have borne the prefix “G” to designate that they are government owned vehicles. Under the new system will there be one prefix designated to government owned vehicles or will there be a variety of prefixes?

**HON. N. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):** — Perhaps, as Minister of Government Services, I must answer. The answer to your question is, No, there won’t be one prefix designated for government vehicles.

**MR. LANE:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I take it then that there will be a variety of prefixes. If this is so, does it have anything to do with embarrassment by the Government because of a number of different government vehicles travelling on the roadways in the Province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The next question.

### **SASKATCHEWAN TRADING CORPORATION**

**Mr. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry.

This morning in Crown corporations, we were only able to cover the year under review and the Saskatchewan Trading Corporation was brought up. Last year they had approximately \$303,000 in sales in helping to move cattle overseas and \$180,000 loss. Could I ask the Minister: is the Government going to change this now and absorb it into other departments of the various parts of the Government under Industry or Agriculture, because as one of the Members mentioned this morning, we can’t afford any more sales?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, I will take the next question.

### **REVENUE OF LIQUOR BOARD**

**MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board.

Will the Minister give this Assembly some indication of what the expected revenue will be, because of the price increase in the liquor, to the Liquor Board and can he also give us some assurance that some of this additional revenue will be used in alcohol preventative programs?

**HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Saskatchewan Liquor Board):** — Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to put an accurate estimate on what the additional revenues will be from past,

April 19, 1977.

recently approved or any future price increases from liquor, beer or wine.

With respect to the second question, the Saskatchewan Liquor Board turns over each year, as requested, all or a certain portion of its profits to the Minister of Finance as revenues for the Government. It is then up to the Government to decide on what programs the profits from the Liquor Board will be used. The Liquor Board does not attach any strings to the revenue it turns over to the Minister of Finance.

**MR. STODALKA:** — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware that in the case of some of the licensed lounges, as of yesterday, that some of the prices were increased by up to 28 per cent? Is there no control on the amount of increase that a licensed lounge can have with respect to the products they are selling? How does this fit in with the guidelines that we are supposed to have?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, I will take the next question.

### **GOVERNMENT PENSION POLICY**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Mr. Speaker. To the Minister responsible for the Superannuation Board, whoever that may be.

I believe the present Government pension policy is not to allow individuals, who join the provincial public service, to contribute to the civil service pension their years in non-government employment. Is it the Government's intention to change its pension policies to allow individuals who come from outside or non-government employment, other than the four provinces which I understand have agreements with the Government of Canada, to contribute to the Government pension to make up for the years in non-government services?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — There currently is a means of them doing that.

**MR. LANE:** — What is that means and can you explain how the means is exercised?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order!

**MR. LANE:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it serves any useful purpose to give the individual's name but can the Minister advise why a person with a pensionable employment with the city of Glasgow, Scotland Police Department would be allowed to use his pension from the city of Glasgow and transfer it to the Government of Saskatchewan pension fund for his years of service with the Glasgow police, when Canadian citizens and people outside, who were trying to encourage the Government, are not allowed to do it.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Canadians are permitted to do it.

## RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT RE LEGISLATION

**MR. G. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. Would the Attorney General not agree that it is the responsibility of the Government to see to it that all matters related to legislation, that are the responsibility of the Government, are within the confines of the legislation?

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I think that I cannot agree with that question. I suppose I could agree with it in a general overall sense but surely if, for example, the Western Development Museum Board has a statute that it follows, has a board which is responsible for the governing and the overall operations of the museum, it's not the job of the Government to run the affairs of the board. If that was the case we wouldn't have the board. We would simply go ahead and have a Minister and a deputy making the decision. I think I have to say to that question, that that is a responsibility of the board. That is the board's responsibility.

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the Attorney General has said in terms of the running of the board. My question, though, had nothing to do with the answer and I would like to go at it again, if I may, with a supplementary.

Would the Minister not agree that it is the responsibility of the Government, i.e. the Cabinet, to see to it that Orders in Council passed by the Government are within the confines of the legislation that the Government is responsible for looking after?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I would agree with that, that Orders in Council, before they are submitted to Cabinet or before the matter comes into real effect, are examined by the appropriate legal officer. An opinion is endeavoured to be given as to whether or not the Order in Council is legal.

I can give you many examples. I don't like to mention legislation that is before the courts now but I guess I have to, Bill 42. Orders in Council are under attack there. Now we think that that Order in Council is perfectly legal and perfectly proper but it's under challenge. That can happen with anything.

## WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — In view of the fact that the Western Development Museum Act explicitly provides for the appointment of a board of directors consisting of anywhere from three to a maximum of 11 members, by what authority did you presume to appoint 12?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the exact provisions of the statute are and, therefore, I cannot answer the question because it's predicated on certain assumptions, nor do I know what the Order in Council in question says. It hasn't been tabled or anything of that nature. I would have to review it.

## **SASKATCHEWAN TRADING CORPORATION**

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Vickar). In light of the record of the Saskatchewan Trading Corporation, is it the intent of the Government to either absorb this into other departments of the Government, or to completely dismantle the Saskatchewan Trading Corporation?

**HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry):** — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Trading Corporation, as such, will not be dismantled as I stated this morning. There is a plan, as I stated this morning, to have it restructured, possibly in another department, but that is not for confirmation at this time.

**MR. LARTER:** — Supplementary. Mr. Minister I wonder if, by showing the \$180,000, you really feel this is a viable corporation and is it doing good for the industry?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Again, as I mentioned this morning, the corporation is rather new. It has been in existence since late 1974 and I think it has some growing pains but through the experience that we've gained in 1975 and 1976, hopefully, we should come out of this in the future.

## **WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM**

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Would the Attorney General give the House the assurance that he will check the validity of the Order in Council, which appointed the current board of directors of the Western Development Museum, in view of the fact that we have suggested that it goes beyond the powers of legislation?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I can undertake to ask the solicitors in the department to take a look at it again. I don't see any reason why I would deny that.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Would you also give us an assurance that you would then ask the law offices in your department to consider the effect of appointing a board of directors larger in number than the legislation permits? What effect would it have on the dismissal of Mr. Wilson if, in fact, the board was found to have one more member than the legislation allows?

## **RELOCATION OF INTENSIVE LIVESTOCK OPERATIONS**

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington):** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Does your Cabinet have before it now for consideration a revised policy as it relates to the relocation of intensive livestock operations?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, the policy which you referred to has been approved.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker I would just like to say thank you very much. I have been after this for about a year and a month.

### **MOVING SEDCO TO ST. VICTOR SASKATCHEWAN**

**HON. N. VICKAR (Melfort):** — Last week the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. R.E. Nelson) asked a question in the House when I was absent about whether we were going to move SEDCO to rural quarters such as St. Victor.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. VICKAR:** — I'm happy to announce this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg should note that we are not considering moving SEDCO. However, should the occasion arise that we would decide to move SEDCO, I have a much better place than St. Victor, we would move it to St. Front. St. Front, Saskatchewan happens to be in the corner of my constituency which also borders the constituency of Kelvington-Quill Lake and Kelsey-Tisdale. What more central location can one have than among four strong constituencies.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** — I wonder if I could have a supplementary on this. Does the Minister not feel that in his statement he just gave that he's not showing exactly the same political bias that he is showing in all his deals with SEDCO and with all the different political loans he has given through SEDCO? Should he not go down and take a look at the facilities at St. Victor and give this serious consideration, as the Premier of the Province promised he would give?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, I said I was not ruling out that possibility should we ever decide, although I had a preference to move it to St. Front over St. Victor.

I did see the facilities that are at St. Victor. I had two Royal Trust salesmen looking with me in the last couple of days, showing me the property that they have. There's no problem.

### **SASKOIL**

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in Charge of Saskoil. Does Saskoil give Saskatchewan owned and operated companies any priority in work sent to them or work let out in contract?

**HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Saskoil):** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, by and large where we are contracting for either services or supplies, we look to Saskatchewan contractors.

**MR. LARTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well over 85 per cent of

April 19, 1977.

all Saskoil work is handled by a very few companies. Will Saskoil look into more equitable arrangements in letting out work to companies that are Saskatchewan owned and companies that pay taxes to support their own company?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have seen one letter to the officials of Saskoil from one individual, who operates a business in Estevan. I am advised by the officials of Saskoil that there is absolutely no basis to his complaints, there is absolutely no basis to the charge that we don't do an appropriate and a very significant portion of our business in Saskatchewan where, indeed, those services and supplies are available in this province.

**MR. LARTER:** — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Many service companies were promised equal privileges and that the workload would be evenly spread by the Minister himself. Will Saskoil take steps to carry out its promise to these companies that Saskoil will also take up the exploration slack?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the record of Saskoil speaks for itself. With respect to evenly spreading out the business, at no time did I indicate that we would evenly spread business between people who weren't competitive. I believe the information, supplied to me by Saskoil with respect to this, is that they have found that the individual's prices are not competitive with other firms in the Estevan area and, therefore, they haven't employed that particular firm as often as that individual would like. Certainly Saskoil is prepared to look at distributing its business amongst Saskatchewan men but not if the businesses aren't reasonably competitive with one another.

#### **AMOK CORPORATION — FRENCH INTEREST**

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a series of questions and supplementaries to the Minister of Mineral Resources. I understand that AMOK Corporation, which is involved in exploration and mining development for uranium in northern Saskatchewan, is partially owned by French interests and I wonder if the Minister would, in fact, confirm that and in doing so, indicate what proportion of the AMOK Corporation, if any, is owned by French interests?

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — The answer to the Member's question is Yes, some of the AMOK operations are owned by French interests. There are several separate interests, one is a Crown corporation of the Government of France. I believe it owns about 40 per cent of the operations. There is another French private corporation which retains about 30 per cent. Those figures are, perhaps, not precisely accurate but I would be more than happy to check them and give that information to the Member at some other time.

**MR. CAMERON:** — By way of supplementary. As the Minister knows, the Government of France is currently causing some difficulty in terms of negotiations between Canada and the European economic community with respect to uranium exports into the European economic community. The Minister may be aware that France refuses two things; one, is to be bound by the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards; and secondly, it has long refused to be bound by the International Non-proliferation Treaty



respecting nuclear weapons. And I wonder, in view of the position of the Government of France in those two respects, the propriety of the Government of Saskatchewan permitting a French Crown corporation to extract uranium from the Province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, as the Member is fully aware, our position has always been that the partners or the companies that have a profile or a presence in the Province of Saskatchewan will abide by the Canadian regulations as to the removal and/or sale of that uranium. I do not believe that it is, therefore, within the jurisdiction of the Province of Saskatchewan to undertake to resolve a problem for which it does not have any legal obligations. The Canadian Government is responsible for the movement of uranium from Canada and we are perfectly willing to abide by the policies and the laws that are laid down by the Federal Government in the movement of that product. And this company would be obliged, its interests would be obliged, to recognize and adhere to that policy.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Well, may I ask you, that so long as the Government of France continues to refuse to be bound by the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and secondly, refuses to join in the International Non-proliferation Treaty, are you, as long as those refusals continue, prepared to continue a joint venture with a French company and particularly a French Crown corporation for the extraction of Saskatchewan uranium?

**MR. MESSER:** — Well, I think that this is hypothetical but if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that if the presence of that company is here, extracting uranium, one should not believe that they will be able to handle or sell that uranium in a way that they, as a government, would like to handle it. The entity that is here in Saskatchewan will abide by Saskatchewan laws and it will abide by Canadian laws and it will not abide by laws that they would be subject to, if they were operating in France. So I think there is a distinct difference here. They have their opinions in regard to how uranium should be moved in the international or global market but as far as any uranium that comes from Canada, they will abide by Canadian laws.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister how the Government of Saskatchewan justifies the propriety of dealing with a country like France in the international uranium business? It is considered an outlaw country because of its refusal to abide by the safeguards or sign the Non-proliferation Treaty. How do you justify the propriety of the Government of Saskatchewan licensing that company, permitting it to mine uranium in Saskatchewan and indeed joining in a joint venture agreement with it, in view of the fact that it has refused to abide by those safeguards and that treaty?

**MR. MESSER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the stance that the Member relates to is one that the Government of France takes, not necessarily AMOK. It is a private company which happens to be headquartered in France. It is also a minority in the overall activity in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am also, Mr. Speaker, surprised that the Member for Regina South isn't better

April 19, 1977.

informed as to how AMOK obtained a presence in the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe that his father was sitting on the Treasury Benches as a Minister of the Crown when the present agreement was negotiated to allow AMOK to undertake to develop and explore its uranium operations in this province. Its position, in regard to the sale of uranium on the global scene, was not different then than it is now. But putting aside, Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with the Government of France, we are dealing with a corporation which is headquartered in France with a minority interest in uranium operations in Saskatchewan and they will abide by Saskatchewan and Canadian laws. That is the point that has to be made here now.

### **ARTS GRANTS BY CANADA COUNCIL**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Party):** — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and the Minister responsible for Culture and Youth, I address this question to the Attorney General, as I am confident that this important matter would have been discussed at the Cabinet level. Undoubtedly, the Attorney General is aware that the Canada Council recently made Arts grants to various artists across the country and that there were no junior or senior Arts grants made by the Canada Council to anyone in the Province of Saskatchewan in April, 1977, nor, in fact, in the last three years have there been any senior grants made to the Province of Saskatchewan by the Canada Council. Is it your Government's intention to express a formal and strong complaint to the Government of Canada for this obvious and apparent discrimination against the Province of Saskatchewan in the awarding of Canada Council grants?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I'll take notice.

### **OIL ROYALTY RATES IN SASKATCHEWAN**

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Conservative Party, has on several occasions asked some questions, I believe April 7th and April 18th, in regard to what ways royalty rates on heavy oil production in Saskatchewan are competitive with royalty rates in Alberta. I have in general conveyed to him that new oil royalties in Saskatchewan, after deducting available incentive credits, could be slightly higher, equal to, or slightly lower compared to Alberta new oil royalties at all production rates above 60 barrels per day per well. It, if I may add, Mr. Speaker, is easier to qualify for new oil royalties in Saskatchewan than in Alberta. In these circumstances, new oil in Saskatchewan and old in Alberta, it is probable that the producer would be paying lower royalties in the Province of Saskatchewan. The combination of incentive rebates in the lower royalty for new oil in Saskatchewan is as generous or more generous than anything in Alberta. I would like to give the member an example in order to substantiate that.

If a company in Saskatchewan, which had sufficient old oil production to finance the drilling of new wells with incentive rebates available, it would be entitled to 17 per cent in the Lloydminster area and 14 per cent in other producing areas of all royalties paid, and it would be refundable for work done in the Province of Saskatchewan up to a limit of 75 per cent of the cost of drilling and completing a well or wells. If a

new well with a production rate — I have to take some examples as I had conveyed to the Member that the situation might be slightly higher, the same, or slightly less — of 40 barrels per day which I think is not unreasonable, the company would receive a refund of 75 per cent of the cost of drilling and would also pay the new royalty rate of 26 per cent. If it was a development well as opposed to an exploratory well, and most wells are in fact development wells, there would be no incentive refund in Alberta and the well may or may not qualify for the new oil royalty rate in that province of 20 per cent. In the Saskatchewan case, which is not uncommon, it is more generous than in Alberta. Also in Saskatchewan if the well had been unsuccessful, if it was dry or if it was abandoned for whatever reasons, 75 per cent of the cost would still be refunded from royalties paid on other production which is not the case in Alberta for the development and extraction of heavy crude oil.

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

**MR. STODALKA:** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Earlier in the day I asked a supplementary question which you ruled out of order. I wonder if you can just indicate the reason.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yes, I believe that was the Member's question with regard to the Saskatchewan Liquor Board. The Member was seeking information which, in my view, was information that is equally accessible to all Members in documents or published reports and consequently, I ruled it out of order. I think if the Member checks the wording of the question, he will find that information is available to all Members.

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

#### **RETURN NO. 61**

**MR. S.J. CAMERON** (Regina South), to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 61 showing:

(1) The number of persons who have been offered the position of Deputy Attorney General or asked if they would be interested in having the position, if offered. (2) If any, (a) their names and (b) the reason they declined.

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the Members of the House to turn down this Motion for Return for a number of reasons. First of all, it's not quite worded in a way that I can answer it, even if I was inclined to answer it because in these kinds of exercises a lot is put on the word "offered". In discussions that one has had, I don't think one could quite say that and furthermore, while there have not been very many names with whom discussions have taken place, (note the word "discussions" as opposed to "offers"), I think that it would be inappropriate for me to reveal those names, or the reasons if any were given, for obvious reasons. When talking to people, you talk to them in confidence. Some may or may not have current employment; some are not serious. We had a number of people who showed some interest in the matter before we decided on the appointment of Dr. Gosse. So I think that in

April 19, 1977.

the interest of maintaining the professional integrity of everybody involved in this matter, I think there is no other option for me but to urge this House to defeat this Motion.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Motion we will support the Attorney General. We can't believe that persons applying for positions or being approached to apply for positions should have that public record. There has to be some professional and I say, personal integrity. We're a little surprised at the question. People surely should be able to apply for a government position without having it become public and then possibly prejudice their present employment. We think that would be an unfair position for the Government to be in.

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — Well, let me say, Mr. Speaker that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, the reason for the Motion has obviously now lost some urgency and in some respects it's become academic because since the matter was put on the Order paper, a Deputy Minister has, in fact, been hired. It was a concern for many of us, including the Member for Qu'Appelle apparently, because he had several times expressed the concern that many months were going by and the appointment of the Deputy Minister was being delayed. And, of course, the Deputy Minister's position is the most vital of all in the department, with the exception of the Minister himself. We saw in the same period when the Deputy Minister had not been replaced that a number of prosecutors, I think numbering seven in total, had left the department. It was for a period of time, showing every evidence of some pretty serious decay and lack of direction because of some of the decisions which the Attorney General was or was not making, because of the lengthy delay that had occurred in not appointing the Deputy Minister. There was, as a matter of fact, some speculation around in the Bar and the legal community as to why persons were not being prepared to take the position that was being offered to them. I know that there were one or two people who were, in fact, offered the post and who declined it. It would have been interesting to see what reasons the Attorney General gave for their declining to take the post. But clearly there was, as I say, a period of time when the community was growing concerned about the disintegration of some portions of that department in the absence of the Deputy Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I would like to take this opportunity to caution the Member for Regina South that he may not in closing debate introduce new information. He has every right to comment fully on any remarks that had gone before and in this case by the Attorney General and the Member for Qu'Appelle. However, if there is any new evidence or comments the Member wishes to make, he would have had to make them at the opening remarks which he chose not to do.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Well, I said in conclusion but for the fact the Deputy Minister has now been hired and we all welcome that news, I would have argued this Resolution a lot more energetically than I'm not prepared to do. It's become, in a large part, academic. The question, at the time it was put on the Order

Paper, was a good one. I would have been most interested in the information being listed. I might say in response to the Member for Qu'Appelle that what it asks for are the names of those persons to whom the job was offered, not those persons who applied for the job, and there's quite a large distinction there to be drawn. I appreciate the fact he wouldn't recognize it because it is indeed so large and obvious.

Motion negatived.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON BILL NO. 01 — An Act to amend An Act respecting the Holding of Real Property of The Saskatchewan Command and Branches of The Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League.**

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **RETURN NO. 3**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Miss Clifford (Wilkie): That an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 3 showing:

(1) Whether any overpayments of funds have been made to any families under the Family Income Plan administered by the Department of Social Services since the inception of the plan. (2) If so, (a) the number of overpayments that were made (b) to whom, and the amounts in each case the overpayments were made.

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Resolution I have an amendment that I would like to make at the end of a few remarks that I have pertaining to this Motion. I don't think we need to spend too much more time on it as it was, I think, amply dealt with during consideration of my Estimates, and at that time I had indicated as to why we could not go with the Resolution as stated. I would like to reiterate that because the Family Income Plan was to respond immediately to the needs of a family rather than wait, say a period of six months or a year and then respond, we could expect that any one particular time that there would be overpayment. So that if you took the Family Income Plan at any particular point in time, we would have overpayment. We have taken however, a number of measures to make absolutely certain that these are minimized and I think I listed all of those when we were considering my Estimates and, therefore, I won't go through those again. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the original Motion: that on the proposed Motion of Miss Clifford that an Order of the Assembly do issue for the Return No. 3 showing the Motion amended to read:

“whether any payments or any benefits have been paid to families under the Family Income Plan where after receiving year-end information, the

April 19, 1977.

said families were determined ineligible for all or part of the benefits paid to them. (2) If so, (a) the number of outstanding families that were determined ineligible for all or part of the benefits paid to them. (b) the amount of outstanding benefits as related to the families in (a) above.

It's moved by myself and seconded by the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan).

**MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie):** — I should like an opportunity to look at the amendment. I presume, from what I have listened to, that it cuts out a lot of the information that I wanted originally. We did find out much of the information, as you stated, in Estimates. I am pleased to get any information at all that I can from you but nevertheless, I still feel that when I do, the information you have offered will not explain the high overpayments up to \$1 million in each one of the programs of the Family Income Plan and the Social Assistance Program. I would like more time to look at the amendment and, therefore, beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RETURN NO. 27**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 27 showing:

Copies of all submissions and briefs prepared by or for the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its agencies with respect to the costs of moving prairie grain by rail and the rationalization of the prairie branch line system.

He said: Mr. Speaker this question put on the Order Paper is a most sensible one in my view, in the sense that there is not an issue in the province which is more important currently nor will be more important in the next 12 or 18 months — the cost of moving prairie grain on the one hand and the rationalization of the prairie branch line system on the other. Two questions, of very vital importance to the rural makeup of Saskatchewan, are facing us immediately and will in the next 18 months.

The Resolution asks the Government to produce briefs so that we can have a look at the studies which it conducted and the submissions it made in consequence to the Hall and Snaveley inquiries. I don't think there can be a better illustration of the need for a freedom of information act than this very Resolution, because the Government has done a study; it has got papers and material compiled on this vital question. We asked them to produce it and they say no. What justification there is for that is beyond me, except an attitude of arrogance. As I say, I think it is a prime illustration of the need in this province for a right to an information act, where we could apply to the Government to make these studies available to us. If they refused to do it, we could then make an application to a district court judge to have an order forcing them to do it.

Bear in mind studies are conducted with the money of the

taxpayer. We are the people that paid for them. The studies are of vital importance to a current question. We should be entitled to have the information but the Government says, No. I imagine organizations such as Sask Pool, the community groups that are going to be affected by prairie branch line abandonment and rationalization, organizations like the Palliser group and other farm organizations would be most interested in having these studies. I imagine even the Farmers' Union may have an interest in this. That is one side of the question.

The other side is that we, and many others with us, have a suspicion that the submission made by the Government to Snavelly was not entirely in accordance with the information that was given to the Government pursuant to the studies it commissioned. The reason we have this suspicion is that Members will remember that during the Snavelly inquiry the Government of Saskatchewan indicated that it had commissioned certain studies in this respect and had them available but refused to give them to the inquiry and Carl Snavelly, conducting the inquiry, exercised subpoena powers and drew forward some information from those studies which the Government didn't want to reveal. Some of the information proved to be rather embarrassing, in a sense, to the Government. We wonder why the Government has that reluctance having gone to the difficulty and expense of doing the study and getting the information. Why didn't they lay it before Snavelly because, after all, Carl Snavelly was most determined to get at the truth of the matter?

Therefore, it leads, as they say, to a suspicion by many that these studies commissioned by the Government of Saskatchewan, in fact, revealed information of a kind which the Government itself did not want to reveal because it would have been embarrassing to some past positions taken by the Government. Mr. Speaker, we are very disappointed in the attitude shown by the Minister in charge and by the Government in refusing this kind of information. It amounts in our view to a blatant, a very blatant example of governments doing things which they clearly ought not to be doing and, as I say, gives us a very good example of why we need an information act in this province.

Motion agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. McMillan (Kindersley):

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.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Mr. Chairman, just a couple of comments. The phrase “positive action to prevent illegal drainage of water” may raise some questions in the Members’ minds. It would be quite simple to impose penalties, which I don’t think the Hon. Member who proposed the Resolution had in mind. I believe what has to be done, a matter I have urged in the Assembly in the past, is that a one shot effort be made by the Government of Saskatchewan to make the capital available to rechannel those well populated areas or areas with a great number of farms and that the capital be made available by the Government of Saskatchewan to allow for major rechannelling and to really get back to the guts of the problem. To say that we are going to stop illegal drainage of water really doesn’t solve anything. The law has been such that one is not supposed to change water courses and one is not to create water courses which will present a hazard or flood neighbors’ lands or downstream water. The law in the past has been totally inadequate. I think the Minister will agree, it is impossible in Saskatchewan for farmers to commence action against their neighbors because the neighbour upstream has rechannelled or put in new culverts or changed water courses. I submit that any talk of preventing illegal drainage of water is wishful thinking as opposed to anything constructive. What has to be done is there has to be a one shot effort by the Government of Saskatchewan to provide the capital to allow for whatever ditching is necessary, adequate culverts, proper mapping so that the water courses can be determined in light of new circumstances, that is farms, roads, etc.

To do this project in piecemeal steps, I suggest, will not solve the problem. We can go back to the usual argument of the Opposition that rather than buy a potash mine expending the funds for proper channelling and proper drainage of farm lands and proper funding to farmers to allow them the capital outlay, it would probably be a better long term investment for the people of Saskatchewan. It would restore to cultivation, lands that are no longer arable because of drainage, illegal drainage in the past.

As I say, anything less than a total effort by the Government will be ineffective. We in the Conservative opposition do support the intent of the Motion, we do support the principle of the Motion. Again, our position is that in order to really solve the problem, the capital funds must be made; a one shot effort must be made. We urge that upon the Government; a piecemeal operation will just perpetuate the problems that we have now.

**HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker I should like to make a few comments on this particular topic and after I have completed my remarks I should like to move an amendment to the Resolution. The Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. G. Lane) said that he thought we should have a one shot effort to take care of the problems which relate to drainage and flood control. I can assure him that a one shot effort to take care of all the drainage and flood control problems in this province would take just about all of the Budget of Saskatchewan, and certainly I think that would be an irrational move on our part until we are prepared to, or able to, look at the long term ramifications of such a policy.

When one examines the criticisms of the Opposition, one needs to also examine the conditions that brought about the unprecedented demand for drainage and flood controls during the



last couple of years. We had, as you know, four very much above average years, both in rainfall and snowfall from 1972 to 1975. Many areas in the province which experienced serious flooding became inundated with large inflows of water which, in many cases, simply spilled over onto low lying land, which had little or no history of past flooding and had no natural outlet.

This was particularly true in the spring of 1974-75, particularly in the southeast part of the province. Part of this was due to high snowfall, and partially it was due to the fact that the thaw came late and resulted in almost all of the snow melting in one week's time. Also it was partly due to a large number of farmers using modern earth moving equipment to do a great deal of unauthorized drainage in an attempt to free more land for cultivation and to move the water off more quickly in the spring to facilitate their seeding efforts.

High grain prices of course added to the pressures for farmers to drain as much land and get as much cultivatable acres as they could. The demand for assistance for drainage projects and technical assistance by our engineering staff, during this time, mushroomed far beyond the capacity that our limited staff could handle in a very short time. It also became evident that it was very necessary for the Government to take a hard look at what was happening on the flood plains in this province. It's an easy solution for farmers or a group of farmers to convince themselves that there is little harm in draining a few extra acres or deepening a natural run to get rid of some surplus water. However, when one examines the implications, of hundred of farmers all wishing to do the same thing, the results become rather sobering as we see millions of acre feet of water moving uncontrolled into our already overtaxed drainage basins. The result of this, as most farmers and rural municipalities will know, has been severe damage to low lying farm lands and to our municipal road system. Existing legislation, as has been indicated, has simply not proved adequate to cope with the large amount of illegal drainage which is taking place.

Although the law does provide that anyone draining water onto another farmer's land, thereby causing damage to his property, is liable for recovery of those damages, the legal process is extremely frustrating and an unsatisfactory one which leads to a great deal of expensive litigation and hard feeling amongst neighbors. As you know, proof is hard to obtain, and the assessment of damage is very difficult. It is very obvious then that there had to be a new direction taken in the drainage and flood control policies of the Government. It was becoming more clearly evident that the unrestricted drainage of water could no longer be tolerated. Unauthorized and illegal drainage was building to the extent that some regulatory measures had to be taken.

The farm organizations, including the SARM, the SFA, the C and D Associations, the National Farmers' Union, The Saskatchewan Wild Life Federation and SUMA all recognized that the legislative authority contained in existing legislation was no longer adequate to cope with the present situation. Nor were the C and D Associations or the Watershed Associations capable of handling the overall drainage and flood control needs of the province. As a result the Government struck a committee of four Ministers, including the Ministers of Agriculture, Environment, Municipal Affairs and Tourism and Renewable Resources to set up a thorough study of how to deal with the shortcomings of our present legislation and flood control policy. This committee as members will know, was expanded to include a committee of

April 19, 1977.

officials from the four departments to provide technical and informational service and also a public advisory committee made up of all of the interested parties throughout the province.

This Public Advisory Committee has been hearing briefs from the public and from municipal and government authorities to examine the needs of a proper program. A total of 27 briefs were considered by this committee. They have done an excellent job of identifying existing weaknesses in legislation and although the interim report stops short of making specific recommendations, the shape for future development for drainage and flood control is emerging.

Both the Advisory Committee and the Officials' Committee are conscious of the need for an early resolution of the problem. However, it is important that a proper evaluation be done now so that governments and municipal bodies, as well as farmers, will be aware of the responsibilities of each in future policy. It's very evident that any program of drainage must carry with it the ultimate responsibility of proper flood control measures.

Farmers and urban people in the lower reaches of our water sheds cannot be expected to bear the brunt of upstream drainage. Indiscriminate drainage of recreational areas and wildlife habitat, without regard to long-term costs, can also not continue. Long-term solutions to our drainage and flooding problems must be incorporated with an extensive program, to educate the people of our province with respect to the effects and side effects of a drainage program and the positive effects and benefits of good soil and water management and conservation practices.

One has to question the rationality of simply overloading ever-increasing amounts of water from our countryside. Researchers are beginning to question, seriously, what the long-term effects of such a policy might be to our agricultural community. Will the water tables drop? Will the lack of surface water result in less average rainfall over time? These are serious questions which must be answered. A good start has been made in the study by the committee and we are hopeful that they will be in a position to make some firm proposals to the Government within the next year, which will enable us to move forward with a more rational approach to the whole problem of drainage and flood control.

We are pleased that the various levels of government, together with farm and other related organizations, are working together so well to deal with these issues. Members will know, that as a result of the Qu'Appelle River Study, substantial work has already been done to reduce the flood threat in some of those areas. Some flood prone land has been purchased and leased back to farmers or has been designated to oil rights.

The Souris River Basin Study, jointly funded by the Federal Government and the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Governments, is now doing a comprehensive study of the Souris Valley Basin. When this study is completed we should have some firm recommendations as to the proper drainage system for that area. In the meantime, substantial funds are also being made available to continue some of the more urgent small drainage projects throughout the province. A number of the larger projects are in the advanced planning stage and a substantial number of smaller community projects have been cleared for construction in the coming year. There can be little doubt that a well thought out drainage and flood control program is urgently needed. We embarked on a program of public

consultation which, although it appears to be slow in developing alternatives, will, I am sure, result in a long range rational policy. We are involving all interested parties so their interest and co-operation can be assured. Because the drainage and control of water is an issue which has many local side effects, it is our desire to have a maximum of input to local authorities, be they Watershed Associations, C and D Associations or municipal governments and recreational groups. No doubt any recommendation for future water management will provide a great deal of opportunity for this involvement, in fact may put the onus for local work in the hands of watershed boards under the umbrella of provincial legislation. Because of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that our Government has moved in a very effective way, I think, and a very rational way to try to bring about a resolution to the flooding drainage problems of our province, I would like to move seconded by Mr. Whelan that Resolution No. 3 be amended by:

Deleting all the words after 'Assembly' in the first line and substituting therefor:

Commends the Government of Saskatchewan for conducting a drainage and flood control program planned and designed to avoid down stream flooding as well as environmental or wild life conflicts and since there are not adequate controls over unauthorized private drainage, this Assembly further commends the Government for initiating a study to look into all aspects of flood control including controls over unauthorized private drainage in Saskatchewan.

**MR. A.N. McMILLAN:** — Any direction one looks today he sees fools — that has to be without a word of a lie the most foolish statement I have ever heard, perhaps running a close second to that from the Member for Qu'Appelle.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You aren't adding much.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well you will get your chance to enter the debate too if you can figure out how to put three words together coherently.

The Minister has just stood on his feet and commended his Government for doing absolutely nothing but instigating a study to look into the long range corrections. I say the study will probably be a good one, it will probably come down with some recommendations. The Minister stands up and commends his Government for having taken action. He does absolutely nothing to deal with the illegal drainage of water.

Since I spoke to this Resolution in the initial stage in this House, I've travelled some considerable distance in northeastern Saskatchewan. I have seen field, after field, after field trenched from pot hole to the next pot hole to the next pot hole. The same situation has existed in Kindersley for three or four years and, yet, you so foolishly ignore that. You refuse to deal with it. I could understand it, if it was a technical problem, one which demanded considerable attention and long range study to correct the question of preventing illegal drainage

April 19, 1977.

It is a problem that is simple to put an end to and your Government, either through inability or lack of interest, has refused to deal with it and you have just confirmed that now. If you think the people in rural Saskatchewan can wait another year for you to put a stop to the illegal drainage of water, you are badly mistaken. It goes on and on and on. I have stood here in this House and pointed out to you the problems that Saskatchewan farmers have; your answer to them is prosecute a neighbor. That has been the answer from the Minister of Agriculture. And I suggested what would happen to your already dwindling popularity in your own area if you tried that against one of your neighbors. You must be aware of that and yet you stand up here and amend this Resolution to commend yourself for a job you have done in dealing with the illegal drainage of water, when you have done nothing. If that isn't foolish, then I have never seen anything foolish, with the exception perhaps of the Member to the left who runs a close second to the Crown Prince of Fools, the Minister who was fired from his job of responsibility for the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation. What have you done, what have you done for the farmers in Saskatchewan about this problem? Nothing. The committee has come down with an interim report, surely an adequate opportunity for your members of the committee and yourself included, to make some interim recommendations dealing with the illegal drainage of water. What have you done? Nothing. The only people in Saskatchewan who have taken any defence at all for the illegal drainage of water are those people who have contacted the local RCMP detachments, have received confirmation that the RCMP were responsible for administering the Water Rights Act and received permission to phone and notify an RCMP Barracks if, in fact, they found an infraction under way. That was the only protection and you have the gall to stand up in this House to commend yourself for no action at all.

I have suggested to you and I have given you a lot of credit. I've said that probably your study in the long run will be a beneficial one. I don't have any doubt about that, but there is no policy at the moment for constructive drainage of flood prone land; you couldn't help but make some improvements. I expected considerably more from, particularly, the Minister of Agriculture in dealing with this problem in the short run. That is one of the first things I specifically asked for in this Resolution and you chose to ignore it. I don't think the farmers who are being affected by the illegal drainage are going to ignore the fact that you have ignored them.

I would like to say a couple of words about the comments of the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), who stood up and proved to all who may still have any lingering doubts, that he is indeed a bona fide 24 karat fool. His suggestion, and one I suspect that comes from a pseudo legal mind was that I should be chastised for having suggested that positive action be taken with regards to illegal drainage. He stood up and said that Members of this House can't condone that kind of language or that kind of insinuation in a resolution because it might lead to penalties being placed on people who violated the Water Rights Act. Now that is a strange statement if I have ever heard one.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would ask the Member, in his remarks, to not comment on the remarks of the Member for Qu'Appelle because the Member is obligated at this point to deal only with the amendment which is before us. Consequently he cannot speak about the remarks of the Member for Qu'Appelle because they were given before the

amendment was put on, therefore, the Member must restrict himself to the amendment.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — . . . detract from their degree of foolishness, Mr. Speaker.

Members of this Government have commended themselves through the amendment for doing nothing. Members of this House have stood and condemned you and a Member, speaking previously, has condemned you and has suggested that positive action should not be taken because it might lead to penalties on people who broke or violated the Water Rights Act. The Minister obviously isn't aware of the situation that is involved there. I don't know to what degree or how much explanation is necessary to make him aware of it. Wouldn't it be a terrible thing if those people who broke the law in Saskatchewan and violated the Water Rights Act were subject to penalties — an interesting statement from the Member for Qu'Appelle.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I would ask the Member to do two things for me. The first thing I would like him to do is to withdraw the personal comments he made about the Member for Qu'Appelle and then cease from discussing comments that the Member for Qu'Appelle may have made because the Member for Qu'Appelle has not spoken on this amendment. He has made no remarks on this amendment.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I will withdraw my comments, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member should suggest which comments he is withdrawing.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Which ones did you ask me to withdraw? I am perfectly prepared to co-operate with the Chair.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the Member, in a serious situation as this, should not toy with the Chair. The Member knows very well which comments he has to withdraw; they are the personal remarks he made about the Member for Qu'Appelle.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I will certainly withdraw any personal remarks that I made about the Member for Qu'Appelle. Am I allowed to continue?

Speaking to the amendment that the Minister has brought in, he suggested that it would probably take the majority of the provincial budget in a dollar figure to correct the long term drainage problem on the basis of the drainage problem in Saskatchewan. I would agree with him there, without question, and anyone, who would speak to the contrary about such an amendment and such a comment by the Minister, would have to indeed be foolish.

The long range problems are ones that certainly our Opposition has given you adequate time to deal with. We suggested that it is unfortunate that perhaps the recommendations of the committee won't be coming down for a year because we realize the magnitude of the problem of dealing with the trunk drainage areas and trying to get a cohesive and comprehensive program of

April 19, 1977.

drainage throughout Saskatchewan. We agree that that certainly takes a considerable amount of investigation and some considerable time should be spent on it. I pointed out in my Resolution that you have amended, that that should certainly be the long range view of your Government and I don't suggest you vary from that stance at all, or at least I wouldn't have suggested it, until you amended the Resolution.

The most important aspect of this Resolution was that something should be done about the illegal drainage of water and you have ignored it. Anyone in this Legislative Assembly who could support your amendment to this Resolution is not only complying with infractions of The Water Rights Act but is out and out insulting the farmers of Saskatchewan who are victimized by people who break The Water Rights Act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I would ask that all sensitive and sensible Members of this Legislature oppose your amendment. I am sure that Members of our caucus will be opposing the amendment.

**MR. R.E. NELSON:** — . . . says there aren't any sensible . . .

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well I wouldn't disagree with that on some occasions. I am sure that Members of your own caucus would be slightly hesitant about voting in favor of your own amendment, in view of the fact that many of their constituents have brought to their attention problems with illegal drainage of water, problems which your own Members have found great difficulty in dealing with because of the lack of any sort of legislation which would allow farmers to put a stop to the kind of infractions that have been going on. I think you are to be condemned for bringing in an amendment like this, playing light politics with a serious issue. It doesn't speak well for your stature as a Minister of the Crown or certainly for your compassion for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion by Mr. Pepper (Weyburn):

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

**MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that since this Resolution was tabled in the House in the previous debate that ensued concerning the contents of it, all of us are more than pleased that a

resolve has occurred insofar as the providing of services to rural Saskatchewan by the Canadian Pacific, as had been previously done. I realize that just four services have been restored but at least under those conditions we appreciate the fact that CP was willing and is willing to provide services up until the time that some private trucking interests can be effective in that particular area.

I think this is clear indication that the Canadian Transport Commission, in its determination, failed to realize that there was a need for service in rural Saskatchewan. At least the Canadian Pacific, when they agreed to proper negotiations with the Highway Traffic Board here in Saskatchewan, realized the fact that services were needed and were prepared and did restore the services in those four runs. I think that this is a clear indication, Mr. Speaker, that we, in this House, must accept the principle that we do have regulatory bodies here in Saskatchewan and no matter how large the firm may be or the corporation may be, they are obliged to live up to and honor the responsibility as vested in those respective boards that we do have and in this case it is the Highway Traffic Board.

I do believe that the Highway Traffic Board does its utmost in being fair in the allocation of runs, does its utmost in being fair as far as anybody wanting to get out of a particular service is concerned if, in fact, there are other services available that can be provided for the people of this province. I think it is regrettable that the Canadian Transport Commission, in dealing with this situation in Saskatchewan and making its report as was made and was handed down, failed to realize that the services are required in rural Saskatchewan and as such, it was necessary for the negotiations to be carried on at another level between the Canadian Pacific and of course the Highway Traffic Board in the Province of Saskatchewan.

At this time I can only commend the private trucking industry in Saskatchewan for its method of filling in at a time when the need was the greatest. I can only commend the independent truckers that assumed the responsibility that was absolutely a necessity if any service was to be provided whatsoever. And I am sure that with the type of negotiations and the input that we will have from the shippers, the businessmen and consumers and all who are to be affected by the restoration of this service, we will find out in the future exactly what is needed in rural Saskatchewan.

I would like to suggest at this time that when the type of transitional period is taking place to allow the independent trucker to assume, in an orderly fashion, the traffic formerly carried by CP Transport, that the type of input that will be provided by the shippers, the businessmen and consumer should also be expanded to include those people who will be affected by the loss of employment when and if that time should occur. And of course I am referring at this time to those people represented by BRAC. They have been represented by BRAC for a long time and have had many, many years, up to 25 and 35 years seniority and there should be some provisions for them to have their views known within this committee that is being structured.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I think all of us and again I repeat, I think all of us are most appreciative of the fact that this has been resolved for the present time and that there have been services restored on routes within Saskatchewan. I should say in such a way that hopefully now there will be

April 19, 1977.

adequate service to those areas in Saskatchewan that have been suffering up to this time.

**MR. D.M. HAM:** — Mr. Speaker, a few comments if I may.

I think it is in order that we, in this caucus, congratulate the Government for finally coming to terms with the CPR in agreements for trucking. One could question the period of time in which the Government and the CPR negotiated, if you like. I hesitate to use the word 'negotiated' on an agreement for trucking in Saskatchewan. One could conclude that there may have been a campaign to discredit the CP Trucking Association. I think probably, from the firms we've heard in this House and statements in the past, that that goes without much discredit.

It's an unfortunate circumstance though, Mr. Speaker, through this period of time that that created uncertainty and a breakdown in service to the people of Saskatchewan and in the words of the previous speaker, "the shippers, the businessmen and the consumers," suffered. Negotiations were carried on well over a year, negotiations that I understand were, in most instances stalemated by the Government. From my discussions with CP officials, they at no time, from the differences that appeared to be evident between the two groups, were willing not to listen and not to negotiate. I understand also, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the signed agreement the differences in the agreement were so little that there was little change at all. It is unfortunate that the CPR has to be used or the CP Transport has to be used as a political football. I feel that they attempted to deal in good faith and co-operation and again this Government has, as they have done so frequently in the past, confronted the CPR or the CP Transport people.

I am hopeful that in the future, Mr. Speaker, that politics will be pushed aside and that future negotiations in situations like this are more meaningful and the people of Saskatchewan are not put in the position of suffering.

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments, with respect to the Resolution. I was interested in the Minister's way of expressing the agreement he had to come to with CP the other day. It reminded me, as a matter of fact, when he said it, of President Nixon and his withdrawal from Viet Nam; you know when he was being clobbered so badly and kept talking about peace with honor. Here, I am not sure the Minister wasn't getting clobbered by CP and decided he'd best retreat too. The best way to retreat of course, is with a myth and the myth you should perpetuate in the course of the retreat is that you have in fact won the battle.

I am not sure he is as much the victor as he was the vanquished in the course of the confrontation with CPR, but there was a serious question that was raised in respect of that confrontation, which left so many people so uncertain for such a long period of time and was so foolish in a sense. And that is whether or not the Highway Traffic Board is being realistic in these rates that it is setting for truckers in the province. There was some evidence before the Highway Traffic Board or before the Canadian Transport Commission which led them to conclude that, in fact, Saskatchewan was being somewhat unrealistic in the rates it was setting for its truckers. I think that is a serious question at which we ought to look. No one likes to



suggest that we ought to have rates higher because, of course, the consumer then pays more for the movement of the product.

But on the other hand, if we can't keep a good, sound, viable trucking industry in the province, everybody in the long term is going to suffer. The one serious question that arises out of all of it is, in my view, that we ought to go back, take a look at the rates that the Highway Traffic Board is setting in respect to the trucking operations in the province with a view to determine whether or not those rates ought not to be raised in the interests of preserving, in the province, a far better transportation system at that level than we currently have.

Now I know that there are Members on our side of the House that want to address some additional comments so I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Stodalka (Maple Creek):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to provide a quick settlement to the dispute with Ottawa over cable television policies.

**MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, following up on the Resolution that is before us at this time, I would like to make a few comments on this Resolution and move an amendment at the end of those comments.

I think that all of us in this House are well aware of some of the difficulties that have come about with the application for cable in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think that surely all of us in this House should be more than aware of the facilities that have been provided by Crown corporations, in this case Sask Tel, in the Province of Saskatchewan. In fact, in the past history of Saskatchewan, it has been proven beyond question that Sask Tel has been able to serve the entire province and it has been proven beyond any question, whatsoever, they have done it efficiently, effectively and very economically.

Mr. Speaker, some of the practical implications I should like to refer to very briefly this afternoon, having to do with why I say Sask Tel should have the ownership of the hardware completely from square one to the last square before it is then given to the public as the message, have to do really with about seven different areas. We know that there are obvious advantages of Sask Tel ownership of all the signal delivery facilities.

Number one — I would like to suggest that it would avoid wasteful duplication of facilities and operators. I don't think there is any question about that, whatsoever.

Number two — there would be a co-ordinated utilization of facilities for all purposes. I think that everyone in this House is fully familiar with the fact that it is not just cable that we are talking about today, not just that message and that type of facility that will be given to us, as the viewers of

April 19, 1977.

television through cable, but the many other facilities that will be used and included in that cable, once it is in place.

Number three — a separation of the different functions of content and delivery. And that is why I am suggesting that there is definitely an advantage of Sask Tel ownership.

Number four — the average pricing to enable service to a larger number of communities and service at cost. And I'll very shortly deal with that, Mr. Speaker, insofar as why and how that is possible. In fact, even the commission, the CRTC, agreed with that position when that fact was brought before them at the hearings.

Number five — Sask Tel's proven competence, reliability and low rates which are referred to at the beginning of my remarks this afternoon.

Number six — validity of only each of power, water, sewer, gas and signal delivery operators in streets and lanes. And I think we have seen a situation in Moose Jaw, which I think is regrettable, where the City Council saw in their deliberations to grant the use of lanes and alleys for use of another signal distribution system.

Number seven — the system integrity and end-to-end responsibility for signal delivery.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that at no time has Sask Tel, at no time has the Government of Saskatchewan ever indicated that they were interested in the delivery of other than the system and that program which will go from one end to the other in a complete signal delivery. They are not interested in the message at all, never have been, never will be. And I am suggesting that there is no reason to believe that the CRTC and the federal regulatory agency should not have control in the monitoring of the system insofar as the message is concerned. And never has this Government said that they object to that procedure now or will they ever in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have suggested that surely we can all support the principle of the one power utility, one gas utility, one water utility, one sewage utility and one communications utility in the streets and lanes of this province and in the streets and lanes of our municipalities. We have heard opposite and I am sure that I have heard it I don't know how many times, Mr. Speaker, that why doesn't the Government go ahead, provide the private carriers and provide the private applicants who received the licences to use the facilities and fight it out in the courts. I am suggesting that there is an alternate course and they failed to accept it and they failed to realize that that course is open to them. I do believe they probably realize it's open but they are not prepared to do what is available to them to do.

Sask Tel has a tariff offering which is open to all cable licensees to accept for the purpose of delivering their signals to the subscribers, and this tariff has been offered to companies such as Prairie Co-Ax which I am very familiar with. They maintain Mr. Speaker, that Prairie Co-Ax cannot accept Sask Tel's tariff because of the ownership condition on this licence. In view of the fact that both the logic and the law in the province support the use of Sask Tel's facilities, why shouldn't Prairie Co-Ax apply to the CRTC for relief from, or removal of these ownership conditions, at least until the issue is resolved in

court instead of once again, as we have just seen in the last Resolution insofar as which party has a responsibility, we see that Prairie Co-Ax and the other licensees have every opportunity to use the tariff offering that is available to them at this time.

The CRTC can remove or waive these conditions if they were applied for without a hearing but only if these applicants and these licensees apply for such a removal or waiver. And I see no reason why corporations like Prairie Co-Ax should not show their interest in speeding the service to the people of this province by making that application.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting when you read your report of the CRTC which was handed down and read what the commission themselves had to say about our situation in Saskatchewan. And I will quote directly from that report?

At the same time the commission recognizes the historic role of the provincial carrier, Sask Tel, in providing telecommunication services to the remote areas of the province through cross-subsidization of the service to scattered and isolated communities and individuals by densely and economically viable urban communities. The commission also recognizes that in Saskatchewan, the most rural of the larger provinces with approximately half the population living on farms or in small communities, the principle of at least partial rate averaging by such cross-subsidization is widely accepted. Most of the applicants also accepted the concept that future provisions of service to smaller communities will require some support from larger communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting this afternoon, and I will use Prairie Co-Ax as a typical example, that some of those Private applicants under no condition would ever provide the service to the small rural communities surrounding Moose Jaw which they received the licence for, would not under any circumstances, whatsoever, because their economically viable base would not permit that. I am suggesting that they would not be concerned about the community programming, that is very evident and should be evident within each individual community. And I am saying that if, in fact, we are really interested about bringing services to the people of Saskatchewan, then those opposite should join with us, at this time, in saying that we have to do this through cross-subsidization and do it in such a way that the Sask Tel will supply the facilities to the various small municipalities throughout this province.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if we look at the applicants who were before the CRTC when the applications were made for licenses, we will realize that in most cases what they said and what the Commission said was the majority of the shareholders and the majority of the Board of Directors should be Moose Jaw residents. It was a myth to see the number of people who put in \$1,200 each and then said that they were now shareholders and as such they were directing that company. There are eleven people in Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, who suggested and, in fact, they weren't suggesting, that they were made directors of Prairie Co-Ax. That group holds a minority of common shares, at that time at six per cent. And I am suggesting that when you look at who really owns Prairie Co-Ax then you realize that those investments of \$1,200 or less and the representation of

April 19, 1977.

six per cent is a far cry from having any control or supervision over Prairie Co-Ax.

If you look at the ownership of Prairie Co-Ax, you will see that the remaining shares, 45 per cent of Class B Preferred Shares, were held by Calgary Cable TV, I think now that has made a movement in the last short while, then a subsidiary of Cablecasting of Toronto. The influentials in that firm were J.D. Meakison, and D.R. Graham, both of whom appeared at the hearing representation insofar as Prairie Co-Ax was concerned, and Peter D. Curry, who is Chairman of the Board of Cablecasting and also President and Chief Operating Officer of Power Corporation of Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that these people from central Canada, these people who are representatives of organizations and corporations as large as the Power Corporation of Montreal are not really that concerned about whether or not people in Moose Jaw and the surrounding area receive any type of service insofar as cablevision is concerned. I am suggesting that they are trying to make an inroad into the legalities of the country and trying to prove that individual municipalities do have the right, or they are alleging that they have the right, to control the lanes and alleys when it has been proven throughout history that Sask Tel has that moratorium insofar as the use of the lanes and alleys is concerned. And I do believe it is unfortunate, at this time, that corporations such as that are being taken and are taking municipalities such as Moose Jaw for a ride.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will see, as we have seen in the last situation, a resolve of this problem. I do believe that the Federal Government and the Communications Department and Mme. Sauve have moved considerably in this regard. I hope that they will continue moving in the area of ownership of the hardware from the head-end to the final delivery point. I believe it can be done with determination. As I look at the newspaper clipping here on March 24, I see the position in Saskatchewan is no different than the position adopted by the Government of Alberta. In Alberta, and I will quote from the paper, the Leader-Post of March 24:

Edmonton — Paid television should come under provincial rather than federal jurisdiction, Utilities Minister Allan Ward told the Legislature.

He suggests that Alberta's position supporting provincial control over paid television would be stated at the Federal-Provincial Communication Conference in Edmonton next week. Paid television and cable television are somewhat the same ball of wax and I am sure that those provinces in the West and those provinces in Canada realize that there should be some determination by the respective province s insofar as the supplying of the message and the supplying of the hardware.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to move a resolution. I will so move, seconded by my colleague, Mr. Allen from Rosemont, to add the words following 'policies':

That this Assembly condemns the Federal Government for its stand on the ownership of cable television hardware in this and other provinces, which will inhibit the introduction of cable television to

smaller centres and will give the Federal Government and private operators control over Saskatchewan's communication network.

And further:

This Assembly commends the Provincial Government for its stand on cable and closed-circuit television being delivered by non-profit community co-operatives.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to just say a few words in support of the amendment of the Member for Moose Jaw North and also in doing so, commend him on the remarks that he made that I thought were excellent, to the point, well organized, etc.

One of the areas that I don't think, in this whole debate, that probably has come out as much as it should have, is the fact that we in Saskatchewan are not presently being served as well as we should be by the CBC. I think if you looked across the country, province by province, looked at the facilities that have been installed in those provinces by the CBC, the moneys that have been allotted for the development of local programs and local talent in the different provinces of Canada; Saskatchewan would have to be at the bottom of the line as far as that kind of thing is concerned. One of the things that most interests me, about the Government's policy in regard to cable television, is that I think that it, in some way, answers the problem that we have now, in terms of the development of local artists in Saskatchewan. It's been shown that if the Provincial Government's policy is implemented within a very short period of time, there will be \$1.5 million, roughly per year, available for local programming in Saskatchewan that's not available now. And that, I don't think, will be available if we leave it up to the CBC.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this whole debate has been clouded by remarks that have been made by some Opposition Members. What they have been trying to say to the public is this, that the reason you do not have cable television in your house today, the reason you cannot watch the NFL Monday night is because those Socialists won't let you have it. I get calls from time to time saying, why are you holding up cable television in Saskatchewan? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be possible for people to have cable television until the installations for cable television have been laid. Opposition Members know that, so when they say that we are somehow holding back the implementation of cable television, they are simply not being totally factual.

The Minister of Telephones and the Minister in charge of cable television have both indicated to the House that those installations are moving ahead as quickly as is possible. I know that my constituency, which I'm happy to report, is one of the first being serviced by cable television in Regina. Those installations are going in at a rapid rate. The Government expects that by the time it is possible, technically, for people to receive cable television, the policy in regard to cable television will be solved and settled. That's obvious. I think that's obvious to anyone who has been paying attention. Our Minister of Communications or Minister in charge of cable

April 19, 1977.

television has been working very hard with Madame Sauve and CRTC to come up with some sort of an agreement. I could say, I think without exaggerating, that to most reasonable people when it's explained to them, our cable television policy makes eminent sense.

Now there are just one or two more things that I'd like to say in this area. I think it's very important, Mr. Speaker, that people recognize what the difference is between our policy and the policy of Opposition Members in regard to cable television and what effect the differences in those policies will be on Saskatchewan viewers. First of all and this has been said by the Member for Moose Jaw North, it will provide, at reasonable cost, cable and close-circuit television to Saskatchewan people. And I think that's important. I think that a service like this should be provided at as low a cost as is possible to do two things: (1) to develop the system, to pay for the system (2) to provide for some local programming in Saskatchewan. That's a policy that we have and if our policy comes into effect, that's what the effect will be. With the Opposition policy, that is not what the effect will be.

Secondly, program content — this is very important — program content will have a democratic input for our community co-ops that are putting on this program. Any person in Saskatchewan who wants to have an influence on the cable television system merely has to go down and take out a membership in the co-op and go to the meeting. I recall, a few days ago, the spirited debate on violence on television. Everybody complains about what we see on the TV. Well our policy will give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to have some input in what their children see on television. And I think that's very, very important.

Thirdly, our policy will provide for, but the Opposition's policy will not provide for, close-circuit systems in Saskatchewan's smaller communities. I understand that a pilot project will be going ahead in a community like Meadow Lake, probably even Assiniboia. The Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg criticized me for saying that I'm happy that we're getting cable TV in Regina Rosemont but I understand that probably even a place like Assiniboia will get cable television with our Government's policy but will not get cable television if they follow the policy of their Member, the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Finally, most people in this House wouldn't realize that I'm a patron of the arts, but I've been told by many members in the artistic community, who I run into in different places, that they do not have an opportunity in Saskatchewan to earn a living, to perform in their own province. If they want to be a singer, a musician, etc., and they want to practise their craft, they have to go someplace else. They have to go to Toronto or Montreal or Winnipeg, places like these where the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and other Federal Government agencies, etc. have provided opportunities for Canadian artists to perform. And I think that we have a tremendous amount of talent in this province. If any of you were at the talent night here a week or so ago, at the Centre of the Arts, you would have seen the tremendous amount of talent that we have in this province. If we want those people to stay in this province to entertain our people, we have to do something to provide them with an opportunity. And I say that this policy, in the first few years alone, will provide \$1.5 million to keep those

people at home.

The policy of the Opposition would send them to Toronto. So with those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I take a great deal of delight in seconding and voting for the Resolution amendment by the distinguished Member for Moose Jaw North.

**MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — I'd just like to make a few remarks before adjourning the debate and to consider some of the remarks that were made by the Member for Moose Jaw North. Every time something comes up that is related to the Federal Government the Member comes out with his best. Sometimes I wonder if his body is here in Regina and his real mind is present some place in Ottawa remembering some pleasant years he had in Ottawa some time ago.

I was pleased with the Member for Regina Rosemont's announcement that we may be getting cablevision in some of the rural communities of Saskatchewan. After listening to the Crown corporation meetings concerning Sask Tel and asking a few questions in those committees I didn't come away with the impression that we were going to be receiving cablevision in rural areas, certainly not in a very short time. It was suggested that the cost of providing services to these communities would be almost prohibitive.

I notice also the Member for Moose Jaw North indicated that there was a possibility of moving television into some of the smaller centres around Moose Jaw North. I seem to get two messages. One seems to indicate that we're going to have cablevision brought into rural Saskatchewan. The second one seems to say it's too costly. I certainly hope that the costly argument is not the one that's going to prevail and that we can somehow get cablevision into rural Saskatchewan.

The idea that the Member for Regina Rosemont had about the talent that we have here in Saskatchewan and the capable people is noble, but I am afraid it takes more than capable people and talented people. I am concerned about the cost of production and just how far these funds, that are available, are going to go in producing. Certainly when you're going to produce programs, you're going to have to have a market. And is the market in Saskatchewan going to be really large enough? Or are we sort of pipe-dreaming? Are we going to be able to really supply these people with the employment that is necessary or give them the opportunity to use their talent here in Saskatchewan? And with these few remarks I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 11 — SPECIAL CARE HOMES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Allen (Regina Rosemont):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to seek agreement with the Special Care Homes Association to ensure that residents of non-profit Special Care Homes and Housing Facilities be given direct representation on the Boards of Directors of such facilities.

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Berntson.

April 19, 1977.

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say how much I appreciate the support of both the Liberal and Conservative Opposition to this Resolution and the matter in which they presented their remarks, etc. We seem to have so much disagreement in the House and I would just like to say how much I appreciate their support.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Could I enquire from the Member for Regina Rosemont if he's closing debate on the Motion, or does he want to close debate on the amendment?

**MR. ALLEN:** — I want to close debate on everything. I want to say that I would like to thank the Members here who supported this Resolution.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution agreed to.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 24 — VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Thibault (Kinistino):

That this Assembly deplores the increasing violence in television programming and the consequent desensitizing effect on viewers and urges the Canadian Radio Television and Communications Commission to take steps to:

- (1) study the effects of constant exposure to violence, particularly among young viewers; and,
- (2) set standards for programming which prevent excessive amounts of violence.

**HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on this Resolution. The Member for Kinistino, speaking on this Resolution, clearly pointed out the need for higher moral standards in television programming. I want to . . .

**MR. LARTER:** — We said Stand on this Resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member will realize that calling for a motion to stand merely means that it will stand if no one wishes to speak. The Member from Canora wishes to speak on the matter and he should proceed at this time.

If, in the event that the Member for Qu'Appelle wants to speak on the matter at a later time, he has the opportunity to get into the debate.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Thank you Mr. Speaker. In continuing my remarks, I want to first of all congratulate the Member for introducing this Resolution for debate by the Assembly.

The Resolution, I believe, is a most timely one and one



which deserves the attention of each and every one of the Members in this Assembly. The subject dealt with, should be of concern to all of us. Parents, schools and society, in general, are particularly concerned with the ill-effect television violence has on the developing minds of children. The debate on the Resolution, I am certain, will be kept at a high level, having a non-partisan approach and a unified voice in order to better solidify our unanimous position in support of the Resolution.

Violence is a problem without boundaries and it extends into all human situations. Ever since humanity, violence has been, and still is, a part of human behaviour and very likely will be in the future. Violence is built into human society at many levels. Wherever there are the rich and privileged and the poverty-stricken and the starving, there is at least indirect violence. Apart from the outright breaking of laws, there are many activities which are still legal but are morally wrong.

It has often been said that violence, generally speaking, exists because of uncivilized circumstances, but that is no longer true by any means, because today we have as much and even more situations of violence than we did, say 1,000 years ago. It may be said that uncivilized circumstances still exist, but we must also admit that violent situations today are occurring amongst supposedly a civilized people. I suppose the answer must be that people will be people and that human nature, in fact, hasn't really changed that much from years ago.

But I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that violence today certainly has its root cases different from that of years ago, and I want to suggest that one of the present root cases of violence stems from violent and immoral programs viewed on the TV idiot box. When a socially irresponsible program is presented to us for viewing on the screen on the TV in our living room, that, in itself, creates a violent atmosphere and environment which may lead to a violent situation.

Violence, in so much of North America's television programs, has been the subject of some public discussion and concern for a number of years. Critics, social scientists, politicians and church leaders have become alarmed by TV's seeming immersion in physical violence and perverted sexual behaviour.

Over the past two decades, television has become our chief form of entertainment and the main source of news for most people. It has changed our ideas of time and space, removing distances and helping to increase the speed of history.

Outside of a few special interest groups and a small body of communications researchers, issues of the nature and type of programs on our television system has been given low priority in Canada and the setting of standards has been totally overlooked.

Television was first developed by businessmen and technicians fascinated with this new instrument of communication. Those involved with supplying the content — writers, actors and technicians — came to television from jobs in writing and the arts. These people tended to draw upon the materials and forms with which they are familiar, making only slight changes for television. Only recently have broadcasters learned to use, to their best advantage, television's ability to portray the present and to bring it to the eyes and ears of the viewer immediately, wherever the viewer may be. We must move ahead

April 19, 1977.

and beyond the production and transmission methods.

The issue of the content of television is understanding the important role played by television in defining and expressing our culture and way of life, as well as the influence it may have on our social and moral way of living. Television has changed our way of life more drastically than any other social innovation we have ever seen. People change their eating and sleeping habits; the youth directs his attention away from reading and toward television. Television is unique in terms of the amount of time devoted to it and in terms of its special attraction.

We need to establish very clearly what effect television has on our everyday living and the society in which we live. What we need are program standards designed to develop programs which are primarily aimed at providing either entertainment or information, without having to portray violence and immorality. I realize that in a certain program, violence and immorality could be, could be, a significant aspect of the program development. However, I want to point out that certainly this ill-aspect of the program could be kept to the minimum rather than have it blown up to the maximum and to a point where it overshadows the main subject matter of the program.

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, review some statistics pointing out the possible effects of television violence. In the United States in 1954, content analysis of the frequency of acts of physical violence such as hitting, stabbing, shooting or otherwise doing physical harm to another, suggested that 17 per cent of all United States prime time programs were saturated with that kind of aggression. By 1960, these violent acts increased to about 60 per cent and by 1969 the increase was up to 80 per cent.

In the United States, studies of children's programs in the 1974-1975 season found that 83 per cent of all the programs were filled with violence. There was a violent act once every three minutes on children's Saturday morning cartoons.

We must ask, Mr. Speaker, what effect does television violence have on children? In the United States the tests of the effects of television, almost without exception, show that on the four year olds, eight year olds and 12 year olds, the immediate effect of viewing that kind of violent material is an increase in the child's willingness to physically hurt another person. In major studies, involving hundreds of normal children from all parts of the United States, the results showed that the more television violence the child watched, the more aggressive he or she was in his or her attitudes and behaviour.

We must be concerned with how our children will act as adults, not merely how they act as children. An investigation was conducted on this issue again and in the United States there was firm evidence that there is a link between watching violent television programs and the violent and aggressive behaviour of children in real life.

On the other hand, evidence also suggests strongly that there is a clear beneficial relationship between the activities children engage in and the programs they watch on TV. If the child manages to get into a situation in which he discusses in class about pro-social actions he has seen on television, such as sharing or helping the unfortunate, he is much more likely

to exhibit similar behaviour. It would, therefore, appear that positive TV programming in the long run does bring worthwhile results. There are values that we would like to give our children but do not — values such as co-operation, sympathy, sharing, affection, friendship, understanding, learning to accept rules, coping with frustration, self-esteem and valuing the unique qualities of each individual. Television today does not show too much of this in its programming.

Children are so easily influenced and we have it in our power to do good or evil to them. Man does not transmit social behaviour genetically from one generation to another — man is adaptive. We teach our children how to act. The most effective way to transmit social behaviour to the next generation is, of course, by our own actions. We teach our children merely by acting in front of them until they learn by observing their environment. They see what our values are and, by and large, they adopt them. That's how television works. Purposely or inadvertently, whether we wish it or not, television is and must be a teacher, not because we have made it so but because the natural process of observation-learning takes place when children watch the behaviour of others.

It is argued that television viewing, in itself, is informative and educational and that the children today are more advanced in technology because of television. This may be true to a degree, on a selective basis, in terms of general viewing, but it is not true when we assess the programming in totality. Television is a teacher whose curriculum is largely unplanned and whose effects are largely unmonitored.

Mr. Speaker, another area of violence I am very concerned with is that which exists in hockey. I wish to discuss this at this time through this Resolution because much of the major hockey sport is televised and viewed by many, young and old.

One element that is disturbing is that the basic rules that apply to professional hockey also apply to juveniles, midgets or even little tom-thumbs, youngsters under 10 years of age. When one takes a look at the basic purpose of hockey, it is recognized that the game is to provide a form of recreation. It is, however, unfortunate that part of the recreation package is violence. Hockey for boys six years old and those in the early teens, in my opinion, should be brought out of the framework of professional hockey.

I have spent hours at rinks. I really love hockey. But my major concern is that there seems to be very little, if any, difference in terms of applying rules to pee-wee hockey players, 9 and 10 year olds, to 10 and 11 year olds and between applying rules to junior and professional hockey, even though professional hockey has a completely different objective in mind. Less than one per cent of all hockey players in amateur hockey will make the professional leagues, yet we insist on having similar rules. This is one of my concerns.

Ten years ago there were rare experiences of boys in bantam leagues fighting with their fists. Today, when you watch a game, you will find that fighting is very common. The rules of the game are not strict enough nor are the penalties severe enough to impress upon the youngsters that the hockey game is a game of skill rather than a game of roughness and ability to use body contact to the extent of injuring opposing players.

April 19, 1977.

Might I suggest that the attitude of young hockey players today is something that is being developed to a great degree through the violence that appears on TV hockey programs. It is sad that this is happening, and it would be most unfortunate if we were to close out professional hockey from TV programming.

A player should be able to enjoy hockey. In later years, he could look back on hockey as a great experience. This is the way I want my boy to look at it, and I am sure that this is the way you would like to have your boy look at it. I want my boy to learn from hockey, not necessarily to be a professional player but to gain from hockey an experience towards the growth of his character as a person.

Mr. Speaker, the kids watch Hockey Night in Canada, and to a boy watching this sort of thing presents a boyhood dream, to some day be a great hockey player, to skate well, to stick handle, to score goals, as well as be a game hero! They watch the program because they like hockey and because they have favourite teams and players.

A great majority of parents are placing a great deal of emphasis on winning championships. Some coaches are caught up in this as well. Sometimes parents and coaches are handling boys solely for the purpose of reflected glory.

I believe in competition. I am not saying body contact should be taken out of sports. If the player is protected, there is a place for it, to a degree. But I believe that there is just too much emphasis on the part of coaches and spectators on hard-hitting body contact which often ends up in fighting.

Many of us recollect the many hours of TV entertainment we had from the Canadian-Russian series. I am sure you will agree that the emphasis in this series was strategy and skill rather than roughness and hard body contact. I am sure you will agree as well that the TV viewers enjoyed the games immensely without having to view rough play and fighting.

The point I want to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the violence we view on television covering professional hockey games is part of the total violence package we are discussing in this Resolution, but I also want to point out that in order to improve and set up higher viewing standards on televised hockey programs, it would be necessary to change and improve the present rules of the game. This of course, involves more than the CRTC. But may I suggest that if we as a society put our mind to it, we could, with consultation, reduce the violence in the game and if we do this our TV hockey programs will, of course, improve without losing their popularity with television viewers.

I want to suggest that we positively must make an effort to carefully assess the present television programs with the view of improving and developing programs by minimizing and, in some cases, by completely removing the violent and immoral features out of programs. Letting television violence continue as it has, without expressing concern and making proposals for improvement, is social negligence on our part as legislators. We must not stand by accepting acts of violence as part of life and having television contribute towards an already morally weak and sick society.

I would like to suggest that we in Saskatchewan could take a lead in the area of improved TV programming by expressing our grave concern through full support of this Resolution and by impressing upon the Canadian Radio and Television Communications Commission the need to take positive steps in setting up an inquiry committee or a task force, with specific terms of reference, covering the effects of TV programming with special focus on violence and morality. The results of such a study, I am certain, would be interesting, and perhaps somewhat shocking. The public should be made aware of the results of the study in order that they may have an understanding and a greater realization of the effects TV programs have on our way of life and social behaviour in general.

Besides studying the effects of TV programming, the Resolution requests that standards for programming be set to prevent appearance of excessive violence. Setting standards is an important aspect of this Resolution. If we are to minimize violence and immorality in television programming, we must have strict standards as well as a constant monitoring device to keep programs within the required standards.

I would ask all Members of this Assembly to give serious consideration to this very worthwhile Resolution and I would urge that all Members give their full support to the Resolution.

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may address a few remarks to the Resolution, one which I think is largely a motherhood Resolution in the sense that I would expect that all Members of the House would accept the concept that television does provide for viewers a tremendous amount of violence and, in fact, a tremendous amount of immorality in the kind of programming that is there, whether you look at prime time or whether you look at news or whether you look at sports or whatever facet of television viewing one wants to examine.

I have a bit of difficulty with the wording of the Resolution in the sense that the first part of the Resolution asks for an inquiry to be conducted to find out what the effect has been and yet the Hon. Member who just spoke spent a good deal of time listing statistics that have already been gathered and that are already available indicating just what the effects are, whether we talk about four year olds or eight year olds or twelve year olds or whatever.

I think we have to ask ourselves realistically what the term excessive violence means. We can all think of programs on prime time that, in our minds, we would probably all agree have excessive violence as a part of them, but after we get the top two or three listed, we might have some difficulty coming to a consensus about what excessive violence may be in some other programs. I think we can do the same kind of thing on children's programming. We might all agree that Batman is a program with excessive violence or that Spiderman is a program with excessive violence. I wonder how many Members would list Bugs Bunny as a program with excessive violence. Many of us would, because very few scenes go by on that program where a dog is not bopping a rabbit or a coyote is not bopping a dog. That kind of thing happens and yet most of us look at Bugs Bunny or Donald Duck or that kind of thing as being a pretty innocent sort of television program.

April 19, 1977.

The Member's reference to violence in sports, particularly hockey, is dear to my own heart. Members may recall that a year or so ago Saskatoon City Council closed the arena and forced the cancellation of a game because of excessive violence and that wasn't an act that has gone singularly across the country. Many people, responsible for the operation of arenas, responsible for Attorney Generals' departments across the country, have taken pretty strong stands. The Minister mentioned the Canadian-Russian series with its emphasis upon skill. I think the Member would also agree that when you look at the Toronto-Philadelphia series of one year ago, particularly the games played in Toronto, and the Philadelphia-Toronto series played this year, there is a considerable difference in emphasis. There seems to be a different attitude from the public and from the officials of the game with regard to what they are going to allow to be done and what they are not going to allow to be done. And the kind of stick-swing brawling violence that was there a year ago wasn't there last Sunday night or last Friday night. For those of us that are Leaf fans, we wish that something else had been there that wasn't there too. But I think that the matter of violence in sports is something, particularly in hockey, on which we are probably over the hill.

The matter of hockey, competitive hockey for young children, is another matter which is near and dear to my heart because I think we introduce competition in hockey at far too early an age. Instead of dealing with the skills of skating and passing and shooting, we get little kids at six years old out on the ice playing another team, building up frustrations because they don't have the skills, resorting to other acts to try to overcome the fact that they don't have the skills. These manifest themselves later on as 10 year olds or 12 year olds or 14 year olds in the kind of action that the Minister has mentioned.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the Member mentioned the social responsibility of legislatures with regard to controlling violence. I think that we have to keep in mind the parental responsibility when it comes to television as well. If there are programs that parents do not want their children to watch, then surely to goodness, they all know where the on/off switch is and they all know how to use it. And I think that many of us understand the television situation well enough that if programs are not being watched, they are not going to last long. And I think that in addition to talking about greater controls at a federal level, with regard to regulations pertaining to violence or morality on television, that it behoves all of us as parents and in our contact with parents to remember that, in fact, we have the ultimate control because whether or not the signal comes into our homes is a decision that we can make. It's a conscious decision that we can make. If we don't want to watch programs, we do not have to watch them and if we do not want our children to watch them, we can control that too. And I think that we ought not to lose sight of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, I have other matters that I would like to say with regard to this very interesting topic and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### RETURN NO. 40

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron: That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 40 showing:

The Number of trials conducted in Saskatchewan on criminal charges in each of: (a) the Magistrate's Court (b) the District Court (c) the Queen's Bench Court, in each of the years 1971 to 1976, both inclusive.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I am going to move an amendment which is going to be a lengthy amendment to this particular Motion and which amendment, Mr. Speaker, I will be wanting to have in effect as a substitute amendment for Orders for Returns No. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46 and 47 inclusive, because in a sense all of these Motions are endeavouring to determine some statistical evidence relating to cases, convictions, breakdown as to Courts and so forth. I think the way that my department can provide some information is to do it in the fashion which I am going to propose here.

Mr. Speaker, just a further word of explanation. The court statistics maintained for the Magistrate's Courts deal with cases rather than the number of trials, number of persons, number of charges and number of offences. And a case means any charge or group of charges brought before a court, in respect of which there is a single disposition made by that court. For example, if there was one information sworn with one charge and six counts under that charge and it was dealt with at one time by the court and one fine was assessed, it would be treated as one case rather than as six cases. If there were six individual fines assessed for each count, it would be counted as six cases. If two individuals were charged on the same information and the two individual sentences passed by the court, it would be counted as two cases. A case would include all appearances before the court respecting guilty pleas, preliminary hearings and trials. Charges that are withdrawn before court appearance would not be counted as a case. Individual appearances would not be counted as individual cases.

A case is counted upon disposition. For example if a case is commenced in 1974, but is not ended until 1975, that case would not be counted until the year of the disposition, namely 1975.

I am advised, I don't mean this critically of the person who asked the question, but my officials tell me that the information requested by Returns 41 and 47 inclusive, which I will try and incorporate in one amendment in a moment, really would be very difficult and virtually would be unavailable on a province wide basis for any province in the country. Some provinces are a little bit ahead of Saskatchewan in the statistical data. Quebec, British Columbia and Ontario are developing information systems. We are too in a very embryonic way with the Criminal Justice Management Improvement System. We are not in the same category yet as Quebec, British Columbia and Ontario, but while they are developing these systems, they are still highly regionalized with different kinds of

April 19, 1977.

inputs going into this kind of a situation, not able to cover the whole province. As I say, we are developing our information system. This Provincial Court Management Information System, that I've talked about earlier, will be able to provide all or most of the information requested in Returns 40 to 44 inclusive and 46 and 47. However, it is anticipated that this will make us not able to do so before February of 1978. So what I am going to do, in no attempt to thwart information but to provide that which we have, I would like to move, seconded by my colleague, Mr. Whelan, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Regina North West, that Return No. 40 be amended by deleting all of the words after the word 'showing' and the following substituted therefor:

(1) The number of cases and convictions in the Magistrate's Courts in Saskatchewan for each of the years 1968 to 1976 inclusive under the following:

- (a) Criminal Code — Canada, Impaired and Related.
- (b) Criminal Code — Other.
- (c) Narcotic Control Act.
- (d) Other Federal Acts.
- (e) The Liquor Act.
- (f) The Vehicles Act — Speeding.
- (g) The Vehicles Act — Other.
- (h) Other Provincial Acts.
- (i) Municipal Laws.

(2) The number of cases and convictions in the District Courts in Saskatchewan for each of the years 1968 to 1976 inclusive under the following:

- (a) Criminal Code — Canada, Impaired and Related.
- (b) Criminal Code — Other.
- (c) Narcotic Control Act.
- (d) Other Federal Acts.
- (e) The Liquor Act.
- (f) The Vehicles Act — Speeding.
- (g) The Vehicles Act — Other.
- (h) Other Provincial Acts.
- (i) Municipal By-laws.

Case means any charge or group of charges brought before a court in respect of which there is a single disposition made by that court. Civil actions are not included.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there will be some gaps in the information which is sought but I would submit to the questioner and to the



House that once this Return is ordered, it will be able to provide to the Member the substantial substance of the information that he wants and I will be moving this for Return 40 and in order to dispatch the business of the House, I will be asking that we defeat Returns 41, 42, 43, 44, 46 and 47 as being encompassed in this particular Motion. I so move.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Yes, I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't obviously had a chance to see this, but it appears that the amended Return would answer reasonably well the questions asked in 44, 43 and 46, but I don't see that it would meet, at all, the objectives of 40, 41, 42 and 47. I should like to have a little more time to look at that and to talk to the Attorney General about whether we are talking about convenience for his department or the impossibility of supplying the information. I need a little more time to look at it and time to talk to him and I would, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RETURN NO. 45**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 45 showing:

Whether any personnel employed by SGIO has been in any way assisting the Carter Commission on no fault reparations. If so: (a) the names of these persons; (b) the nature of their assistance; (c) the remuneration that has been paid to them.

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of clauses in this Motion that we would find difficult to comply with, in working out an answer. In addition, the Reparations Committee that is herein referred to as the Carter Commission is no longer active. Therefore, I am proposing an amendment which will give the Hon. Member the information that he seeks, will make it considerably less difficult for us to answer and it will at the same time make the answer more specific.

The amendment I proposed to move to Return No. 45 and seconded by the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) would read as follows. I wonder if I could send a copy across to the Hon. Member. Delete all the words after 'employed by SGIO' and insert the following:

Worked for the Carter Committee on no fault reparations on either a full time or part time basis. If so: (a) the names of those persons; (b) the nature of their assistance; (c) the remuneration that has been paid to them.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 48**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do

April 19, 1977.

issue for Return No. 48 showing:

The total amount collected by way of fines for all convictions in Saskatchewan in each of the years 1971 to 1976, inclusive.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be offering an amendment here as well and the explanation I will offer is as follows.

The questioner wants to know the total amount collected. I am advised by my department people that the total amount of fines collected by the courts is not centrally recorded. The fines that are collected by the courts may be, for example, payable to municipalities or the Federal Government or the province and the distribution of this fine revenue has been done historically on a decentralized basis by each of the various court officers.

Now in 1975 one of the reforms that we instituted was to establish a system to provide payment for all federal fine revenues to the Department of the Attorney General who, then in turn, distributes this money to the Federal Government. However, municipal fines continue to be distributed by the individual court offices to the municipal governments. I think the Members will know there are some reasons for that.

The information available is with respect to the amount of provincial fines that have been collected and transferred to the department to the consolidated fund. Implementation of the Provincial Court Management Information System, when complete, will partly rectify the situation.

The amendment that I propose, therefore, will reflect fiscal years rather than calendar years since government accounting records are kept on a fiscal year. There is, however, no way to relate the amount of fines collected to the number of cases and I would, therefore, move, seconded by my colleague, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) that Return No. 48 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'showing' in the second line and substituting therefor:

The total amount of provincial fines collected for all convictions in Saskatchewan in each of the fiscal years 1971-72 to 1976-77 inclusive.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### **RETURN NO. 49**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 49 showing:

The disposition of moneys paid into court, and if invested: (a) how quickly such funds are invested; (b) where such funds are invested; (c) at what interest rates such funds are invested.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, again a small amendment. The substituted wording here will restrict the Return to moneys paid into

court relating to civil actions. Without changing the wording, the department would be obliged to consider other moneys that are paid into courts, such as fine revenue, JP fees, bail, restitution money, transfer fees and there is a great big long list. I don't think that was the intent of the Return. The intent appears to deal specifically with moneys paid into court and to civil proceedings.

Accordingly, I would move, seconded by my colleague the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 49, be amended by adding after the words 'The disposition of moneys paid into court' the words 'in civil actions'.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 50**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 50 showing:

- (1) The amount of money 'paid into court' in civil actions in Saskatchewan in each of the years 1971 to 1976, inclusive; (2) The interest, if any, earned on these funds, (3) The rate and the amount of interest, if any, paid out thereon.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, on this one as well, there will have to be an amendment — perhaps a word again of explanation. The amount of money 'paid into court', and I'm using the phrase 'paid into court' in quotes — there has been no reason to keep a record of this, but we can supply how much is on deposit at any given time, such as March 31 in any year in total and by centre. I should point out that to answer this question, it will require a visit to each judicial centre, 19 in total, to calculate the seven amounts requested. The interest earned would require a visit to each centre and the interest on hand for distribution for any year on March 31 for each centre can also be readily determined.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I'm going to do for better clarification and assistance for us to answer this matter, in such a way that will reasonably give the Member his information, I would move seconded by the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 50 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'showing' in the second line and substituting therefor the following:

- (1) Of the moneys 'paid into court' in civil actions in Saskatchewan, the amount on deposit as of March 31 in each of the years, 1971 to 1976 inclusive; (2) the amount of interest on hand for distribution of these funds at March 31 for each of the years, 1971 to 1976 inclusive; (3) the approximate rate of interest paid out thereon.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 51

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 51 showing:

The criteria used in bestowing Q.C.'s in Saskatchewan and whether (a) the Law Society of Saskatchewan; and/or (b) the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench; and/or (c) the Chief Judge of the Magistrate's Courts; and/or (d) the respective Bar Associations are consulted as to persons who ought or ought not to be offered Q.C.'s.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by my colleague the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 51 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'showing' in the second line and substituting therefor the following:

(1) The criteria used in bestowing Q.C.'s in Saskatchewan; and (2) what legal and judicial groups are consulted as to what persons ought or ought not to be offered Q.C.'s.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 52

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 52 showing:

The amount of money paid to lawyers in private practice in Saskatchewan in each of the years 1971 to 1976, exclusive of amounts paid to prosecute, by the Government of Saskatchewan, its departments, agencies or Crown corporations.

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Chairman, I am going to propose another amendment which, again, is not to thwart the intent of the Motion. It will clarify what I think is wanted. The amendment will limit the response to lawyers retained to furnishing legal advice. Quite obviously that is what was intended. I don't think that what was intended was the question of the lawyer who may be acting as a magistrate or counsel retained under the Legal Aid Plan or something of that nature.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my colleague the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 53 be amended by adding after the words 'lawyers in private practice' the words:

retained to furnish legal advice

and by striking out the words 'to prosecute' and substituting therefor:

for prosecuting and for Legal Aid.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 53**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 53 showing:

The amount of money paid to lawyers in private practice in Saskatchewan in each of the years 1971 to 1976, inclusive, to prosecute charges of a criminal and quasi-criminal nature at the request of the Government of Saskatchewan, its departments, agencies or corporations.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, again a small amendment from the calendar year to the fiscal year to reflect the manner in which the Government accounting records are kept.

I move, seconded by my colleague, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 53 be amended by striking out the words '1971 to 1976' and substituting therefor:

The fiscal years 1971-1972 to 1976-1977.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 57**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 57 showing:

Whether there is any contract, correspondence, memoranda or other writing in existence between the Minister in Charge of SGIO or any official of the Government or SGIO and Roger Carter and/or other members of the Carter Commission on the no fault reparations proposals. If so (a) the dates thereof, (b) the nature and content thereof.

**HON. E. WHELAN (Minister in charge of SGIO):** — Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the Members of the House to vote against this request.

My research people have looked at the journals, examined the rules of the House, all the precedents, and we are convinced that the information that is being requested is privileged. The instructions that were given to the committee, in my capacity as Minister in charge of SGIO, are clearly set out in the terms of reference and are part of the committee report. The presentation by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to the committee very carefully establishes the representations made by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and lengthy questioning by the Carter Committee followed. Certainly that material is also on the record. It was carefully considered by the Committee before they submitted their report.

If representations by SGIO are being sought by the Hon. Member I am sure that they can be made available. We have certainly tried to do that in the previous questions that we have indicated we will answer and in previous information that

April 19, 1977.

has been asked for; yes, we have indicated it will be supplied.

We consider the material requested, such as correspondence, privileged and we maintain that there is no precedent for providing it.

**MR. S. CAMERON (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, I think this is the second example we have seen in one day, again the need for some statutory enactment in the province that will require information housed within the internal workings of the Government to be made available to people.

The reason for the request for the information is clear. I want to establish whether the Carter Committee, in studying the reparations proposal, had before it in any way a communication from the Minister or from anyone in SGIO, including the general manager, or from anyone in the Government as to the direction that Commission ought to go in respect of the conclusion it reached. In other words I was interested in knowing to what degree of independence the Carter Commission was exercising, in studying the reparations proposal put to it by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office.

Again, I have no evidence to suggest that there were communications of a private kind from the Minister to the chairman or from the general manager of the corporation to the chairman or from anyone in the Government to the chairman or any other member of the Commission. I would have thought, that if there was no such information, the answer would have been a simple, no, to the question I put. The fact that the Minister now wants to refuse to answer the questions leads me to believe that I may have been on to something. That is there was some internal, private communication between the Minister, or the Government, and the Commission that I understood was to take an independent analysis and do an independent study of the merit or otherwise, of the SGIO reparations proposal.

Now I am led to suspect that there were some communications that went to that Commission that did not become public or, otherwise, the Minister clearly would simply say the answer to all the questions is, No. But in any event, in terms of the principle of the thing, I say it is clearly another example of an attitude that is so difficult to understand. I can understand if the Minister should say there is some communication, some letters between him and Mr. Carter and they are privileged communications, as a Cabinet Minister to a Commission. I might have some argument but if the Minister had made that point at least he would have made some argument to advance his position.

It is a broad question and very hard to understand how a government can rise and look us in the eye and say that we are not entitled to this kind of information. They are not going to answer the question, they are going to use their majority to vote it out. As I say, it is the second example in the course of one day why the Act which I have on the Order Paper, The Freedom of Information Act, is obviously more and more needed.

Motion negatived.

#### **RETURN NO. 60**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do

issue for Return No. 60 showing:

In each of the years 1970 to 1976, inclusive, (a) the total number of Saskatchewan residents who sustained personal injuries in automobile accidents in this province; (b) the number of such injuries which resulted in claims under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act; (c) the number of such claims which were settled and paid out; (d) the total paid out under such claims; (e) the number of such claims settled on pay out to the claimant of (i) less than \$1,000 (ii) between \$1,000 to \$5,000 (iii) between \$5,000 to \$15,000 (iv) between \$15,000 to \$25,000 (v) between \$25,000 to \$50,000 (vi) between \$50,000 to \$100,000 (vii) over \$100,000; (f) the number of such claims paid out, (i) on voluntary settlement between SGIO and the claimant; (ii) only after the amount was settled by judgment of a court; (g) the number of such claims which were made by and paid out to persons adjudged or decided by SGIO to be without fault in the causing of the accident that resulted in the injury.

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the information that is being requested is reasonable, except that we must get it into sort of an organized fashion so that the people at SGIO can spend less time on it. In its present form it would take a great deal many more man hours than in the proposed amendment that I intend to introduce to the House. I think the information is the same.

I therefore move, seconded by the Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) in amendment thereto:

That all the words after the word ‘inclusive’ in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(a) the total number of persons who sustained personal injuries in auto accidents in this province as reported under The Vehicles Act;

(b) the number of injury claims made under

- (i) Part II (automatic accident benefits) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act
- (ii) Part IV (third party liability insurance for injury and death or property damage of others) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act

(c) the amount of such claims

- (i) under Part II (automatic accident benefits)
- (ii) under Part IV (third party liability insurance for injury and death or property damage of others)

(d) the number of such claims under Part II (automatic accident benefits) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act which were settled and wholly paid out

- (i) during the year of occurrence
- (ii) within one year after the year of occurrence
- (iii) within two years after the year of occurrence

- (iv) within three years after the year of occurrence
- (e) the number of such claims under Part IV (third party liability insurance for injury and death or property damage of others) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act which were settled and wholly paid out
  - (i) during the year of occurrence
  - (ii) within one year after the year of occurrence
  - (iii) within two years after the year of occurrence
  - (iv) within three years after the year of occurrence
- (f) the number of claims incurred under Part II (automatic accident benefits) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act of (i) less than \$1,000, (ii) between \$1,000 to \$5,000, (iii) between \$5,000 to \$15,000, (iv) between \$15,000 to \$25,000, (v) between \$25,000 to \$50,000, (vi) between \$50,000 to \$100,000, (vii) over \$100,000.
- (g) the number of claims incurred under Part IV (third party liability insurance for injury and death or property damage of others) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act of (i) less than \$1,000, (ii) between \$1,000 to \$5,000, (iii) between \$5,000 to \$15,000, (iv) between \$15,000 to \$25,000, (v) between \$25,000 to \$35,000.
- (h) the number of such claims under Part II (automatic accident benefits) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act that were settled
  - (i) on a voluntary basis between SGIO and the claimant
  - (ii) only after the amount was determined by a judgment of a court
- (i) the number of such claims under Part IV (third party liability insurance for injury and death or property damage of others) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act that were settled
  - (i) on a voluntary basis between SGIO and the claimant
  - (ii) only after the amount was determined by a judgment of a court
- (j) the estimated number of such claims under Part IV (third party liability insurance for injury and death or property damage of others) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act which were made by or on behalf of persons adjudged or decided by SGIO to be
  - (i) without fault in causing of the accident that resulted in injury
  - (ii) partly at fault in the causing of the accident that resulted in injury
- (k) the estimated cost of
  - (i) adjusting claims under Part II (automatic accident benefits) of The Automobile Accident



Insurance Act

ii) adjusting claims under Part IV (third party liability insurance for injury and death or property damage of others) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act

(l) the estimated cost of

(i) payments made by claimants to their solicitors in respect of claims under Part II (automatic accident benefits) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act

(ii) payments made by claimants to their solicitors in respect of claims under Part IV (third party liability insurance for injury and death or property damage of others) of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 32**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 32 showing:

In each of the years 1971 to 1976, inclusive; (a) the Saskatchewan centres where Judges of the Magistrate's Court and Magistrates 'held Court' and (b) where 'Court was held' in each of these centres, i.e. community hall, gymnasium, et cetera.

**HON. R. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment which I am forced to make because we are going to have some difficulty in the department backdating this kind of information all the way to 1971.

The amendment that I am going to propose is that we provide information for the years 1974, 1975 and 1976. While it doesn't go back to 1971, I think it will give the member a flavor of what he is trying to get. The reason for that is that we underwent a bit of a departmental reorganization in 1973, allowing us to get this kind of information centrally, thereafter; before that time it is just not possible.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Whelan that Return No. 32 be amended by deleting all the words after 'showing' and the following substituted therefor:

In each of the years 1974 to 1976, inclusive; (a) the Saskatchewan centres where Judges of the Magistrate's Court and Provincial Magistrates; 'held court' and (b) where 'Court was held' in each of these centres.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 33**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 showing:

(1) The number of persons employed by the Government

April 19, 1977.

of Saskatchewan in respect of the legal aid plan in each of the years 1971 to 1976, inclusive; (2) The job descriptions or classifications of these persons; and (3) The salary ranges for each job classification in each of the said years.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, again I have an amendment which I think will give the Member the basic information that he wants. First of all, we will be making a change to a fiscal year rather than a calendar year. Also, we are going to backdate it to 1967-68 through to the fiscal year 1975-76 and I think the information will then be put in the proper perspective for the Member. Accordingly, I move, seconded by the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 do be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'showing' in the second line and substituting therefor the following:

For the Department of the Attorney General, in the fiscal years 1967-68 to 1974-75 and for the Saskatchewan Community Legal Services Commission in the fiscal years 1974-75 and 1975-76, (1) The number of persons employed in respect of legal aid plan; (2) The job classification of those persons; and (3) The salary ranges for each job classification in each of the said fiscal years.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### **RETURN NO. 34**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 34 showing:

In each of the years 1971 to 1976, inclusive, the total cost of the legal aid plan and: (a) the portion of the total costs expressed in dollars and cents paid out in legal fees; (b) the portion expressed in dollars and cents accounted for by administration, including the cost of office space, equipment, personnel, etc.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, again I will be offering an amendment which will slightly restructure this, in order to make it more convenient and more accurate for us to respond. I think the purposes of this will be self-evident when I move the Motion. Would you give a copy to Mr. Cameron please? Moved by myself, seconded by the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) that Mr. Cameron's Motion by an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 34 be amended by striking out all the words after 'showing' in the second line and substituting therefor the following:

(1) For the Department of the Attorney General in each of the fiscal years 1967-68 to 1974-75 inclusive, the total payment made to private barristers and solicitors in respect of legal aid; (2) for the Saskatchewan Community Legal Services Commission in fiscal year 1974-75

and 1975-76 (a) the total cost of the legal aid plan; (b) the portion of the total cost expressed in dollars and cents paid out to private barristers and solicitors in legal fees and disbursements with respect thereto: (1) criminal matters and: (2) civil matters; (c) moneys expended by clinics in the fiscal year 1974-75 and 1975-76 for delivery of criminal and civil legal aid services; and (d) the approximate portion expressed in dollars and cents accounted for by administration.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 35**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 35 showing:

In each of the years 1971 to 1976, inclusive: (a) the number of persons who received legal aid for and in respect of (i) criminal or quasi-criminal matters (ii) civil matters; (b) the number of persons who received legal aid more than once with respect to both civil or criminal or quasi-criminal matters in the five year period between 1971 and 1976; (c) the number of persons who received legal aid for and in respect of criminal charges three, four, five or six times in the period between 1971 and 1976.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, again the alterations here will be necessary to please Mr. Cameron, to reveal the information. There is a great story here to tell about legal aid when you want to tell it. Moved by myself, seconded by the Hon. Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman), that Mr. Cameron's Motion by an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 35 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'showing' in the second line and substituting therefor the following:

For Saskatchewan Community Legal Services Commission, (1) The number of cases undertaken by (a) legal aid clinics in the fiscal years 1974-75 and 1975-76 in respect to criminal and civil matters; (b) private barristers and solicitors for the period 1974-75 and 1975-76 in respect of criminal matters (c) private barristers and solicitors for the period from April 1, 1974 to March 31, 1977 with respect to civil matters; (2) The number of persons who received legal aid more than once with respect to both criminal and civil matters for the period from April 1, 1974 to March 31, 1977; (3) The number of persons who received legal aid for and in respect of criminal charges three, four, five or six or more times in the period from April 1, 1974 to March 31, 1977.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 36

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 36 showing:

In each of the years 1971 to 1976, inclusive, the number of persons receiving legal aid (charged with offences under the provisions of the Criminal Code in respect of which there is an election as to the manner of trial) who elected trial by: (a) Judge alone; (b) Judge and jury.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my colleague the Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy) that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 36 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'showing' in the second line and substituting therefor the following:

For the fiscal years 1974-75 and 1975-76 the approximate number of persons receiving legal aid charged under the provision of the Criminal Code who elected trial by; (a) Judge alone, and the final disposition of election; and (b) Judge and jury, and the final disposition of election.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 37

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 37 showing:

The total number of policemen or policewomen and peace officers employed full time in Saskatchewan in each of the years 1971 to 1976 inclusive, and of these: (a) the number who were members of the RCMP; (b) the number who were members of municipal or other police forces.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I will be making an amendment here with respect to the Motion for Return No. 37. I want to just give a brief explanation. In the case of the RCMP, the information that will be provided is the RCMP personnel employed on federal duties and national police services, in terms of the total number of members. The RCMP advises that they are unable to give us a breakdown of the number of provincial duties alone or only. The question with respect to peace officers also poses a problem. Peace officers would include sheriffs' officers, highway traffic officers, some vehicle farm petroleum products officers and others who are peace officers with respect to various statutes. I don't think this is what was intended by the Resolution. In addition, a further compounding problem in this area of peace officers is that some of the traffic officers were appointed special constables under the Provincial Police Act but the Highway Traffic Board

believes that this matter has fallen into disuse, and some have retired. Accordingly, the amendment that I propose seconded by my colleague the Member from Kelvington-Wadena (Mr. Byers) is as follows: That Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 37 be amended by striking the words 'and peace officers' in the third line and by striking the words '1971 to 1976' in the fourth line and substituting therefor the following:

The total number of policemen or policewomen employed full time in Saskatchewan in each of the years 1967 to 1976 inclusive, and of these: (a) the number who were members of the RCMP; (b) the number who were members of municipal or other police forces.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 38**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 38 showing:

Of the total number of peace officers employed in Saskatchewan between the years 1971 and 1976 inclusive: (a) the number who were women and (b) the rank these women held in each of the said years.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I have to make a small amendment here because I am advised that the RCMP are either unable or unwilling to provide a breakdown of their number by sex. Indeed I think it is inability since they do not record them on that basis. Accordingly I will move, seconded by my colleague the Provincial Secretary for the great constituency of Biggar (Mr. Cowley) that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 38 be amended by striking the words 'of the total number of peace officers' in the third line and substituting therefor 'of the total number of municipal policemen or policewomen'. The Return would then read:

Of the total number of municipal policemen or policewomen employed in Saskatchewan between the years 1971 and 1976 inclusive, (a) the number who were women and (b) the rank these women held in each of the said years.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 39**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 39 showing:

The total amount of money collected in each of the years 1971 to 1976 in Surrogate Court fees.

April 19, 1977.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Kramer the Member for Battlefords, that Mr. Cameron's Motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 39 be amended by adding after the words 'The total amount of money collected' the words 'as petition fees':

The total amount of money collected as petition fees in each of the years 1971 to 1976 in Surrogate Court fees.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 31 — SUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR PROBATION SERVICES FOR JUVENILES AND ADULTS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to provide sufficient funds to permit a renewed emphasis on probation services for juveniles and adults.

**MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I have very few things to say about this because I have been very explicit in what I felt was wrong with probation services. I feel that not only are they understaffed, have a lack of structure and are cumbersome but because of the size of the case loads, being from 48 to 58 depending on the numbers that are used by the Minister or the report they have, in no way can they effectively deal with the clients. I feel that this Motion put forth by the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) is indeed a positive one. We can look at reconstruction in probation service and indeed get some protection and help, not only for the public in Saskatchewan, but also for the probationers whom we are trying to serve.

I therefore urge all Members of the Assembly to support this Motion.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING**

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South)** moved second reading of Bill No. 87 — **An Act to provide for an Economic Impact Statement to accompany Government Bills when introduced in the Legislature and to accompany Statutory Instruments and Regulations when issued, made or established.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to address some comment to

the second reading of this Bill not at great length. The Bill, which Members now know is entitled The True Cost of Government Programs Act, is intended in its broadest sense to attempt to bring some greater measure of discipline into Government spending at a time when, I think without question, the bulk of the population would certainly agree that some greater measure of discipline is required by government at all levels.

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The other day Mr. Speaker was looking at the propriety of this Bill in terms of the rules of the Legislature. I don't know whether Mr. Speaker's silence has indicated that, in his judgment, it is in order but I would submit to you, Sir, and this is my Point of Order, that indeed the Bill is not in order in as much as it would call on the Executive Council for an expenditure, namely the work involved in preparing for an economic impact statement, which would involve some work and in the preparation and the tabling of that economic impact statement together with the Bill. My submission is that according to the Bill, as impressed as I am with the intent behind it, I think that it is contrary to the rules.

**MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon):** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that on a previous occasion you concluded the cost of writing or putting out Bills or information was not considered expenditure as such, that had to be voted on.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would make the point that the argument of the Attorney General is, I suggest, a specious argument designed only to shield him and the Government from having to come to grips with what, obviously, is a sensible suggestion as agreed to by the Editor of the Leader-Post, and I am sure that is great authority. Members opposite wouldn't argue with that one.

More seriously, Mr. Speaker, I make the point that if the Attorney General's argument was accepted by Mr. Speaker, I would have a difficult time thinking that there would ever be a Private Member's Bill that would be found to be in order for that reason.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — That is not a bad idea.

**MR. CAMERON:** — The Attorney General says that's not a bad idea and I can understand him saying that when he is confronted with a Bill such as this, and he is going to have to screw up his courage in one way or another to refrain from supporting.

It does not require deliberately any additional staff of government. It doesn't require the designation, as I had thought at one time I ought to do, of a particular official of government to deal with any particular matter. The fact that it may create some more work does not mean to say that there would be additional money expended because, of course, the work done will be done by public servants who are already in the employ of the Government and already being paid by them. Therefore, that is the reason why I say the argument is specious. My principal point, Mr. Speaker, is that whatever work is required by the Government is work which will be done by public servants already in the employ of the Government, therefore, no additional funds are required. Secondly, if Mr. Speaker should accept the

April 19, 1977.

Attorney General's argument, I can't think of a Private Member's Bill which could ever be introduced in the House.

**HON. E. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, I read this Bill with some interest and I listened with great interest to the comments of the Member opposite. I looked at the Bill with some interest because I think there are two things which it contemplates in general. One, is that for all legislation coming before this House, and secondly, for all Orders in Council or regulations which involve the expenditure of funds, there be this economic impact analysis done. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the Members know, there is a significant amount of economic impact in the House that's done by the Department of Finance, the Budget Bureau primarily, with respect to Government programs. But this goes even beyond that, Mr. Speaker; it is the estimated initial and ongoing cost of the action, which I suggest may not be too terribly difficult and I think is done in most cases, an analysis of the various alternatives to achieve the same purpose at the lowest cost. There could be almost an infinite number of them; a comparison of the cost benefit contained as opposed to circumstances where such action is not taken or was not taken, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the budget for the Budget Bureau which this year is estimated to be \$1,043,980, you have probably got a modest, dare I say, conservative estimate of what this Bill would cost to administer because this would not only deal with some alternatives to legislation which now becomes before this House but all; it would not only deal with legislation but would deal with all Orders in Council and you would have to look at all the alternatives in order to comply with this Act. It is a very short Act, very brief and well written and even a layman, such as I, can follow the Member's intent clearly. It is a very wide and all encompassing Bill and I submit, Mr. Speaker, would be very expensive to administer. Albeit, the Member may argue worthwhile in terms of the expenditure but I think it would be well in excess of \$1 million a year. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it involves the expenditure of a significant sum of government funds.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Party):** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, I wonder if I might ask the introducer of the Bill a question. He mentions an economic impact statement. Does he envisage merely a statement by the Government or by the Cabinet as to the potential economic impact of any particular piece of legislation and that's all, or does he envisage something more than that?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't believe I can allow questioning of that nature at this time. I have received some interesting comments and I would appreciate time to look them over and, therefore, I will delay decision on this Bill as to whether it is in order or not.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, may I make one additional comment in rebuttal to the comments made by the Member for Biggar. The Member for Biggar suggests, Mr. Speaker, that the preparation of the economic impact statement is going to result in a draw on the public treasury of something in the order of \$1 million per annum, which is just a lot of nonsense. I say to the Member for Biggar that this Bill could as a matter of fact



save the Government over the long haul many millions and millions of dollars.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't think that is a Point of Order.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH — VOTE 23 cont'd**

Item 23 agreed.

**ITEM 24**

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the Minister of Health if that includes any increases for the medical doctors for the current and upcoming years or if any negotiations are in progress?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Negotiations are based on the calendar year and we haven't started negotiations for the next round, as yet.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, how does that relate then to the increase in allotment that has been allowed for, within the Estimates? In other words, there seems to be an \$8 million increase approximately. Do we have three months of an unknown entity and if so how much has been allotted?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — In the range of \$500,000 to \$750,000 for the three months.

**MR. COLLVER:** — That's, in the three months, an additional \$500,000 to \$750,000 over and above the increase, if you want the percentage increase allotted for the year. In other words that's an extra, over and above the increase. Am I correct in that?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Yes.

**MR. COLLVER:** — What percentage of the MCIC allotment, in this current budget, is allotted to physicians associated with community clinics; what percentage is allotted to physicians in so-called private practice?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — The payments to community clinic doctors are tied in with the final settlement for the fee-for-service doctors so this is merely an estimate at the present time and will be adjusted at the time when we know what the actual settlement is for the fee-for-service doctors.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't quite follow the Minister's line of reasoning. It is my understanding that the community clinic doctors are not paid on a fee-for-service but are paid on a global budget arrangement and surely the amount allotted to the community clinic physicians can't be deducted from the total. The other is the estimate for the fee-for-service doctors, surely we can come up with a figure in that regard.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Chairman, \$2,059,000 to the clinic and that is tied in with the fee-for-service settlement. We don't know what the

fee-for-service settlement is; it is adjusted on a formula when we arrive at the fee-for-service settlement.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Are you suggesting, Mr. Minister, that over and above the global budget arrangement there is also a fee-for-service arrangement with the community clinic physicians?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — No.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, would the Minister please explain those statements then to this Assembly? If they are on a global budget arrangement then you know how much you are allotting to the community clinics in Saskatchewan for the forthcoming year, surely.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I stated previously the figure is \$2,059,000 and that is an estimate. It is based on a formula which will be tied in to the final settlement when that's arrived at with respect to the fee-for-service doctors. It bears a relationship.

**MR. COLLVER:** — So in other words the Minister is saying that the settlement for the last three months of this fiscal year has not been reached with the fee-for-service doctors. Therefore, if I am correct, the Minister has allowed between \$500,000 and \$750,000 in the totality of the allotment for MCIC, for the total settlement that might be reached in the last three months of this fiscal year with regard to that contract. Am I correct in that? The Minister is nodding.

Then presumably we could deduct the \$500,000 to \$750,000 off the total and that would be the total amount that would be allotted, as an extra, both to the community clinic doctors and the other doctors. Is the Minister suggesting then, I believe there are four community clinics remaining in Saskatchewan, that the total allotment of the physicians under MCIC for the fiscal year under review is \$2,059,000 excluding that additional \$500,000 to \$750,000. Is that correct?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — The \$500,000 figure, that we have suggested, is the adjustment figure which would cover, not only community clinic doctors, but fee-for-service doctors. The \$2,059,000 is the estimate for the cost or the payment to doctors in community clinics.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Right, so what I am really getting at Mr. Minister is an attempt to ask you, what is the average payment per physician under the community clinic allotment or estimate? How much are you allotting under your budget for fee-for-service doctors?

If you have the statistics, I would appreciate if you would break it down by general practice on the one side and specialist on the other. In other words, what is the average payment to a specialist in the community clinics and what is the average payment to the general practitioners; what is the average payment to the specialists in fee-for-service; what is the average payment to the general practitioners under fee-for-service.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Usually since 1976 the average MCIC payment per physician, I am not talking about community clinic doctors and I have to take into account the overhead expenses that are charged as well in terms of that global budget, was \$42,263. That is arrived at through the MCIC payment per physician of \$63,395, less overhead expenses estimated at thirty three and one third per cent — \$21,132.

**MR. COLLVER:** — The total is \$63,395, is that correct?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Average MCIC payment per physician, yes.

**MR. COLLVER:** — What was it per physician altogether or for fee-for-service physicians?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — The average MCIC payment per physician on fee-for-service was \$62,100, less again an estimated overhead expense of \$20,700, average \$41,400.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Do you have any breakdown in those figures between specialists and general practice?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — The average for family practitioners in 1976 was \$56,300; the average for all specialists was \$72,300; the average for all physicians was \$62,100, which was the figure I gave you previously.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Could the Minister inform me, are there any specialists practising in the three community clinics in the Province of Saskatchewan today?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Yes, there are.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Is there any possible way to tell us the number or to have a breakdown of the allotment, approximately?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — We think we can get that information for you. We haven't got it at the moment. We are saying that the relationship between the community clinic doctors and the fee-for-service doctors and the specialists in the clinic and the specialists outside would be roughly comparable. We can provide that for you and will do so.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Yes, if that is true, one could calculate that very quickly just from the statistics that you have given us so far. It would only take a moment to do that. I wonder if you can tell me, how many specialists and how many family service practitioners are associated right now with the three community clinics in the Province of Saskatchewan? That should be information readily available.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — There are 31.25 full time equivalent physicians in

those clinics. I don't have the breakdown with regard to specialists but we will get that for you.

**MR. COLLVER:** — You just don't have the specialists here tonight.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — We will get it for you.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Yes, but we will be finished with it by the time you get it, that is the trouble. What I am trying to come to, Mr. Minister, is the relationship, eliminating specialists, between the payments under the global budget to the family service physicians within the community clinic system relative to the payments under MCIC to fee-for-service family service physicians. I believe, if memory serves me correctly, that the number of specialists practising under the global budget through the community clinic system, is very, very small relative to the total of 31.25. I believe that is correct, but I don't want to be misleading. Unless we have that statistic we can't relate the numbers. That is the problem.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Sorry we can't get it for you immediately.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Minister I wonder if it would be possible for us to stand this Item for a few moments until such time as one of your officials may possibly pick out the number of specialists, or look up this statistic for us and just relate the payments under the one system with the payments under the other?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — I am sorry we can't give you a reliable answer this evening.

Item 24 agreed to.

## **ITEM 25**

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, I had hoped that the Minister would stand that Item. I would be more than happy to go out and get our telephone books and work this out ourselves and come back and inform the Minister tonight. It will only take a moment or two with only three community clinics.

Our questions pertaining to this Item would be pretty much the same barring perhaps the odd question or two, in terms of the awards to SHSP and how the Government influences the different allotments to the different hospitals. But, perhaps, to start with this Item: what allotment under SHSP is awarded to the community clinic system in the Province of Saskatchewan? What is that for?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — The gross payments, budgeted by SHSP to the clinics in the current budget, is \$2,121,600.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Would you tell me what items that is for?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — That includes everything except physicians' salaries,

lab, x-ray, physio, social services, optometry, nursing, etc.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Minister, I'm sorry, everything except physicians' salaries; I wouldn't imagine that it would be included since you've allowed, already this evening, a third of the allotment to physicians for overhead and expense. What I'm asking you is, what does the \$2,121,000 cover specifically within the community clinic system? You must have that broken down, so much for physiotherapy, so much for lab, so much for x-ray, surely.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Well the global budget for the community clinics was built up from a base a few years ago and has been adjusted since then in terms of increasing costs, etc. We can't give you that; we could get the financial statements of the community clinics for you, if you wanted those. We have no breakdown in terms of all those individual items that you mentioned.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, do you not, line by line, budget the community clinics under the global budget system?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — We had a line by line budget in the base year.

**MR. COLLVER:** — What was that base year?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — 1972.

**MR. COLLVER:** — What's the base year for the Regina General Hospital?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Currently 1976.

**MR. COLLVER:** — So what you're saying, Mr. Minister, is that you update the base years for the hospitals in the Province of Saskatchewan, but you are not updating the base year for the community clinic system. Why not?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — The hospitals are on a four year cycle, in terms of the last base line, for arrival at their global budget and the most recent one that was set up was for 1976. Community clinics will be done again next year.

**MR. COLLVER:** — So it's on a six year cycle, is that correct, Hon. Minister?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — No, five.

**MR. COLLVER:** — From 1972 through 1978 is five years?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Six years is fine with me, if that's what you want to call it.

**MR. COLLVER:** — So the community clinic system then is on a six year base period, and the hospitals are on a four year base

period and the total amount allotted to the community clinic system in the Province of Saskatchewan for three community clinics is \$4,180,000. Is that correct? Are there any other payments by the Government of Saskatchewan under the Department of Health or, in fact, any other department to the community clinic system, grants of any kind whatsoever to add to that total?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — No other grants payable to community clinics. SHSP is allotting \$2,121,600 and the other estimate is \$2,059,000.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Just one further thing, that's \$135,000 per full time physician. Am I correct in my mathematics there?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — No, you are not.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well \$4,180,000 for 31.25 physicians in total comes to around \$130,000, my mathematics is not that wrong. You multiply then, Mr. Minister.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — You are forgetting about all the other employees. There are 100 or more other employees in the community clinics.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Minister, as the Minister well knows, there are other employees of fee-for-service doctors as well, who also employ ECG technicians, for example, and nurses and receptionists and nurses aides and so on. What I'm saying is that there are 31.25 full time physicians associated with the community clinics and the payments by the Government of Saskatchewan to the community clinics on a global budgeting system is over \$130,000. Is that not correct, per physician?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Chairman, the fee-for-service doctors are paid on a gross basis, with one-third allotted to cover their overhead. The community clinic doctors are paid on the basis of two-thirds of that gross, to cover overhead in the clinic. They have some additional services that aren't available in the average fee-for-service doctor's office at all. A computation is made to cover that overhead.

**MR. COLLVER:** — No, I think, Mr. Minister, you are bantering numbers around and you have provided us this evening with the numbers; I'm not providing the numbers. You said that the allotment is \$2,059,000, out of MCIC for community clinic physicians. You said, furthermore, that the allotment under the SHSP was \$2,121,000, for a total of \$4,180,000. You said there were 31.25 full time physicians associated with the community clinics. This number of \$130,000, in excess of \$130,000, is the gross payment if you want, per physician, to the community clinics under the line by line budgeting scheme or the global budgeting scheme. You also said this evening that some \$62,100 was the average payment in Saskatchewan for fee-for-service physicians.

Now the purpose for this entire line of questioning is to ask you, Mr. Minister, whether or not you would think that those figures would indicate that your line by line budgeting method of calculating payments by the Government of Saskatchewan

for health services is working? In our assessment it doesn't appear to be working at all. It costs you twice as much, as we see it, it costs you twice as much to line by line global budget, as it does on a fee-for-service basis. Perhaps the Department of Health should be examining and studying the possibility, rather than continuing to expand its global budgeting techniques to apply to more and more agencies, that instead it might contract those agencies to work on a fee-for-service basis. Such as, for example, the hospitals in Saskatchewan might be much more happy with a fee-for-service type arrangement between the hospital system and the Government of Saskatchewan, rather than the line by line budgeting and we might find ourselves with a far lower cost of providing health care.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — If you take the \$2,059,000, take off one-third for overhead, which is what the computation is based on, you come out with \$1,440,000. You divide it by the 31.25 full time equivalent doctors and your cost is \$46,000 per doctor.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry the Minister is using that statistic to make us somehow believe that the Government of Saskatchewan is issuing a cheque to those physicians for some \$44,000 when, in fact, everyone knows that is not true. The Government of Saskatchewan is issuing to the community clinics, under this budget, a total of \$4,180,000. Is that not correct, Mr. Minister?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — It's not going to the individual doctor. It's going to the full program of the community clinic.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Okay, Mr. Minister. It's going to the full program of the community clinic, yet the Government of Saskatchewan, your department, refuses or appears to refuse, and this is the second year in a row I've asked these same questions, to calculate for the people of Saskatchewan or for this Assembly or for the other Members or maybe even for itself, refuses to calculate what extra services are provided by the community clinics and what is the cost of those extra services, compared to the services provided by fee-for-service doctors. Here's a prime example of global budgeting versus fee-for-service. Both are allotments by the Government of Saskatchewan. In so far as the statistics, you refuse or won't or can't or, for some reason, won't even bother to calculate the additional services and what the cost of those additional services are that come out of the \$4,180,000 provided to the community clinics. If you take out those additional services from the community clinics, we are then prepared to divide the 31.25 physicians into that resultant number. We'll find out whether that compares favorably to the \$62,100 paid under fee-for-service. What we're suggesting Mr. Minister, is that this particular calculation indicates that your global line by line budgeting system appears not to be working. It appears to be costing the Government of Saskatchewan twice as much, when you calculate the payments on a line by line global budget as it does when you calculate the payments on a fee-for-service basis. Perhaps you might be looking at reducing the amount of line by line budgeting and global budgeting that you do and allot more of the funds of the Government, through the Department of Health, on a fee-for-service basis. That is our suggestion. Now if you would like to calculate what the extra services are and what they cost, we'd be happy to readjust

our thinking, but at this point in time, that's what you have told us. Community clinics providing medical services to patients, on global line by line budgeting, costs over \$130,000 per physician. Fee-for-service physicians are paid \$62,100. What else are we to believe?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that general practitioners' offices do not supply laboratory or radiological services, physiotherapy, optometry, nutritional counselling and home nursing, as the clinics do.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Minister repeatedly today and I asked him repeatedly last year, what is the allocation by the Government of Saskatchewan for these additional services? First of all, the Minister in his own words today suggested that the community clinics have more than general practitioners. Now he wants us to believe that the community clinics are only family service physicians. First of all he says there are specialists in the offices, then he says it's a family service practice and we should compare it to family service practitioners — either one way or the other, Mr. Minister. These are multi-facility clinics, we realize. There are also mother multi-facility clinics in the Province of Saskatchewan, and one could calculate how much it costs them per physician, I'm certain. What we're asking the Minister to do is to give us a cost of how much those extra services are, allocated by the Government of Saskatchewan. That's all.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything about general practitioner services in the clinic. I said compared with general practitioner services, the clinic provided laboratory and radiological services, physiotherapy, optometry, nutritional counselling and home nursing, which most general practitioners' offices would not supply. And we can get the financial statements from the organizations and cost them out and make estimates in relation to 1977, now other than that, I can't give you any more figures.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Would the Minister undertake to provide to this Assembly what it costs the Government of Saskatchewan, through the community clinic system, for the extra additional services provided by the community clinic system and then deduct it from the total allotment to the community clinic system in order that we can have a number to compare to the fee-for-service physicians?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Yes, we will make every effort to do that but we cannot do it right now.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Will the Minister provide us a date or a day by which he will have this calculation made in 1978?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — As soon as we can, I can't state any specific date.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Will it be before the end of this Session?



**MR. ROBBINS:** — I don't know when this Session will end.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Will it be before the end of next week?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — As soon as possible.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the Assembly should recognize precisely what the Minister has said here this evening. He will not obtain this information for us. Let's recognize what he said . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! I could do with a little less assistance here. Let's try and cover this Estimate.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, perhaps we will just go back over it again. Mr. Chairman, we have asked the Minister to provide us with some information so that we can compare the global budgeting system with the fee-for-service system. Surely this is an important, no, an urgent matter, because of the tremendously increasing burden of health costs in our province because of the cutbacks that are necessitated by these tremendous increases that are seriously affecting the people of the province. For that reason we suggest that it is a very meaningful statistic and one that the Department of Health should be looking at immediately, prior to establishing a budget, because there may be huge savings in the health care system in Saskatchewan by going to a fee-for-service type allocation for various services rather than a line by line global budgeting allocation. There are built in inefficiencies in the line by line global budgeting style of budgeting that the Department of Health is presently using for all of these organizations. Here is an opportunity to compare both. The Minister, perhaps, has not refused but certainly will give no time as to when he will provide this information to the Assembly. He is asking us to approve a budget, asking us to approve an allocation on behalf of the people in excess of \$100 million without providing us with the kind of information that we need urgently to make the kinds of decisions that have to be made for the provision of health care in our province.

Now we are asking one more time, Mr. Minister, will you provide this information within the next week or so, a week or ten days or give us a time limit, so prior to the totality of voting on the total budget we will have an opportunity to compare those two statistics?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Chairman, one of the problems we have with the Member for Nipawin is that he twists things. His statement the other day that we have had huge cutbacks in expenditures of health budgets is totally wrong and he knows that. We have had huge increases in health budgets consistently, year after year. Insofar as community clinics are concerned, the Hastings Report and the Canadian Medical Association, represented in the presentation of that report, recommended the use of community clinics. We are doing some experimenting, I suppose, in the Province of Saskatchewan as are Ontario and Manitoba with respect to community clinics. I said we would get you the information as soon as possible. I can live with a week or so but I can't guarantee you that you will have it in ten days.

That's all I am saying.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, will the Minister provide this information to this Assembly before the final vote on the Budget?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — I will supply it as soon as possible. I don't know when I can get it for you.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, therefore, the Minister is refusing to provide the statistics in any reasonable length of time.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — No, I am not.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to address this question to the Minister. Are you suggesting that three community clinics' financial statements that you are going to obtain and analyze, three financial statements, would take your huge Department of Health more than a week to analyze and come up with an answer to my question?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — If they had nothing else to do, obviously it wouldn't but they have many other things to do besides answering a lot of the misrepresentations that you bring before this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, is there any official or department of Government, the Department of Finance perhaps, that might be prepared to give a commitment to have one or two of its employees spend about six to eight hours analyzing those three financial statements to come up with a meaningful answer to my legitimate question?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Hire management consultants for the job.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Agreed?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, no it is not agreed. I have asked another question, is there any official of Government who would be prepared to give an answer? I will ask the Minister of Finance. You have accountants in your department, would you provide one employee for a period, a very short period, to analyze these three financial statements so that a commitment could be made to provide this information to this Assembly?

**MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether that information is available to the Department of Finance.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, would the Minister of Finance provide the employee on loan to the Department of Health?

**MR. SMISHEK:** — I don't know whether one would be available.

Item 25 agreed to.

Items 26 to 31 agreed to.

Vote 23 agreed to.

Supplementary Estimate agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:50 o'clock p.m.