

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature
55th Day

Monday, May 9, 1977.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE YUKON

MR. SPEAKER: I have some special guests I should like to introduce to the Assembly today from the Yukon. In order to properly introduce these guests I believe it is important to provide a bit of background since the Yukon and Saskatchewan do have something in common.

Canada acquired Rupert's Land in the north-eastern territory early after Confederation. The first administration of 1869 was created by The Temporary Government Act and applied to a great deal of the West including Manitoba, Alberta, parts of Ontario and Quebec, the Northwest Territories, as well as the Yukon and Saskatchewan. The gold rush in the Yukon of '95 was responsible for setting the Yukon aside as a separate territory. While the Yukon has some similar problems to Saskatchewan, I think the scarcity of population is one that we both have and it is even more readily evident in the Yukon.

The Hon. gentlemen that are here today are Mr. Jack Hibberd, the Deputy Speaker, Mr. Walter Lengerke, who is one of the Members of the Assembly, Mr. Dan Lang who is one of the Members of the Assembly as well. I will ask those gentlemen to rise in the Speaker's Gallery and be acknowledged by the Members of the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: They are here as a working delegation in exchange with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of this branch. I know and hope that their stay here will be interesting and informative to them.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) Mr. Speaker, with you and other Members of the House I would like to welcome a group of students from Massey School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Carla LaFrance and Mrs. Ware, and chaperons, Mrs. McLennon and Mrs. Yoke. I am sure all Members of the House welcome them here today and we hope that your time in the Legislature will be informative.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE YUKON

HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI: (Minister of Education) Mr. Speaker, if I may, I too would like to extend a welcome to the Hon. Dan Lang and the other Members from the Government of the Yukon Territories to our Legislature. I had the privilege of having dinner with Mr. Lang and meeting with Dr. Hibberd as well. I found our conversation very interesting. We share a lot of common concerns and I hope by the sharing of ideas and sharing of experiences that together we may be able to assist each other in meeting some of the problems we commonly share.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. A. ROBBINS: (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my word of welcome to these gentlemen from the Yukon. I have met Dr. Hibberd before at the Health Ministers' Conference in Fredericton. I hope their stay is enjoyable and that they enjoy the afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

WESTERN PREMIERS' CONFERENCE

MR. E. C. MALONE: (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I am not sure if the Premier is intending on reporting later on the Western Premiers' Conference, but if he isn't I would like to direct this question to him now.

Before the Premier left to attend this conference, we in the Opposition asked him to undertake to do a number of things at the conference and the Premier was good enough to give us the assurance that he would. In particular we were asking about the possibility of a common-front approach by western Premiers to the Government of the Province of Quebec and my question to the Premier, was this matter discussed and are you in a position to report to this Assembly at this time as to what if any decisions were made?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) Mr. Speaker, the matter was certainly discussed and a high degree of agreement on the type of approach which should be used with respect to the Government of Quebec was achieved. Doubtless there will be differences in interpretation but essentially we agreed that in our judgment it would be unwise in the restructuring of Confederation to let it be thought that western Canadians would agree to any proposal involving independence for Quebec followed by a customs union with what remains of Canada. We agreed as four premiers of the four western governments as now constituted to reject an proposal that would involve independence for Quebec followed by a customs union with the rest of Canada. It was further agreed that it was appropriate to co-operate with the new Quebec Government on matters of a strictly governmental or administrative nature while at the same time making clear our opposition to the PQs separatist aims.

I think those were two statements which were agreed upon with respect to the new Government of Quebec.

MR. MALONE: I notice the Premier is holding a statement and it may be that you are going to give it later in the day and if that is the case I can reserve comments until that time. Was that your intention?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement to give. The rules make it a little difficult since the rules preclude the Member from asking me questions on the ministerial statement following my giving of it; alternatively I can give it in the Question Period but it will take about five minutes. I would be happy to either give it in the Question Period and have it extended for five minutes on that account or alternatively to accept questions following the ministerial statement but I am clearly in your hands, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to proceed with that particular ministerial statement at this time?

MR. MALONE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could let the Premier give the ministerial statement at the appropriate time. I believe his Estimates are coming up today and that may give us an opportunity of asking further questions.

PREMIER'S VISIT TO ATLANTA

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Indian Head-Wolseley) Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to direct a question to the Premier. I understand from news reports this morning and I am sure that all of us are delighted to hear the Premier is getting an opportunity for an early holiday, that he is journeying to Atlantic City tomorrow and I would like to ask the Premier the purpose of his visit south and could he indicate just whom he is going south to see and if he has any specific objectives in mind in that visit?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the news report but if it said I was going to Atlantic City, it is incorrect. That is the place where the new gambling laws are to be tried, and I think they are not my idea of how to make a living. So I am going to Atlanta and I am leaving on Thursday to speak to a group of business people on Friday in Atlanta. I will also be meeting with PCF staff there. It is a group of customers and potential customers of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and other businessmen in the Atlanta area. I think it is fair to say that Atlanta is becoming an increasingly important city in the United States mostly because of its business and its political impact. It is useful in my judgment to speak to a business group in Atlanta. I had hoped that the Session would be over when I made that arrangement and I still hope it will be. My purpose is to speak to the business group and I will be returning early next week.

MR. MacDONALD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Premier's

rather disastrous, if I might call it visit to China last year for the purpose of selling potash and potash sales this year are down rather dramatically, I wonder if the Premier believes that this is the correct technique to attempt to sell potash or to encourage Saskatchewan business on a political level rather than on a business or a sales level and whether he sees that this particular trip will be more productive or fruitful than his year ago visit to China?

MR. BLAKENEY: Well I can only hope that it proves as productive and fruitful as the trip to China. I noted recently the Government of South Korea and Canpotex to once again purchase 100 per cent of its potash requirements from Canpotex. If I thought that the potential potash customers of Atlanta would fill their requirements 100 per cent from Saskatchewan, I would be more than delighted.

I think that the nature of business is that it requires primarily sales by business people, salesmen, people of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. That task is reinforced by political leaders giving statements as to the general framework in which the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and indeed all of the corporations within Saskatchewan public and private operate. My predecessor, as premier, made numerous speeches in the United States, talking generally about the failures of socialism. It seemed to be the same speech. I tend to vary my script from time to time. But presumably he felt that these were worthwhile. I note that the Premier of Alberta is off to the Soviet Union and to Greece and to the Arab countries. I am sure he feels that that trip is worthwhile. My much more modest perambulations about the world, I tend to hope, will produce something for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

METRIC MEASURING SYSTEM — GRAIN

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK: (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister in light of the fact proposals are before the Federal Government to withdraw the sections of the federal Bill requiring the grain industry to use the metric measuring system, would you, Mr. Minister, now reconsider and withdraw Order in Council 578/76 of April 20 until such time as a proposed committee to hear the views of farmers has been completed and a subsequent report submitted?

HON. E. KAEDING: (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, I believe the Order in Council which is referred to is an Order in Council put forward by the Attorney General, which deals with Land Titles. All that Order in Council does as far as I am aware is to require that land titles offices stamp on the land titles document the measure in metric. It doesn't require any business to be done under the metric system; it doesn't require hectares for sales or anything like that. It simply puts the metric measurement on document, so that in future when metric becomes used in Canada, metric conversion will be there.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CONFEDERATION

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) In view of the fact that very shortly the Ontario Government had planned a conference on Confederation which was to have been political and to some extent non-political, would the Premier be prepared to indicate to the House an intention to establish an advisory committee on Confederation to advise the Government and perhaps bring perspectives to the approach which your Government takes on the Confederation question which are outside of the rather more narrow perspectives that necessarily flow because all of the people involved at this point are political and not just political but all of one particular political party?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, in the light of subsequent events in Ontario, the plans to make their conference non-political may well be suspect in some people's minds. Whether or not the non-political nature of the planning was there from the beginning I think is open to a good deal of question.

The suggestion that we have some advisory committee certainly has some merit but I don't want to commit myself to it. I would like to examine what the practice is in other provinces and whether or not this idea has found itself adopted by any government across Canada. This is not to suggest that we shouldn't do it because no one else has done it, but I would like to take a little counsel on it before I indicated any response to it.

MR. MERCHANT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier in that same area be prepared to consider establishing special funding perhaps within the Department of Culture and Youth, with the aim of building Saskatchewan and Canadian spirit, special funding for projects which would make people in this province better appreciate what we are as a province with the ultimate aim that would make us better able to deal with the problems and assist in dealing with the problems that Confederation faces now?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member has given an excellent description of what the Department of Culture and Youth now does. I think in the last five or six years, since the establishment of the department, we have seen a great flowering of cultural endeavours, particularly those where we have emphasized the different ethnic cultures which we have, English, French, German, Ukrainian, Polish and the rest. We have seen a great flowering of this. It is my view that we can only strengthen Canada by emphasizing our diverse roots emphasizing the pride which each of us has in our own racial, cultural and ethnic background, but emphasizing at the same time that we are all Canadians, with a devotion to one country united from sea to sea.

I think the Department of Culture and Youth has done an excellent job on that. Coming up very shortly is Mosaic '77 which will have this as its theme (one of its themes) and I think almost the entire budget of the Department of Culture and Youth (at least that devoted to the culture end) is at least indirectly devoted to that same purpose.

GENERAL MANAGER — SEDCO

MR. R. H. BAILEY: (Rosetown-Elrose) Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Last day the House was in session you received questions during Question Period about the new position with SEDCO, namely the General Manager, and a question came forward as to the name. At that particular time you informed this House that you would not be making any further statements until a press conference later on. Mr. Minister, that same afternoon the press obtained the name of the new General Manager. Do you not consider your actions to be a little bit shameful as far as ignoring the Opposition of this House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear'

HON. N. VICKAR: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Speaker, I don't think I did anything that was contrary to tradition. I knew that there would be a press release. I wasn't aware that that press release was ready for that afternoon. When I was questioned in the House that morning, I did not have the press release in front of me. However, the press release, I was told, at noon or shortly after, that the press release was coming forward that afternoon. I made the statement to the press out there during the time the release was made.

MR. BAILEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I recall during this Session, I believe it was the Premier who indicated, Mr. Minister, that it would be good advice and he suggested his Government would be following a particular pattern where major events such as that would be made in this House. I just want to add one further question, Mr. Minister, was the name of the new General Manager released to the press at the press meeting or was it released to the press in this Assembly prior to the press statement?

MR. VICKAR: There has been no press conference. The press conference hopefully is slated for tomorrow morning with Mr. Flynn, the name of Mr. Flynn was, I think, given to the House that afternoon because it was already announced on the radio, first thing in the morning. I did give that name to the press in my press conference.

MR. MERCHANT: A supplementary. Would the Minister not agree that his comments sound somewhat incredible in light of the fact that a very full report was carried in the Leader-Post which appeared on the street at about 11:00, one hour after you had answered questions. And though many Members of the House have a great belief in the miraculous abilities of the Leader-Post, some of us believe that it was printed some hours before you answered the questions.

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Speaker, again I will have to say what I said a moment ago that it was knowledgeable first thing in the morning; some Members had heard it. I don't know where that came from. I don't know how they got the information. It was not released to the press until the afternoon. I have no further comment.

OPEN MEETINGS FOR ENERGY CONFERENCE

MR. S. J. CAMERON: (Regina South) I would like to ask some questions of the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer), but in his absence perhaps the Government House Leader can designate someone to respond.

With respect to the Energy Minister's Conference coming up on Wednesday, I am wondering firstly, what Saskatchewan's response has been to the request of Ontario and Manitoba to have the meeting open to the press and public, which I understand the Federal Government is prepared to do and is seeking the views of the provinces?

MR. A. BLAKENEY: (Premier) Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the request. I can expect that we have given the response which we have given so often in the past, that we would not insist that the Conference be closed, far from it. We generally favour open conferences, but if the general feeling among the provinces was the other way, we would also accede to the idea of a closed conference. We have had some open Energy Conferences in the past that were quite satisfactory so far as the Government of Saskatchewan is concerned in the sense that people all across Canada were made more aware of the issues involved. I don't think much was solved during the conference portion of it, but conferences have many purposes. Generally speaking, while not knowing what the Minister may have said, and I underline that, our general position is that we have no objection to an open conference. However, we will accept the view of the majority, whichever they prefer.

MR. CAMERON: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If it seems likely that we are looking at an increase in the price of oil of about \$2 a barrel, which would take it from \$9.75 to \$11.75, in view of the fact that that would mean an increase in the price of gas in Saskatchewan of about 7 cents a gallon, and about 6.2 cents a gallon for home heating fuel, can you give us an assurance that between now and September 1 when those price increases would take effect, you will seek some mechanism to shield Saskatchewan consumers from those two price increases?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I have to say that I cannot give the Member that assurance. The arguments used consistently and by everybody for higher energy prices are that only in this way can consumption be conserved, or reduced, and that our supplies be conserved. Clearly to the extent that governments shield consumers from the effect of increased prices, then the objectives of conservation are thwarted. We, in this province, have not been pressing for higher prices. We put forward once again our proposal that prices be maintained at their current level and that in exchange for that arrangement the Federal Government make certain tax concessions, and that any increase in price, the entire amount of any increase in price be deposited in an Energy Security Fund and used for finding further energy resources in Canada. That position we put forward in 1974 and we have put forward consistently since that time. It has not found favour with the Federal Government.

They have rather wished to rely upon higher prices as their method of conserving our energy supplies, and the efforts of the private sector in exploration, as their method of getting greater supplies in hand discovered. We don't think that either of those methods are particularly effective but since they are the ones selected I think that it would be inappropriate for us to attempt to negate any efforts which may be made at conservation along the lines outlined by our National Government in its national policy.

FACILITIES AT CREIGHTON

MR. G. N. WIPF: (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) A question to the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, since the DNS came into being, the people at Creighton used to receive a fair amount of services from Flin Flon and a few of the concerns up there are, and I shall name a few here and ask on them; Senior citizens' residence is the DNS planning now on building a senior citizens' residence in Creighton, due to the fact that the one in Flin Flon has burned down and we do have some Saskatchewan residents without a senior citizens' home up in that area?

HON. G. R. BOWERMAN: (Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan) Mr. Speaker, the municipality of Creighton has only within the last 10 days I believe, agreed to receive their services from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, Municipal Services Branch, and so any decisions that were made with respect to Municipal Services or housing or other programs in Creighton, previous to that 10 day period 10 days ago would have been made through the Department of Municipal Affairs, or through the Saskatchewan Housing Program or other programs related to the southern administration of those programs. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan believes that now they have requested the services through the Department of Northern Saskatchewan that we will be able to provide, with equal degree, the kinds of services they have previously received through Municipal Affairs.

MR. WIPF: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to do with Creighton again. I also understand that there is no high school in Creighton and the high school kids have to go to Manitoba for their high school education. Is the DNS planning to put in high school facilities in that area — a town of 1,700?

MR. BOWERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think there has been any request by the local school board at Creighton for that.

MEDICAL PROFESSIONS ACT — BILL 51

MR. E. C. MALONE: (Leader of the Opposition) A question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier would clear up some of the confusion that is going on presently in the House, and in the public, about the fate of Bill 51, the Bill to amend The Medical Professions Act. In the Premier's absence as he no doubt has been advised we were left with the clear impression that this Bill is going to be withdrawn. We are now

advised that it is still before the Law Amendments Committee. My question to the Premier is, is the Law Amendments Committee going to be allowed to proceed with this Bill and have it moved through there to come before this Assembly before we adjourn?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the source of the confusion. The Bill has at all times appeared on the Blues as being in the Law Amendments and Delegated Powers Committee. I took the precaution of having a transcript of my remarks at the news conference and there are two references to it. These were in the context of what bills would or would not be likely proceeded with. I talk about Bill 51:

And if there are serious misgivings about it, and I am now convinced that there are, I think that we will certainly have a second look at it. It is quite possible that Bill 51 will not be proceeded with.

That's the first reference to it. Later on I said:

I think our position is firstly not to proceed with it at this Session, and secondly, whether or not we proceed with it in the future will be determined later.

We certainly have made no decision to go ahead at the next session. We just have to take a total relook at it to see whether, because of the strongly felt concerns such as that, we should give it another overhaul. And I think that states the position fairly well. We have been impressed with the representations made, both in the Committee and outside, that there are some concerns about Bill 51 which we hadn't fully taken into account. We are taking, what I have called in my news conference 'a second look at it', and that's where it stands. We, as a Government, are in a process of 'taking a second look at it'.

MR. MALONE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Premier give me some idea just how long this second look is going to take, whether it is going to be looked at today for the second time and then some indication being given to this House, or is it going to be looked at after this House is adjourned?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, we will obviously be looking at it as soon as possible. The pressures of the House have prevented us from having a Cabinet meeting since . . .

MR. CAMERON: Didn't prevent decisions though we notice.

MR. BLAKENEY: . . . but such is the nature that biting comment by the Member for Regina South. No, I think we are obviously going to look at it as soon as we reasonably can. I can't give you an assurance as to when we may reach any further conclusions.

STATEMENTS

WESTERN PREMIERS' CONFERENCE

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) Mr. Speaker, I rise to give a brief report to the Legislature on the Western Premiers' Conference which was held

May 9, 1977

in Brandon, Manitoba, on Thursday and Friday of last week.

As you know the Premiers of the four western provinces now meet on a more or less annual basis to discuss matters of common concern. Our discussions are invariably congenial and informal, frank and productive.

Much of our time, in Brandon, was devoted to federal/provincial relations and the state of Confederation. The Premiers received and released the report of a task force which had been established at last year's conference to examine federal moves into areas of provincial jurisdiction. The report is a lengthy one and detailed study of federal/provincial tensions in a number of policy fields, including resources and communications. The conclusions and recommendations reflect a high degree of consensus among the four governments.

The Premiers expect that the report will contribute toward a lessening of friction in some of these areas and we hope that it will be possible to arrange discussions between federal and provincial officials to consider their report in detail.

As you know from press reports the Premiers had a long and vigorous discussion on the state of Confederation. I believe our communiqué on this subject is a significant contribution of the ongoing national debate and one of the most important achievements of our meeting.

The western Premiers have made it clear that in considering a restructuring of Confederation, they reject any proposal that would involve independence for Quebec, followed by a customs union with what remains of Canada. In our view it is imperative that the people of Quebec, before voting in a constitutional referendum, have a clear understanding of the view of western Canada on that proposal. At the same time we have recognized that the problems of Confederation cannot be solved within the current status quo. We have, accordingly, committed ourselves to the pursuit of changes, revisions and accommodations, designed to ensure that our federal system will be more responsive to the needs of all Canadians and the legitimate aspirations of all parts of the country.

The Premiers also agreed that it was appropriate to co-operate with the new government of Quebec on matters of a strictly governmental or administrative nature, while at the same time making clear their opposition to the PQ Separatist.

Another matter I raised with my fellow Premiers, the possibility of a joint study to determine the likely effects on western Canada of Quebec separation, as I indicated last week that I would. It was felt, and I don't disagree with this conclusion, that such a study would be inadvisable; that it would lend undue credence to an outcome that was both undesirable and at this point, unlikely.

A number of other subjects were discussed on which I shall report very briefly.

On agricultural matters agreement was reached with respect to further co-operation in agricultural research and interprovincial committee of officials was established to co-ordinate planning and action that may be required as a result of drought conditions in western Canada. The Federal Government was urged to amend the proposed Competition Act to make clear that

agricultural marketing boards are exempt from its jurisdiction.

The four Premiers issued a joint statement on trade and tariff policies and agreed to continue co-operative efforts to secure benefits for western Canada in the current round of multilateral trade negotiations and through the pursuit of bilateral agreements.

Since 1974 the four western provinces have made three joint submissions to the Federal Government with respect to the current gas negotiations.

The Premiers and Transportation Ministers had a very useful private discussion with Chief Justice Emmet Hall on the report of his commission on the grain handling and transportation system, which will be released one week from today. You will understand that I am not at liberty at this time to comment on the report itself.

In addition, in the transportation field, the Premiers issued a statement outlining common concerns of the four provinces with respect to proposed amendments to the National Transportation Act, rail passenger services in western Canada, ports policy, a number of air policy matters, one or two other items.

This statement that I now give to the House, has necessarily been brief and selective. I am tabling copies of the communiqués which were issued, as well as a copy of the Report of the Task Force on Constitutional Trends. You may be interested to know that next year's conference will be held in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table copies of the communiqués issued by the conference at Brandon, together with the report of the western Premier's Task Force on Constitutional Trends.

MR. MALONE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier, before he takes his seat, would indicate whether he has copies of those to send over to the Opposition.

MR. BLAKENEY: I don't have them right here. Sorry, I will get copies of the press releases and I hope a copy of the report of Constitutional Trends.

MR. MALONE: Mr. Speaker in just replying briefly to the Premier's statement, I suppose by the very nature of it, it must be general and not be too specific in its contents because of limitations of time we have in the Assembly.

Let me firstly say that I certainly welcome once again the statement that these conferences prove to be useful and that they are conducted in a cordial way, as indicated by the Premier. I welcome, as well, the statement about the approach to the Government of the Province of Quebec. However, I wonder if perhaps at future conferences or a later date, the Premier would indicate what positive initiatives, if any, the Minister discussed about future dealings with the Province of Quebec?

As I say I welcome the statement that the western Canadian Premiers would not accept the sort of customs union that has been proposed by Mr. Levesque's government and I welcome, as well, the statements where they have rejected other suggestions. I think,

however, that it is time for governments of western Canada to take it a step further and not only react in a negative way to suggestions coming from Mr. Levesque, but to study reacting in a positive way and coming up, hopefully, with some bold new policy initiatives from the governments of western Canada, directed to Mr. Levesque and his government.

There was general reference made in the Premier's remarks to discussions of this nature, but nothing specific. I hope later in the day, during the Premier's Estimates, to perhaps question him more closely on that. By and large we welcome the statement of the success of the meeting and we hope that the meeting next year will be even more successful when it is held in Regina.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Speaker, just two comments. First of all I should like to welcome the comments made by the Premier in view of the concern that we have in western Canada about the future of Confederation. I want to assure the Premier that there is little wonder that with representing an NDP Government that there is some concern, not because I think that anyone in the province doesn't trust the Premier of this province, but because at the same time as the Western Conference was going on, almost simultaneously, some 197,000 united steel workers seemed to be putting forth the idea, in Winnipeg, that Quebec should not only have the right to leave Confederation, but some are even discussing that it may not be a bad idea. I would hope that the western Premiers, two of them representing NDP Governments, would use their influence to make sure that this type of thing does not come out of western Canada.

I have a few comments which I should like to make, as well, during the Estimates of the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order! I think I should just take a moment to mention to the Member for Elrose (Mr. Bailey) that some of the material he brought in was extraneous and debatable and you noted the instant reaction from the people across the way about that.

POINTS OF ORDER ON QUESTION PERIOD

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I, and I do it with some reluctance because I don't want to be picayune or nitpicking, I wanted to explore with the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Mineral Resources, some questions about the forthcoming conference of Energy Ministers. I put to you, Mr. Speaker it is topical because the issues will be discussed again nationally, on Wednesday of this week. Secondly, it is of broad importance to all the residents of Saskatchewan because it affects every one of us.

Mr. Speaker knows that I asked one question and was given one supplementary. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is standard to give a Member two supplementaries and when a question is particularly topical in importance, it is, indeed, to extend it to three supplementaries and I was wondering why, Mr. Speaker, you limited me to one supplementary with respect to the complex questions of that variety. I wonder, for the purpose of determining how, in the future, I can get two or perhaps three supplementaries in respect of issues of real importance and broad concern.

MR. MERCHANT: Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order can I just make a brief remark because I know that Mr. Speaker will get up and say I told you in advance that you would have one supplementary. That is the area that I hope to address myself to at some point.

I suggest to Mr. Speaker, that it would be more appropriate if Mr. Speaker listened to a question and reply and then decided even though having said one supplementary, or last supplementary, if it were clear that something of import had developed, that Mr. Speaker, might then permit a further supplementary. I can't for instance, imagine four or five supplementaries to one question and I can't as well imagine a questioner being sat down, after having asked the first supplementary or, indeed, no supplementaries whatsoever. What I am really suggesting is that establishing sort of iron clad rules around the asking of supplementaries, might be easier for Mr. Speaker, but would be of less value to the House and less value in terms of getting information from the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: I try not to establish any iron clad rules on the number of supplementaries.

With regard to the Member for Wascana, I would have to review the material that he used in his question, but it was with regard to an advisory committee on Confederation. Oh, you weren't referring to yourself, you were referring to the Member for Regina South.

I will deal with the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) and the original point raised.

The Member began by asking whether there would be an open or closed conference. At the time I didn't regard that as that important or that urgent and then he slightly switched the topic to what he speculated would be, or he was asking the Government to speculate on what its position would be and I thought it was slightly hypothetical, however, I allowed him that supplementary, which was slightly different from the original question, which I thought was not that important, but, however, be that as it may, I think the Member was quite at liberty to come in later with a question, to get back on the topic that he wanted to pursue. Now it may be that the time intervened at this case, but I know that Members have brought the subject later on another question. The judgment I made with regard to the supplementary, as it was being fairly general and speculative or hypothetical at this time. However, I didn't prevent the Member from sharpening it up a bit and bringing it back in later.

SECOND READINGS

HON. E. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill No. 110 — An Act to amend The Condominium Property Act, 1968.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill proposes an amendment to The Condominium Property Act, 1968.

When the original Condominium Act was introduced by the then Attorney General, Mr. Heald, it was a draft that was adopted from legislation that existed in other provinces. The Attorney

May 9, 1977

General, at that time, admitted that the Act would, because of the techniques that were developing in construction of condominiums, need attention and updating.

Other jurisdictions as well as the Province of Saskatchewan have been studying the present Act. As a matter of fact in one jurisdiction there is a very careful and detailed study being undertaken of The Condominium Act and how it applies and the construction techniques that exist. This is being undertaken in the Province of Ontario.

We had hoped to bring The Condominium Act before the Legislature in its new overhauled presentation, but we ran out of time and we had hoped to have the experience of all of the other provinces as well as our own experience before bringing the Act before the Legislature.

Meanwhile contractors and developers, in Saskatchewan cities, want to proceed with a certain type of complex condominiums by stages. The present legislation will not allow contractors or developers to construct this type of housing on a by stages arrangement.

People who approached us, the contractors, developers, the landlords, property owners, predicted that as high as 500 such housing units were being held up because of the present clauses in the present Condominium Act. With the shortage of houses, housing in this province, we considered it necessary and realistic to introduce these amendments to a system and to make it possible to undertake the type of condominium construction that they were requesting.

This Bill does a number of things. First it permits condominiums to be built by stages on one piece of property. It provides for a recognized interest that can be sold or mortgaged by the purchaser when the project is in its first phase. This legislation allows for an extension of time to complete other phases of the same project if time is needed. It protects owners of one phase from future or charges on another phase located in the same property. It provides for a bond by the developer that will be procured in a prescribed manner. This is set out in the legislation and the penal bond must be delivered to the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments, based principally on the Alberta legislation, allow the developer to retain effective control over those portions of the property required for future development. In addition they provide financial protection for purchasers of units in the early phase to ensure completion of the entire project.

We contend, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill will help alleviate the housing shortage. It is not controversial. I urge all Members to support Bill 110, which proposes an amendment to The Condominium Property Act.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, just a very few comments on this. The official Opposition is going to support this Bill. It makes eminent sense that condominium construction or any housing construction or development be done in stages and to insist by legislation that it be done on the whole very often will lead a condominium or any developer to withdraw or to hold back the development until he feels at such time as the entire development can be sold.

Thus, the major thrust of this amendment makes it possible for condominiums or developers to construct their condominiums or their houses on a stage by stage development process.

We think this is good and we will certainly support the Bill.

MR. H. LANE: (Saskatoon Sutherland) We also will be supporting the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed of the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that **Bill No. 104 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act (No. 2)** be now read a second time and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Ham.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 16

Malone	Anderson	Ham
Wiebe	Larter	Berntson
Merchant	Bailey	Katzman
MacDonald	Lane (Qu'Appelle)	Wipf
Cameron	Birkbeck	Lane (Saskatoon Sutherland)
Nelson		
(Assiniboia-Gravelbourg)		

NAYS — 25

Blakeney	Matsalla	Feschuk
Bowerman	Robbins	Tchorzewski
Smishek	MacMurchy	Shillington
Romanow	Mostoway	Vickar
Messer	Whelan	Skoberg
Snyder	Kaeding	Nelson (Yorkton)
Byers	Dyck	Allen
Baker	MacAuley	Koskie
Lange		

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 25

Blakeney	Matsalla	Feschuk
Bowerman	Robbins	Tchorzewski
Smishek	MacMurchy	Shillington
Romanow	Mostoway	Vickar
Messer	Whelan	Skoberg
Snyder	Kaeding	Nelson (Yorkton)
Byers	Dyck	Allen
Baker	MacAuley	Koskie

NAYS — 16

Malone	Anderson	Ham
Wiebe	Larter	Berntson
Merchant	Bailey	Katzman
MacDonald	Lane (Qu'Appelle)	Wipf
Cameron	Birkbeck	Lane (Saskatoon Sutherland)
Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg)		

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON BILL NO. 98 — An Act to establish a
Traffic Safety Court for Saskatchewan.**

Section 1 agreed.

SECTION 2

MR. J.G. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Chairman, I expressed to the Attorney General my concerns about the use of the Justices of the Peace as opposed to magistrates and judges of the Magistrates' Court. Is there any reason that the Attorney General could not amend the definition of traffic justice to include judges of the Magistrates' Court should the situation arise that perhaps you can have individuals who are judges of the Magistrates' Court without one coming back to the House and secondly, giving yourself the flexibility which I would prefer?

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion has some merit to it and we have considered it. However, we basically decided to stick with the proposal as it is on the strength of the recommended course of action by the Special Committee of the Legislative Assembly. I keep in mind that this is only a private project although it is a comprehensive Bill, which part of the project, if it works, may be expanded to the province and at that stage in the game we may very well have some cross kind of jurisdiction allowing our magistrates to be involved in this matter. For the time being, since the matter will only be operative in Regina, I am prepared to stay with the lay justice approach and if that doesn't work to come back to the House and try and justify it. I feel I have to do that in light of the Committee recommendation, justify the reason for expanding it for the possible involvement of a full time magistrate. So I think the Member has a good point but at this stage of the game I am prepared to gamble and go with the lay matter on the basis of the report.

MR. LANE: Do you have any individuals in mind for the traffic justices?

MR. ROMANOW: The answer is, no, to that.

MR. LANE: Will it be formally advertised or what is your intention?

MR. ROMANOW: I don't think it will be advertised by way of newspaper advertisements, you know the kind that we say, but it will be advertised in the sense that we are talking about it now. Quite clearly I would like to have a person who has a demonstrated good layman's knowledge and interest in traffic law. The

whole concept behind this thing is to have a person who does not look at these things legalistically. I know your concern for which I share many misgivings, I say publicly and that is in finding such a person who is so unconcerned about legalistic matters that the purpose of the court is thwarted that way. However, there are safeguards. There is the appeal mechanism and, of course, we do have the idea of the pilot project. So I am confident that it can work and that's the basis of the structuring and no advertising. Hopefully we'll get a large number of people recommending this.

MR. LANE: One final question. It is stated to be a pilot project. Will the Attorney General undertake, before it becomes a permanent structure, to bring the matter before the Assembly again so that we can bring our possible concerns that may develop and would the Attorney General be prepared to make that undertaking?

MR. ROMANOW: Yes, I think I can undertake that. I hope that I don't forget it if the matter is being expanded but I am sure that if I do Members will bring this to my attention because there will be time during the Estimates. I am sure during the next year we will all be watching with interest how this experiment operates. So I fully expect that there will be an opportunity either through you or through me to debate this thing further one year from now.

MR. E. ANDERSON: (Shaunavon) Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Attorney General what is the reason for Section 2 of Section 5?

MR. ROMANOW: Perhaps I could answer it this way. The basic bylaws of Wascana Centre and the basic bylaws of urban or rural municipalities, you will note, say with respect to this Section deal with "prohibiting, regulating or controlling the parking or stopping of motor vehicles". What we wanted this court to do was not to be bogged down with people who are disputing parking tickets or stopping tickets. Those are the two kinds of limitations that are put on that. We want this court to deal with driver attitudes, I mean actual driving skills, driving approaches, defensive driving if you will, that kind of an attitude based on actual Vehicle Act infractions — driving without paying attention or speeding or whatever the infraction is. Now the seat belt law is passed in principle, and accordingly our thought was that we would have to limit the parking type offences. Otherwise we could be flooded with all kinds of additional charge which really defeat the overall purpose of this Bill.

Section 2 agreed.

Sections 3 to 5 agreed.

SECTION 6

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, what are the reasons for number six. Can you enlarge upon this?

MR. ROMANOW: Well, Section 6 really is one of the most important if not the most important Section because it outlines the powers of the traffic justice. What it does, and this is the experimental

nature of the court, it allows the justice to sentence an offender to a form of penalty, I use that word in quotes, which deals with trying to deal with driver habits. You will note under 6(1)(b) that the justice may impose on the person a fine or penalty but suspend that fine or penalty and direct that person to attend a driver improvement program which is approved by the Cabinet. Now you will note that the Saskatchewan Safety Council has driver improvement programs, defensive driving. They are one week courses or couple of day courses. Presumably Cabinet after passage of this Bill would say this is an improved driver improvement program, Saskatchewan Safety Council Driver Improvement Program. Having so approved it, a Justice of the Peace could, in any one particular case say to the driver, "I am sentencing you to a \$25 fine, plus costs, but I am not going to take this driver improvement program which has been approved by the Cabinet." I mean as an approved program, we don't have to approve it all the time but as an approved program, "and I want you to pass it and upon a certificate of having successfully completed that program I am going to absolve you from payment of the fine." That is part and parcel of the entire philosophy of this Bill which is to get a driver to come before this court out of the thinking that the only thing that is required is a simple payment of the fine. It really is a re-direction of style, re-direction of attitude, perhaps an upgrading of driving skills.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, in Section 1 of Section 6, it would appear that the people enforce this law. It says, "notwithstanding any other Act or law in force". Does it supersede all other Acts, laws enforced by their own will?

MR. ROMANOW: The answer is, Yes, but keep in mind it is within a fairly limited jurisdiction. This judge will deal with basically Vehicles Act offences but not be empowered to deal with any criminal code driving offences which are of a much more serious nature, an example being, driving while impaired, or dangerous driving under the criminal code. That will have to be dealt with by a fully trained magistrate, lawyer, in the normal traditional way. We could expand and give, and we hope to if this thing proves successful, to the magistrate these kinds of sentence alternatives as well. But for the purpose of this Bill we are talking only about Vehicles Act offences and therefore notwithstanding any of The Vehicles Acts for this experimental project if the guy comes before the traffic justice, Section 6 applies. You can have this kind of a situation that I have described take place on an experimental basis.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, would the Attorney General tell me if weight restriction offences would be under these magistrates as a Vehicles Act offence?

MR. ROMANOW: I refer the Member to Section 5(1)(d) above. "A traffic justice may try any person who is charged with (d) exceeding the maximum weight specified in a permit issued to him under Section 65 of The Highways Act." So the answer is, Yes, to your question.

MR. ANDERSON: Then, Mr. Chairman, if I read this correctly, under the weight restriction Act these special justices would be empowered to put any fine they want, notwithstanding any other Act or law in force in Saskatchewan prescribing a fine or penalty

for the offence. They could override anything put in there.

MR. ROMANOW: No, because the Justice of Peace is limited to the level of fines that he can place by virtue of the statute which sets out the penalties for excessive weight. In other words, he can't. "That the notwithstanding" does not apply to that. The "notwithstanding" says, "notwithstanding the fact that you are only limited to paying a fine I can also direct you to a driver improvement or I can waive you paying the fine", something which if they didn't have in this provision they wouldn't be able to do and the guy would be mandatorily obligated to pay the fine; we have no option there. What this does is it doesn't allow him to pile on penalty on to penalty. He has to follow the statute. What it does, it gives him a sentence alternative namely not collecting the fine if the guy takes a driver improvement course or whatever the approved training program is. It doesn't add additional fines, if I can put it in that sense; it gives him, in a way, a more lenient approach to the offender because he can say, if you take the course successfully I am not going to ask that you pay the fine. So the overall maximum penalties and of that penalty structure which all the truckers know about, that still remains. The only thing is that the magistrate, the JP now has some flexibility in his sentencing.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the Minister explain that for the purpose of not overloading the courts with traffic fines for stops, illegal parking, why he would bother putting in the exceeding the maximum weight limit which is certainly not a driving offence as he put it, a rational responsibility in the operation of a vehicle. It would fall surely under the same thing as a parking violation. It is not dangerous driving that you are trying to prevent with overloads. I am curious why he put this specific thing with the weights and with the parking. It just doesn't make sense to me.

MR. ROMANOW: I think the Hon. Member has a fair point. In the make up of this Bill a number of inputs of advice are received. It is a judgment call. I don't feel particularly hung up about this. On the recommendation of the officials of the Highway Traffic Board we felt that this was certainly of a higher calibre, the exceeding weight limits than the simple parking violation thing. We didn't want to exclude too many things from the court. We didn't want to add too many things to the court either. It was a judgment call of where we draw the line. I think you make a fair point that one could perhaps as easily knock out subsection D of subsection 1 of Section 5 but in our judgment and based on representations from the officials of the Highway Traffic Board, I concurred that it was something a little bit higher and a little more important than the simple stopping or parking. So that is the reason that that was in.

Section 6 agreed.

SECTION 7

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the Attorney General. What is to prevent the driving conviction record of the person appearing before the court from coming into the hands of the judge prior to his making a determination of whether the person is guilty or innocent of the charge that is made against him?

MR. ROMANOW: I think the Member has raised a good question. The answer to this is that I suppose, in a nut shell, there is nothing in the black and white of the law which would prohibit the type of thing that the Member raises in the black and the white of the law as is printed here. And I think accordingly he raises a good point. The way that it is drafted assumes that in the operation of the court, the record, when it surfaces, will be in the hands of the court clerk and the officials surrounding the JP and not forwarded to him prior to the determination of innocence or guilt. I would say, or at least venture the opinion, that if indeed, the record found its way into the hands of the JP before that determination of innocence or guilt and therefore could be shown to be part of the deliberation process and perhaps even prejudicial to the activity of that JP in finding innocence and guilt, that of course, that person would be subject to, or could be subject to some form of superior court review, some kind of a superior court review perhaps by the prerogative rites. I am not sure whether it would apply there but that may be a possibility. The other thing, of course, is that there is the appeal mechanism which is available to the full member of the Magistrates' Court at a subsequent date if it comes to line. I guess what I am answering is that I just don't foresee that happening in the day to day world of practice. If it does then there is this remedy available and that if it appears that is a situation we would have to come back to with some kind of remedial wording.

MR. CAMERON: Well, it gives me some concern as a matter of fact. If you were here dealing with people that were judges as distinct from Justices of the Peace, I would feel better about it. But here we are dealing with Justices of the Peace many of whom don't have legal training. Most of them don't. Secondly, the bulk of them don't have experience in the courts. They don't, for example, even know that the long-standing tradition of the law is not to look at a record of an accused until after the determination on the question of guilt or innocence has been made. As a matter of fact, I rather suspect what will happen here is when a charge is laid in a case that is to come before a JP, he will requisition under Section 7 which gives him the power to do so, a copy of the conviction record of the accused and that will come to him and be drawn to his attention before he determines whether the person is guilty or innocent. You say one has the right of appeal, but that isn't very effective either because imagine how that works. Suppose you, the Attorney General, have three convictions for driving without due care and attention. You are charged again without due care and attention. If the judge has in his possession your record the likelihood is that he will be prejudiced against you and not decided on the narrow question of whether you are guilty or innocent but take into account those previous convictions.

If he does that you have a right of appeal, fair enough but how do you appeal? You appeal to a magistrate saying that the judge took into account my record prior to making a decision of whether I was guilty or innocent and you, of course, have to disclose in your notice of appeal that you have a record. That is the kind of information, which you know is a long-standing tradition in justice that we have not given to judges or juries in advance of the determination of guilt or innocence. So what I should like to see us do is to stick in a section which would clearly draw to the attention of Justices of the Peace that they are not to look at that record until after

they have made their determination of whether the person is guilty or innocent.

MR. ROMANOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Hon. Member to withhold such a proposal at this time. I have already said to the Member for Qu'Appelle that this is an experimental operation and I am sure that one year from now we will be in a better position to know how serious that kind of a situation that you raise proves to be. I would make two comments in support further of the request that we hold it off for a year.

One other comment that I overlooked in making — at the time of your initial question was that, of course, this person or persons will be subject to the direction of the Chief Magistrate, Judge Ernie Boychuck, who is a trained person and who does know the judicial responsibilities of not only the magistrates but of the people in this regard. I fully expect that there will be a set of directives or operative directives, or some kind of rules set out which will cover this particular poi in practice over and above everything else I say.

The other comment I would make, and I stand here to be corrected by my colleague, it has been a little while since I have practised, but it seems to me that on subsection 5 on page four, on a simply de novo that needs to be stated on the notice of appeal, is that I simply appeal, period, no reason need to be stated on this area. I just simply put a notice of appeal filed, just say that the judge erred in a law or whatever the reasons are and that is it. The new person has to hear it on the basis so that the de novo application doesn't necessarily necessitate a revelation that the conviction was based on the receipt of the record. So I would ask the Member that we see how this thing goes for a year and if it presents a problem, I would be more than in agreement with them to move the appropriate amendment if that becomes a problem. I don't think it will in light of the comments I make.

MR. CAMERON: It is something I don't like to let go by but I am prepared to sort of, as you invite me to do, sort of set aside for a year and we will see how it works, but would you give me an assurance that as a minimum, it will be in either a regulation or a directive to Justices of the Peace? That in respect of the requisition of these records of convictions they understand that they are not to use those things. They are to remain sealed until after they have determined whether the person is guilty or innocent. If guilty they look at the record; if innocent they send it back or never look at it again. If that could be done by way of regulation or directive it would relieve my concern to some extent.

MR. ROMANOW: Yes, I will give the Member that undertaking and we will give you a copy of either the OC or the directive from the Chief Judge the moment that it is done.

Section 7 agreed.

SECTION 8

MR. CAMERON: I have a more serious concern, I think, with respect to clause 8. Bear in mind, that under this Act, Justices of the

Peace would be trying some fairly serious situations and understand I support generally what the Attorney General is here doing.

But for example, under Section 5, a Justice of the Peace would be trying these charges: speeding at high rates of speed, which draws a pretty severe penalty; driving without due care and attention, which is another one that can have some fairly serious consequences, both in terms of not only the offence being committed, but the insurance question as well — the question of liability. So they are trying, from time to time, some fairly serious questions.

Now we have given people the right of appeal. We can apply for a new trial to a magistrate but there is no appeal beyond the magistrate's level and in my view that's far too restrictive. We should give people an additional right of appeal to a District Court Judge. Now if you wanted to cut it off at the District Court Judge level, that's fine with me. I think they needn't have an appeal beyond that, but as a matter of fact, I don't know of a single offence, this would be a first in my view, where you have an appeal only to a magistrate and no appeal beyond the level of the Magistrates' Court.

Now as you know, what will happen if we leave it at this, is you will get a body of precedent developed, a precedent developed by only the Magistrates' Courts with no sort of right of appeal beyond that. So I want in respect of this appeal section to move an amendment, seconded by Mr. MacDonald that:

Sub-section 7 of Section 8, which is the appeal section, be deleted and the following substituted therefor: 7(1) that further appeal from a decision of a Judge of the Magistrates' Court under this Section shall lie to the District Court by way of trial de novo and the provisions of this section governing an appeal in the first instance, shall apply mutatis mutandis to an appeal to a District Court Judge and secondly, there is no appeal from the decision of a District Court Judge made under this section.

MR. H. LANE: (Saskatoon Sutherland) If I could speak to the motion on the floor right now, I think that in terms of the immediate effect, if the Attorney General will recall, judgments of a criminal court can be, if for example there is a guilty plea on a criminal matter, can be taken into a Civil Court at a later date and used as evidence against the person in proceedings on the civil side. Now I am just wondering, without any rights of appeal, if the person should change his mind or if indeed there was a conviction and this came forward at a later date, now I am not just sure how it might get in — I am concerned about the circumstances, there might be some difficulty. Because if you are ruling on a criminal matter, a quasi criminal matter, it is used later on in a civil court and you are taking away any liberty to appeal beyond the Magistrates' Court level, could that not, Mr. Attorney General, create some problems indirectly in the case where for example a criminal proceeding of a minor offence had a bearing on a fairly severe civil case? I am thinking of a traffic violation where there is an accident and a lot of money involved in terms of the civil liability. I am wondering if you have given that any thought.

MR. ROMANOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, again I have a mixed mind on this proposition that is before us. My basic feeling at this stage in the game is to say No to the proposed amendment as it is worded, primarily because of the words trial de novo to the District Court. I am not dug into that either. Perhaps I can be persuaded over even during the course of the discussion here to follow. But my basic rationalization is that the Magistrates' Court is a pretty competent court at this stage in the game. I believe that very strongly. I think that it is like any court it has its strengths and its weaknesses.

It seems to me that if we accept the Member for Regina South's motion, we're almost virtually back in the same situation prior to this experimental Bill being introduced because an accused person, as I understand it, can have three brand new trials. He has a trial at the JP level; he has a trial at the Magistrates level and he can have another trial at the District Court level, all on the same charge. And the whole function of this court was to, while not doing away with individual rights, I agree, that what has to be uppermost in this consideration, is that we try and get away with that kind of a rigid operation. Now perhaps maybe what we could do is say in this subsection 7, I am now directing my comments to the Member for Regina South, perhaps we could strike out by way of trial de novo, perhaps put in there — on a question of law and further appeal from a decision of the Judge in Magistrates' Court on this section shall lie to the District Court on a matter of law and the provisions of this section governing appeal shall apply mutatis mutandis or something like that. Then that might be a saw off. It would allow me to say that the magistrates can make the decisions on fact. There would be a further review to the District Court if the magistrate acted clearly contrary to the provisions of the law or exceeded his jurisdiction or something of that nature. I don't know how the Member for Regina South would react to that, but maybe we could saw off on that.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, as a matter of fact, I think that you make a reasonable point. That is to say, I do believe that as a matter of fact. You do have a trial before the Justices of the Peace, you have a new trial before the magistrate. Where I differ from you is where you would limit the right of appeal beyond a judge of the Magistrates' Court. I know that that can be very unsatisfactory in many situations and I think there has got to be an additional right of appeal. If you prefer to limit it to questions of law, certainly I can accept that as being a whole lot better than no appeal whatever and one can make the argument that you shouldn't have the expense of a difficult trial de nova route which means to say that you've got a brand new trial and you go through the whole process again.

I would be quite prepared to accept, as satisfactory to me, an additional right of appeal to the District Court Judge on questions of law.

MR. ROMANOW: Let me try this out on the House. It's rather poor drafting, but I think it will be satisfactory.

I would move that the amendment be further amended: by striking out the words "by way of trial de novo" in the third line thereof and substituting the following therefor "on a

question of law". So that it would read "A further appeal from a decision of a Judge of the Magistrates' Court under this section shall lie to the District Court on a question of law and the provisions of this section governing an appeal in the first instance shall apply mutatis mutandis to an appeal to the District Court Judge, and the balance of the amendment would follow the way it is.

If that is satisfactory, I move that, seconded by my colleague the Member for Kelsey Tisdale (Mr. Messer).

Debate continues on the subamendment.

MR. LANE: I can't recall the first motion. Was there something in the Member for Regina's motion to remove prohibiting any further appeals beyond a certain level?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can read the amendment. It was moved by the Member for Regina South that a further appeal from a decision of the Judge of Magistrates' Court under this section shall lie to the District Court by way of trial de novo and the provisions of this section governing an appeal in the first instance shall apply mutatis mutandis to an appeal to the District Court Judge. (2) There is no appeal for the decision of a District Court Judge made on this section.

MR. LANE: I am not sure what the Attorney General's amendment has added. Is the position you are taking that after the trial at the Magistrates' Court level then a question of law can go right up to the Court of Appeal?

MR. ROMANOW: Go to the . . . court.

MR. LANE: And that's the cut off.

Subamendment agreed.

Amendment as amended agreed.

Section 8 as amended agreed.

Sections 9 to 11 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 74 — An Act to Regulate the Practice of Denturists in Saskatchewan.

Sections 1 to 6 agreed.

SECTION 7

MR. MacDONALD: May I ask the Minister of Health, are you going to do Section 7, subsection 2(a) "defining any word or expression used in this Act but not defined in this Act".

HON. W.A. ROBBINS: (Minister of Health) We agreed to drop that one.

MR. MacDONALD: Was it dropped?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the Law Amendments Committee.

Section 7 as amended agreed.
Sections 8 to 15 agreed.

SECTION 16

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Minister, Clause 16, did we have an amendment in Committee?

MR. ROBBINS: No, it comes up later again I believe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In section (b) there was an amendment, in Clause 16.

MR. ROBBINS: It was a written referral from a dentist, Yes, that's passed. That was in Committee.

Section 16 agreed.

Sections 17 to 25 agreed.
Section 26 as amended agreed.
Sections 27 to 36 agreed.
Section 37 as amended agreed.
Section 38 as amended agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 73 — An Act for the Promotion and Protection of the Health and Safety of Persons Engaged in Occupations. (continued)

Sections 12 to 23 agreed.

SECTION 24

MR. R. KATZMAN: I would like to move an amendment to Clause 24, which would add where the word '10' is to submit the word '20', and I refer to this as the number of employees required in an occupational group before you need a committee. Part of the reason why I am recommending this change is from my own past experience with Occupational Health Committees and areas where they have them. It seems to me that 20 is a better number for that reason than 10 because when you have only 10 members it seems that everybody knows everybody's job and the problem doesn't exist up until you get to the 20 number so I would make the motion that:

Subsection (1) of Section 20 of Bill No. 73 be amended by submitting the word '20' for '10' where it appears in the first line.

The debate continues on the amendment.

HON. G.T. SNYDER: (Minister of Labour) You know this is the first indication. The Member for Rosthern has flashes of brilliance out of the blue every now and again and determines that somehow or another because of a personal experience that he has had that somehow the matter to which he draws attention to is not working properly. We haven't had any indication that number '10' or the number of employees in the industrial plant placed at 10 is too low a figure for the purpose of a proper working of an Occupational

Health Committee which has been of genuine benefit not only to the larger industrial plants but certainly those which have a number of employees from 10 to 20. I would invite the committee to defeat the amendment because I don't believe any case has been made for the increase in the number of employees before it is necessary by the statute to provide for the establishment of an Occupational Health Committee.

MR. KATZMAN: I realize the Minister hasn't been in the work force for many years and doesn't realize what is happening in the work force anymore. I would suggest that if he spent or had his people go out and check with the small groups that I have that have 10, 15, 17, 19 workers. I have talked to about 30 or 40 groups within the city of Saskatoon area that I was able to contact and they suggested to me that because they are so small, 13 or 14 members, the committee is really a waste of time because they are constantly in contact with their problems if there is any developing because everybody knows everybody's jobs. And when I got to the outfits that had 25 and 30 I discovered the opposite problem. They were starting to get a little bigger, and therefore the committee was serving a real good function. There is the reason for the amendment, that the people that are working with 15, 16 and 20 or under 20 employees seemed to recommend that the committee really is non-functionable because they know everybody's job and over the 20 mark or 25 they think it serves a function and that is part of the reason. Also I was informed on one or two occasions that the boss had dropped the company down from 13 and 14 employees down to the 9 so he wouldn't have to have the committee. I don't like seeing that happen. I think we've all known, being involved in Occupational Health, that to find a magic number, you know what is the best number and the people that are involved in the committees seem to suggest 20.

MR. MERCHANT: I would like to say a couple of things about the amendment. I think I agree with the Member's amendment but I don't particularly agree with the reasons that the Member advances for the amendment. There is a difference in quality that Members can easily understand between the kind of operation that has 10, 12, 14 employees and the kind of operation that is larger, 20 plus. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, you could say that level would be better at 25 or 20 or 18; you have to draw the line somewhere. The fact is 10 catches almost every school in the province and the result is that the rural units are bedevilled by these committees which for all intents and purposes in their circumstances are ridiculous committees. To have 10 or 11 or 12 school teachers, 8 school teachers and 4 employees perhaps a teacher's aide, compelled to draw together in an Occupational Health Committee is ridiculous. To have the little companies that operate out of stores to have to draw together in an Occupational Health Committee is ridiculous. What the result is by and large the little stores ignore the legislation completely. I'm advised by the two colleagues of mine who run school unit boards that one just decided to heck with it he wasn't going to organize any of these silly Occupational Health Committees.

The other went through the process, found it a little embarrassing having to go to principals and saying, "Hey, you should get together in our Occupational Health Committee". Spend a couple of weeks organizing it and nobody's heard of

them since because nobody could care less. The teachers clearly know that this kind of thing just doesn't fit their problem, that occupational health is intended for jobs that have some potential for danger, if I can put it that way. Our own office which employs about 12 or 14 people, doesn't have an Occupational Health Committee; we don't propose to organize one. The clerks and the commissionaires that are organized around the Legislative Buildings, if that were a unit, would by law be expected to have an Occupational Health Committee. Ridiculous. Everyone can clearly see that an Occupational Health Committee makes sense when you're working with a group who aren't engaged in sedentary forms of employment. And if you want to make a numerical division you find that by dividing at this higher level 20 you basically get the companies that do something in an active way rather than having all secretarial or sedentary employees of some sort or another.

This is a good amendment, the kind of amendment that will result in less objection being taken by business to an Act which is basically designed to do a pretty good thing. It's the same kind of good amendment that I think we should be passing in Section 33 and I'll address it when we get there, which takes out the criminal sanctions from the legislation. Both are valuable because they try to calm the problems between management and their employees which this Act to some extent exacerbates.

MR. SNYDER: Mr. Chairman, just in reply to some of the suggestions that the setting up and the operation of Occupational Health Committees in schools for example is a matter of the least possible concern to teachers, I think this indicates once again, that the Member for Regina Wascana certainly doesn't have his finger on the pulse of the operation because we do receive the minutes from these people when they have on numerous occasions identified some hazardous conditions which they desire to be rectified.

We're not at all convinced with the argument that the schools are not a proper environment for an Occupational Health Committee. I don't want to prolong the argument with respect to the number of employees required prior to it becoming mandatory for the setting up of an Occupational Health Committee but just to use one classic example, if I might, Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that in the manufacturing industry alone there are 88 establishments which have between 10 to 14 employees for a total number of 896 employees in the manufacturing industry who would be excluded in the event that the amendment by the Member for Rosthern were accepted. There is another group another 53 establishments where the number of employees ranges between 15 and 19 making something like 170 establishments which are presently required to set up an Occupational Health Committee which would be excluded. In this particular category there are approximately 800 employees making a total of 1600 employees that would be now exempt from the requirement to set up an Occupational Health Committee in the manufacturing industry alone. If you want to go into a number of other small industries we can compound that and multiply it many times over but in the manufacturing industry in Saskatchewan alone there would be some 1600 employees not covered, that are presently covered. You can talk if you like about the teaching profession or some other lower risk industries but to accept the amendment which is before us would actually reduce the number of people covered by Occupational Health Committees or involved

in Occupational Health Committees by some 1600. It might be interesting if you like, for the benefit of the Member for Regina Wascana to put on the record a letter from St. Brieux, Saskatchewan to Mr. D. Ramsay, Secretary-Treasurer Humboldt School Unit No. 47, Humboldt, Saskatchewan.

Dear Mr. Ramsay:

On November 1, 1976 we sent you a letter requesting the Unit Board to consider repairing the shower rooms in St. Brieux School. In that letter we specifically requested that the Board look into this slant on the shower stalls which results in stagnant water lying throughout the day and the tiles in the shower room needing to be replaced with ceramic tiles.

We feel the chance of students being injured from slipping on the shower room floor is a factor. Since we have received no response to our previous letter to you we decided that we should get the opinion of a third party and thus we have requested that an Occupational Health Officer come to St. Brieux so that we may get his opinion regarding these two concerns. We would also like to inform you that the furnace and chimney in the kindergarten school are badly in need of repair. We feel that it would be advisable to carry out repair of these items before their condition constitutes a safety hazard.

We trust you will notify the Unit Board of our concerns and they will again consider making the necessary repairs.

Signed by the Co-Chairman of St. Brieux Occupational Health Committee.

This is another of other areas of concern in what the Member for Regina Wascana regards as low risk areas. Occupational Health and Safety in offices is the general heading of this group, health problems, allergic contact, dermatitis and other skin problems, visual strain as a result of unsuitable lighting, inadequate lighting, unbalanced brightness, exhaustion of eye muscles due to greater than normal accommodation posturing or continuous eye movement, shoulder hand syndrome, noise effects and so on.

I don't think I need go on to any elaborate detail except to indicate, contrary to what the Member for Regina Wascana seems to believe, unhealthy, unstable, unsafe working conditions exist in other places outside of the industrial plants such as IPSCO and some of the larger industrial and commercial plants. I suppose we're going a little far abreast and I don't want to continue the argument any further except to assure the Members of the Legislature and the Members of this Committee that the provision of Occupational Health Committees in all plants where 10 or more people are employed has proven itself to be most workable. It has been generally adopted by the other provinces who are looking at the Saskatchewan system and in general terms, the number of 10, while it was an arbitrary figure that has been pulled out of the air, we believe it's still probably the most appropriate figure that we can come up with at this time.

MR. KATZMAN: Mr. Minister, what's the method in a place that has

nine employees if there's a problem? The inspector is called in and he will make a judgment and tell the owner to bring the place into order. So half of your arguments that you're using would be corrected by having an Occupational Health officer come in from the department and all it takes is a person to phone and he is not identified, phone the Occupational Health office to come in and the number 20 for that reason is a good number. I've spent some time researching it. I think it's a solid number. The number 10 as you say is arbitrary and is picked out of the hat. I agree with you but past experience has shown as far as I'm concerned that the smaller places of under 20 employees are not having the problems and when they do have the problems they can call in for assistance from an Occupational Health officer. I would, you know, sort of ask you to reconsider your decision of saying 'No' to the 20.

MR. SNYDER: Just one final word. I think the suggestion by the Member for Rosthern somehow or another, these problems will be solved by virtue of somebody (well you are shaking your head and you don't know what I'm saying yet) — now just listen for rattles and maybe something will occur. My only suggestion was that in the event that no one is responsible, no one is on the Occupational Health Committee then the chances of these problems being identified are a good deal less, that is if there is an Occupational Health Committee in place, one which has the responsibility to have an overview of occupational health and safety circumstances in the place of work and accordingly when someone is designated, it becomes his business and I don't believe that the number 10 is excessive under these circumstances, certainly I believe that to be the most appropriate number at this point in time.

MR. KATZMAN: I think the Minister is totally incorrect on that statement because it takes a person to bring it to the Occupational Health Committee's attention to start with, so how is he saying that the Occupational Health Committee does not go out looking for things.

Section 24 agreed.

Section 25 agreed.

SECTION 26

MR. WIPF: I need some clarification on this, Mr. Minister. If a worker refuses work, or refuses a certain job, the Occupational Health Committee can be called in or the Occupational Health officer and he investigates the matter and then says to the employee, "It's safe to go in there". If the employee still feels unsafe on the job for his own reasons can he then be found guilty of an offence under this Act and have charges laid against him?

MR. SNYDER: The protection that is provided under this particular section is that the employee has a right to do what he believes to be unusually dangerous work until the additional steps that you refer to have been taken. After he has exhausted that right, that is to say to have an Occupational Health officer justify that his fears were real or they were unfounded and at that point in time, he has no longer the protection of the Act. He could conceivably have protection by some other

process in the Magistrates' Court or whatever if it progressed to that stage. The protection afforded him is until such time as he has had someone in a position of authority make a determination as to whether conditions were actually unsafe as he believed them to be.

MR. WIPF: There are occasions and these occasions happened to me where the Occupational Health people have come in and my own peers have said it was safe to do the job but within the individual himself he feels it's unsafe. Now, the individual himself then is putting his job on the line. I guess and as you say the only recourse then would be court to get reinstated and I refer in my case to a job that I was on going out on affluent ponds and in a boat when there's four feet of foam. I absolutely refused to do that regardless of who says it's safe and who says it's not safe. Fortunately there were enough employees around to do the job. However, the employee could be fired for this act.

MR. SNYDER: I would think that in the event that the judgment that the worker made was, in the event that it was not upheld by the Committee, it was not upheld by the Occupational Health officer then I would think that at that point in time he would be placing his job in jeopardy, very likely depending upon the whims of management at that stage.

MR. KATZMAN: Isn't there a — I'm not sure exactly where it comes, in fact, but there's a situation where a doctor's certificate says that you can do everything on the job but one item, say you can't be up on a scaffold more than 10 feet; that's a minor part of your job, and therefore the Act does protect you, am I correct?

MR. SNYDER: There is nothing in the Act that makes any kind of a qualified arrangement for an employee to refuse to do a particular dangerous bit of work because of this specific physical disability that he has that doesn't allow him to be on a scaffold of more than 10 feet in height. I don't know of any provision either, certainly not in the Act, and I don't believe in any of the regulations that make that kind of a distinction. Once again the employee has a right to do a piece of work which he believes to be unusually dangerous until it's verified that it is or is not. He has the protection of the Act. After that point in time he has no protection under the Act. Somebody has to make that judgment as to whether it's an unsafe act or whether it isn't, and this is the appropriate mechanism by which he makes that determination.

MR. KATZMAN: Would the inspector have the right to rule it would be unsafe for me and yet safe for somebody else, saying because of some physical defect or weight or something?

MR. SNYDER: I am not sure at all that I have the question. If the question from the Member was whether the Occupational Health officer had the right to shut down an operation as a result of, well you ask the question again and try to do it as thoroughly as you can.

MR. KATZMAN: An Occupational Health officer,

does he have the right to say that the job is not safe for an individual mainly because he's 300 pounds and it's only safe for an individual to do that job that's 150. Is that one of the discretions or not at all; that's all I want to know.

MR. SNYDER: Obviously if you were protesting work, your partner who is working alongside of you, who weighs 135 pounds might have to do it, and this would without question be a judgment that would have to be made by the Occupational Health officer, that would be within his review, his area of judgment.

Section 26 agreed.

Sections 27 to 32 agreed.

SECTION 33

MR. MERCHANT: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to take the illegalities, to take the criminal sanctions, the right to deal in a criminal way from the legislation. I gather from the attitude that the Government takes that they will be voting against this amendment.

But let me say again that the position, though I am afraid that it falls on deaf ears, there are times, frequently, when am attracted to the view of this Government in terms of things that have to be done to bring business to bay, if I can use that phrase. Frequently I agree with the Government that business has to be contained to the extent that we are assured that business deals fairly with people, deals fairly with their consumers, deals fairly with their employees. The private enterprise system, which I consider to be a great system, has some problems that are inherent to it, the inequality that flows from the strong being able to deal unfairly with the weak. I accept that government has to become involved to equalize those inequalities from time to time.

This Government, Mr. Chairman, always seems to overplay that position. It always seems in its exuberance perhaps to protect the weak and in its exuberance to deal in a harsh way with a group of people who don't ordinarily support them, namely the business community. This Government always seems prepared to draw lines of competition, to have the lines between classes if you can use that word, drawn in as tight a way as they can. And the result of doing that is always that society as a whole suffers. The result of setting one group against another always is that society as a whole suffers.

Now here again is an example of the Government, though they don't need those criminal sanctions, they don't need to have an opportunity to deal so very harshly over an Occupational Health and Safety Act, here again we have the Government jumping in with their hobnailed boots, saying, "We don't like you because you're in business; we don't like you because you produce some thing for the economy and this is the way we are going to deal with you". Government, even though that government may have been elected by a group of people with perhaps a labour bias, with a trade union bias, government still once elected has to govern for the good of society as a whole. And I say that when you have basically good legislation, a good concept — occupational health and safety — that you would do better when that good concept is a new concept to soft-pedal that concept, to try to deal in a gentle ways with business when business or the people from whom

you have to have co-operation, if the system is to work well.

What your attitude always does is it encourages other parties to react against your over reaction. It's true that perhaps to some extent the Liberals and Conservatives have over reacted to your biases, and then you have a system where as governments change, you see the pendulum sort of swinging back and forth. We see the pendulum swing back and forth in the Labour Relations Board, depending upon the government that is in power. We see the pendulum swinging back and forth in other forms of labour legislation, depending upon who's in power. Both are partially wrong. I think that some of what the Liberal Government did, between 1964 and 1971, was wrong. And I think that some of what your Government is doing in these areas is wrong. This is an opportunity, I say, and I know it is sort of bleeding to a group who don't want to see, don't want to see class struggles ended, don't want to see class lines diminished, though that would be better for society, it would be worse for your political party. For your own political aims you go on wanting to see those kinds of class distinctions encouraged.

Well, bringing criminal sanctions to bear on legislation that doesn't need criminal sanction just means that this Act works less well. I move this amendment because I want to see this Act work better. I want to see your inspectors and those occupational Health and Safety Committees and the Government and the management teams work in a greater sense of co-operation.

If you don't pass that amendment I say to you that you don't pass that amendment not because you are concerned about workers, not because you are concerned about the Act working better, but because you are concerned about political gains that you get by trying to maintain these false and unproductive class lines that the NDP almost bases itself upon, and from which the NDP from time to time seems to draw political strength and power.

MR. SNYDER: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that the suggestions from the Member for Regina Wascana are either accurate or very kind. I know that you aren't there to be kind, just fair and reasonable, and that's all we expect. I believe those sort of favours have also escaped you.

I think the suggestion that somehow or another this is intended to be an imposition on business is a reflection of the Member for Regina Wascana's wish to protect the worst of the employers, not the good ones, because they're not concerned; they're not worried about the penalty clause in this particular Bill.

It should be of interest to the Member for Regina Wascana that the other provinces that are making a move in the direction of Saskatchewan are providing for a penalty clause, not unlike ours; you know varying degrees, but in many ways not far removed from our own. We believe that there are probably very few in stances where the penalty clause will be applied in the maximum. It probably will never happen. I hazard that this will be the case. We don't believe, for example, that in Saskatchewan we have a great array of hanging judges. They, I think, consider all of the cases very carefully and it would have to be a very wilful act in order for them to apply the full maximum provided for in the penalty section.

Just very briefly to give a summary of what is being done

in the other provinces, in Manitoba, for a first offence, a fine not more than \$5,000 and an additional fine not exceeding \$1,000 a day for each day during which the offence continues, for a second and subsequent offence to a fine not more than \$10,000 and in the case of a continuing offence, to a further fine not exceeding \$2,000 for each day during which the offence continues Imprisonment under Section 54(3), where a person is convicted of an offence under this Act, in addition to the penalty set out in Subsection 1 and 2, he may be imprisoned for a term not exceeding two years.

In Alberta, for a first offence to a fine not more than \$5,000, in the case of a continuing offence to a further fine of not more than \$1,000 a day for each day during which the offence continues or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to both fines and imprisonment and for a second and subsequent offence to a fine of not more than \$10,000 and in the case of a continuing offence to a further fine of not more than \$2,000 for each day or part thereof, and finally to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to both fines and imprisonment. This is in Alberta.

Just to move along very quickly, British Columbia — to a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or to imprisonment not exceeding three months or to both such a fine or such imprisonment.

And you can go on and on. They provide in the British Columbia legislation for a fine not to exceed \$50,000, so the monetary penalties in British Columbia are considerably greater. The threat of imprisonment under the penalty section is somewhat less.

I don't think I need to go on. I can give some examples. In Ontario and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia under the Industrial Safety Act and the Construction Safety Act, but I think in many instances the penalty section has to be regarded as a punitive measure which will be adjudicated on by a magistrate who will judge the condition on the basis of the seriousness of the offence.

Accordingly I would invite the Committee to turn down this amendment that has been offered Mr. Chairman.

MR. KATZMAN: On the amendment, the key section in 33 seems to be the sending to jail, the imprisonment. Would the Minister consider an amendment or amending the other motion so that you cannot be imprisoned until a second offence — the first offences can be up to \$5,000, the second offence can be up to \$10,000 and after a second offence is where the conviction to imprisonment would be involved. Would you consider that type of amendment?

MR. SNYDER: Mr. Chairman, we just voted on one amendment. I have made all the arguments on the amendment presented by the Member for Regina Wascana that I would obviously make to you in the event that you presented another amendment. However, I am not writing your amendments for you. If you want to provide an amendment to the House, we can debate it at that time.

Section 33 agreed.

Sections 34 to 39 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 95 — An Act respecting Community Cablecasters.

MR. MERCHANT: I suppose I should, in starting, though we oppose this Bill, say that I won't be lengthy as I might have been if I didn't know as a forgone conclusion exactly the direction in which the Government will move and exactly what it will do. And I say to the Hon. Member for Regina Northeast, who was kind enough to pound his table in response to that remark, that I speak so often in this House thinking some of them are men of some learning and understanding and in due course one or two of them will be converted, one or two of them will see the light. And one thinks that if subjected to enough reason, like being in a cloud of germs, eventually one or other of you might absorb some of the logic and come around to some understanding of what is going on in this world. But I note that though their hearing seems, by and large not to be impaired, their functioning between the ears and the brain has some problem and we never convert them. I keep walking out of here every day, Mr. Chairman, and I think 'well tomorrow one of them will see the light about something' and it never happens, Mr. Chairman, and it's a great disappointment. It's the great disappointment of my life.

Mr. Chairman, this Bill, the Minister might say, is not related to cable. But in a very real way it is. Indeed I think that the whole involvement of the Provincial Government in pay television is almost a fluke that grew out of their rather childish fight with the Federal Government over jurisdiction in cable television. The Government initially proposed pay as a ploy, as a red herring, in hopes that they could delay cable television from proceeding and at that time there were a number of red herrings presented to the people of this province and then they become more and more involved with pay and they also found that pay was a means of satisfying the cable co-operatives, that they had encouraged to be established, and the way of saying to people like Mr. Dyck in Saskatoon, well even though you in your soundly thought out NDP ways didn't get the right to cable television in Saskatoon, we've got a way to solve your hard hurt feelings. We can, in part, solve the problem. And I think the Government started down the road towards pay not really because they thought that pay was particularly feasible or desirable yet in Saskatchewan but now they're moving further and further towards the advent of pay television, and we're in this curious situation.

A government that when elected in 1971 did almost everything it could to keep cable television from coming to Saskatchewan all of a sudden is now trying to bring both pay and cable to Saskatchewan both at the same time even though provinces like Ontario which have had cable for years and years, still isn't far down the road towards pay even though the United States by and large isn't far down the road towards pay, even though this Government knows pay and cable together isn't really feasible financially.

Now, what are some of the problems this will create for Saskatchewan people? I'm convinced that Saskatchewan people would prefer to have cable than pay. Cable is about the same expense and includes live sports events. And really it's sports events that motivate people by and large to sign up for additional television coverage into their homes. Pay can't bring them live sports events and indeed won't bring them any sports events at all. But the Government now is in competition on behalf of pay television for reasons that one can only assume flow from

the fact that they want some control over the community broadcasting. The Government in an attempt to ensure that pay will occupy four channels in the VHF spectrum. I've tried to develop that in Question Period, Mr. Chairman, and it's not easy to develop. You have 13 potential channels on an ordinary VHF spectrum, three of those in Regina will be taken by the three stations that we now have. They'll be taken not with Channels 2, 13 and 9 but they'll be taken by the cable company which will bring to us those three channels on channels other than 2, 13 and 9. Unfortunately the fact that 2, 13 and 9 will also be operating in the airwaves means that there will be "ghost effect" which will occupy 2, 13 and 9 as well. So six channels of the 13 VHF spectrum channels will be taken by the existing three stations that we have now, and that will by and large be the case around the province.

Then in addition the cable companies will hope to bring to Saskatchewan three channels from the United States, one of which will probably be the educational channel. In addition the cable companies would hope to bring an alpha omega channel, the channel that tells you the time and tells you whether planes are coming in on time, etc. sort of an informational thing. That lifts us to 10 channels and in addition the cable company is compelled by law to bring a community channel. That brings us to 11. Eleven out of 13. Now what the Government has said is we're going to go in and occupy four channels of the VHF spectrum for pay. We'll have an old movies pay station which will be free, we'll have a prime quality pay channel, we'll have a children's channel and we'll have . . . I forget the fourth. I believe their plan is to have a fourth which will be re-runs of current programs, so that there you will be able to see MASH but you would see it one week late. If they do that they're up to 15 channels, so the question is, who has to get a converter? The converters cost about \$99 to \$100, sold at the retail level for about \$100. The Minister said in the House they sell for \$15. That's garbage and the Minister knows it. They sell wholesale for about \$73 to \$74. Now whether the Government feels that it is going to get into the provision of converters as well, I don't know but even in Ontario, affluent Ontario that has had cable television for a couple of decades, many people don't have converters They can't afford them. They don't want to make that outlay of money. They can't afford the cable of \$7 or \$8 a month. They don't have converters and they aren't then without the converter able to add all the other channels the converter adds to your television set. You go from 13 to far more than 13.

Now I say to the Treasury Benches, this may be something that hadn't been said to you by your Minister, that when pay occupies four of the VHF spectrum you're going to face some problems with your constituents when they discover if they take pay and are encouraged by the Government to take pay and will probably have pay first that it's costing them \$99 or \$100 to get cable. They'd better be told that in advance.

Now the other problem with pay, you're now going to have government getting into competition with the television stations for the purchase of movies, etc. The cost of television has gone up about 50 per cent in the last couple of years and is expected to go on rising at that rate. There are a couple of problems, a couple of reasons for that. Independent networks are now buying programs that the networks have chosen not to buy and they're competing for network programming. The Nixon programming for instance, was not purchased by any of the

networks. The Frost program has been purchased by 150 independents. That ghastly show, the parity on the soap operas that runs here, Mary Hartman, is purchased in the United States by 110 independents. It's not purchased by a network. It's doing very well. And these independents, City Television for instance in Toronto, have contributed to far more competition for television programming and the cost is up.

Another thing that has increased the cost of programming is that in the United States the FCC has passed legislation which the Member, Mr. Thibault might have been considering when he was talking about violence on television, has passed legislation that you can't have violent programming before 9 o'clock at night. The curious result of that has been that 30 per cent fewer programs have been produced in the United States. Because there are fewer programs produced in the United States the cost of programming in Canada is up. Now you're going to have government going into competition for those same movies, those same programs and I'm afraid government goes into competition with very little regard for the cost. That's one of the distressing things about the operation of the CBC. It operates with little regard for the cost. And I'm afraid looking at the track record of this Government that your record is apt to be even worse, in terms of looking at cost when you go into the television business.

Now we feel that government should not be involved in a direct way in the television business. We feel you should not be competing with the television companies that are operating here now. That's the other reason why we oppose this legislation. The legislation will pass a tax on anybody who uses pay television. I understand from the Minister that cable operators will be exempted. I hope that these amendments which I haven't examined and which were just given to me, will make it clear to the industry that the cable licensees will be exempted. But nonetheless you'll have a tax on the subscribers of pay television and curiously that will be an escalating rate so that as you get more subscribers you pay more tax. Well that's a curious thing to do, to punish those who operate well.

The co-ops were formed to express community opinion and two co-ops in this province, the best two co-ops got the licences to provide cable. They will bring community television into their areas. They understand the community problems. But the Government comes along and says, we'll establish something else which will decide what kind of community programming will go into the homes of people in this province and that will be the Arts Board. I'm not saying anything critical of the Arts Board. It's true, however, that the Government maintains the right to do the appointing of who sits on the Arts Board. The Regina Community Cable Co-op, the North Battleford Community Cable Co-op are independent of government, so the Government will have us believe and indeed I believe that the Regina Cable Co-op is completely independent of government.

Why should people of this province have to pay twice for community programming? Why should pay television be able to raise a special tax to provide community television when the people of this province, through the subscription rates for cable television, will be providing the money to bring community programming into the province, and bring it in absolutely independent of government. I'm not opposed to the Arts Board but I don't think that the people of this province should have to pay twice, pay through their cable licensees who have to provide

community programming if they're to maintain their licence, and also pay through the tax that will be levied to maintain the Arts Board community programming level.

I'll tell you the reason why this goes on and the reason why you've had the shilly-shallying over the legislation. I believe it's because the Government wants to keep its hand in. They want to keep some control over what goes on in this very important media. I think that's wrong, and I think people looking fairly at the question will always know that government should bend over backwards to ensure that it is not involved with the media. This Government instead is bending over backwards to become involved to keep its finger in, to meddle in the media. I think that's wrong and I think the people of this province, if the question were put to them in those terms and they really examined what's going on in this dispute, would agree that the record of the Government and what the Government is trying to do is bad on the one hand in terms of the record and wrong in terms of what the Government is trying to do.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON: (Minister of Communications Secretariat) I don't oppose and I'm prepared to answer any questions the Hon. Members may have. But I don't propose to get into an extensive debate with Hon. Members on it. I doubt frankly that there's very much new that I could say on this subject in the House. There is one thing, however, I think in fairness I must say to the Hon. Member because he's raised it with me privately. We considered and at one time had decided to include an amendment which would have specifically exempted any service operated by a cable operator. We have now decided not to do that and I want to point this out because the Hon. Member thought something different when he was speaking. We have decided not to do that because we have been advised by our legal advisors that the legislation does not cover anything done by a cable operators so long as it's within the domain of the Federal Government and our lawyers advise us that it may weaken our constitutional position, if we in the Act exempt anything that a cable operator may do, because we'd be open to CRTC to say, okay now boys, you carry all manner of services that we think of as provincial and the legislation would exempt them from any sort of provincial control. We have been advised not to do that. We have been advised that our Act at this point in time doesn't cover the cable operators or what they are doing now and so we do not propose to go with that amendment. I just point that out in fairness to the Member.

MR. MERCHANT: Could I just ask one question then of the Minister and the Minister, I believe will understand the legal significance of it. In questions, Mr. Chairman, where there is equivocal legislation it is possible in certain court reviews to go back to the statements made by the Treasury Benches and in particular the Minister in charge when the legislation was passed. I'd just like the Minister to confirm that it is not the intention of the Government through this legislation to in any way affect the four cable licensees who currently received licences nor is it the intention of the Government to affect the licensee in Weyburn nor the licensee in Prince Albert and it is not the intention of the Government to in any way bring within the ambit of this legislation anyone who receives the right to carry cable television from the CRTC. If the Minister would just say, Yes, that is our understanding, I think that would be satisfactory to me and I suspect, overwhelming if any court challenge was ever made.

MR. SHILLINGTON: Yes, that is our intention.

Section 1 agreed. Section 2 as amended agreed.
Section 3 agreed. Section 4 as amended agreed.
Section 5 agreed. Section 6 as amended agreed.
Sections 7 to 11 agreed. Section 12 as amended agreed.
Sections 13 to 17 agreed.
Section 18 as amended agreed. Section 19 agreed.
Section 20 as amended agreed.
Sections 21 to 23 agreed.
Section 24 as amended agreed.
Sections 25 to 31 agreed.
Section 32 as amended agreed.
Sections 33 to 45 agreed.
Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL 94 — An Act to amend The Arts Board Act, (No. 2)

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.
Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 32 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970.

Section 1, 1970: Chapter 78 agreed.
Section 2: Section 23 agreed.
Section 3: Section 26 agreed.
Section 4: Section 30(d) amended agreed.
Section 5: New Section 32(b) agreed.
Section 6: Section 33 agreed.
Section 7: Section 37 amended agreed.
Section 8: Section 39 amended agreed.
Section 9: Section 41 amended agreed.
Section 10: New Section 94(a) agreed.
Section 11: Section 97 amended agreed.
Section 12: Section 165 amended agreed.
Section 13: Section 201 amended agreed.
Section 14: Section 202 amended agreed.
Section 15: Section 203 amended agreed.
Section 16: Section 205 amended agreed.
Section 17: Section 235 amended agreed.
Section 18: Section 247 amended agreed.
Section 19: Section 252 amended agreed.
Section 20: Section 317 amended agreed.
Section 21: Section 319 amended agreed.
Section 22: Section 321 amended agreed.
Section 23: Section 366 amended agreed.
Section 24: Section 379 amended agreed.
Section 25 as amended agreed.

SECTION 26

HON. G. MacMURCHY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) I bring to the Hon. Members' attention that

this is the amendment dealing with the city of Saskatoon and the business assessment.

Section 26 as amended agreed.

Section 27 as amended agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 101 — An Act to amend The Liquor Act.

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 102 — An Act to amend The Liquor Licensing Act.

Section 1: Chapter 383 agreed.

Section 2: Section 31 amended agreed.

Section 3: Section 34 amended agreed.

Section 4: Section 36 amended agreed.

Section 5: Section 35 amended agreed.

Section 6: Section 38 amended agreed.

Section 7: New Section 68(a) agreed.

Section 8: Section 101 amended agreed.

Section 9: Section 111 agreed.

Section 10: Section 117(a) amended agreed.

Section 11: Section 117(b) amended agreed.

Section 12: Section 118 amended agreed.

Section 13: Section 121 amended agreed.

Section 14: Section 134 amended agreed.

Section 15: Section 138 amended agreed.

Section 16: Section 141 amended agreed.

Section 17: New Section 143(a) agreed.

Section 18: Section 146 amended agreed.

Section 19: Section 146(a) amended agreed.

Section 20: Section 153 amended agreed.

Section 21: Transitional amended agreed.

Section 22: strike out.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 86 — An Act to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act. (Continued)

SECTION 5 — amended

HON. W. E. SMISHEK: (Minister of Finance) The Hon. Member can withdraw that amendment because we have agreed on another amendment that is acceptable to him.

MR. CAMERON: I have had a chance, Mr. Chairman, since moving the amendment to discuss the issue I raised with the Minister and I think between the two of us and subject to the approval of other Members of the House we have agreed on a course which is agreeable to him and satisfies my concern so I anticipate he will move an amendment in accordance with the discussion we had so I am happy to withdraw my motion for an amendment.

Withdrawal of amendment agreed to.

MR. SMISHEK: I have an amendment. I think a copy has been provided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 5, the amendment to Section 5 reads:

Amend Section 5 of the printed Bill (a) striking out by \$200, no more than \$250 in the second and third lines of Clause A and substituting \$125, no more than \$500 and (c) by striking out \$300 in the last line of Clause B and substituting \$500.

Amendment agreed.

Section 5 as amended agreed.

Section 6 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

The Assembly recessed from 5:00 o'clock until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL — VOTE 10.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) Mr. Chairman, I have on my left in Mr. Romanow's seat Mr. Wes Bolstead, Deputy Minister to the Premier, behind him Mr. Philip Doray, Clerk of the Executive Council, and Mr. Mel Hines, Director of Informational Services. The many valuable public servants there are at the back and they will be introduced in due course.

ITEM 1

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Chairman, I have a few very brief remarks to address to this item and I am sure that the Members will be wanting to participate this evening as well.

Mr. Chairman, it is very tempting to me seeing that these are the Premier's Estimates to spend a good deal of time in reviewing the record of the Government to date. I believe it is appropriate in the Premier's Estimates to do this if we feel so moved, and indeed it is tempting for me to go on at some length about the policy of this Government in connection with the take over of the potash industry which, I believe, and which Members on this side of the House believe, is working as a disaster to the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe as well that the expenditure to date of some \$272 million is almost a fraud on the taxpayer of this province, that it goes to a development that is neither needed or wanted but is only being done to satisfy the dogma of the Members who sit across from me to get their hands on all means of production, whether they be in the agricultural field or in the mineral resources field or in the business field. It is tempting for me to go on at some length about this, Mr. Chairman, although I think that the speeches have been made in the past and it is perhaps not necessary to make them again at this time because most people are aware of them. It is tempting as well, Mr. Chairman, for me to talk about the record of this Government and its legislation at this particular Session where it is shown on two or three cases of proposing legislation or regulations or Government policy that is not welcomed or not even wanted by the people of Saskatchewan. I refer to their expressed policy or non-policy or whatever in connection with weight limits on municipal roads. We are not sure whether that is a policy or not a policy. Some days if the Minister of Municipal Affairs is here it is a policy and some days when the Premier is here it is not a policy. You pick up the newspaper of the

NDP and you find that it is a policy, when you read the headlines there. But I am not going to do that either, Mr. Chairman. It is tempting as well for me to talk about seat belt legislation, legislation that seeks to serve a purpose that seeks to benefit the people of Saskatchewan but which I am sure that the Members opposite are as aware as we are the majority of the people of this province do not want. It is tempting as well, Mr. Chairman, to talk about the record of this Government in the field of the development of mineral resources or the non-development thereof. We have seen in this province since the Blakeney administration took power, and since about 1973 the complete, the most utter collapse of the private oil industry in Saskatchewan, an industry that was supposed to have been replaced by Saskoil and by other Government ventures but which has failed miserably. It failed at a time when the demand for this product, the need for this product is at an all time high, not only in Saskatchewan, but in Canada and across the world. I am not going to dwell on that either, Mr. Chairman.

But I think what is necessary perhaps seeing that these are the Premier's Estimates, the Leader of the Government's Estimates, is to dwell on where we are going and not so much worrying where we have been and where we are now, but where we are going in the future, and I think it is appropriate in these Estimates, Mr. Chairman, to ask a number of questions about this, because it is obvious that the planning and research arm of Government, the arm of Government that is deciding what direction this province is going to take, not just in the weeks ahead or months ahead but in years ahead is directly under the control of the Premier.

We on this side, believe that Saskatchewan is facing an opportunity that it has never had before in its short history.

Members opposite and Members on this side have heard me speak about this opportunity in the past. They haven't responded. I intend on speaking about this opportunity again tonight.

I think the examiners of the resources of this province, outsiders looking at Saskatchewan, must go away in envy when they see all of the things that this province has. We have agricultural resources which we don't have to dwell on because everybody knows the great wealth that we have been blessed with in agricultural resources, from wheat, to all other grains, to cattle, to all sorts of industry under the general heading of agriculture. And, of course, the history of this province has been to depend on that particular industry for its livelihood or to suffer through bad times when that industry is in a state of depression. But since about 1973, 1974, as I say we have been presented with an opportunity by the rest of the world to diversify this economy that has been so dependent in the past on one thing only. We have had an opportunity to develop our potash resources, we have had an opportunity to develop our energy resources, we have had an opportunity to develop our hard rock minerals, we have had an opportunity to develop our timber industry. And I think it is fair to say, without over-stating the case, Mr. Chairman, that this Government has missed the boat. This Government has failed to grasp these opportunities, particularly in the energy resource field. But I am wondering now, Mr. Chairman, and I think many people in Saskatchewan are wondering, is the opportunity going to be continued to be missed. Are we going to sit back and are we going to let the energy resources we have remain under the ground,

and I am not speaking of uranium at the present time, I am speaking of oil and natural gas.

I think that most Members on this side of the House welcome the appointment of the present Minister of Mineral Resources. I think that perhaps we have an inkling for the first time, that perhaps Government policy is going to be changed in connection with the development of these mineral resources which are in such great demand.

The Government in 1973, of course as I have said, crushed the private oil industry. They did so because they were too greedy. They did so because they wanted to take too much of the royalties that would accrue from the sale of those resources. There is no doubt whatsoever that the Government owed a duty to the people of Saskatchewan to take a larger share of those royalties at the time when prices went so high, as the Government of the Province of Alberta did and as governments elsewhere in the world have. But you can go too far, and it is obvious to Members on this side, Mr. Chairman, that the Government went far too far. Ever since the passing of the disastrous Bill 42 the oil industry has died. We have seen now some new initiatives being made by the new Minister of Mineral Resources. In our view they do not go far enough, but perhaps in the future, this is the first step, perhaps in the future, we will be getting other new initiatives that will bring about the development of this key industry to the people of Saskatchewan, an industry that can start the road on our diversifying of our economy. I hope that the Premier will let me know when he replies as to just what initiatives, if any, what plans if any, his department, the Planning and Research Department, within his office is taking in this regard.

At this present time Mr. Chairman, we can combine conservation techniques, conservation laws and at the same time have development. We can be looking for new fields for oil, new fields for natural gas. We have not been doing so since the passing of Bill 42. If we had been doing so the mind almost boggles as to what perhaps we may be enjoying right now in the way of returns to the energy resource fund. Hopefully, in the days ahead we will be seeing some new direction in this regard.

I want to talk about the energy resources fund, Mr. Chairman, and I want to remind the Premier, and I want to remind other Members of this House that that fund was set up for a particular purpose. I can well remember the Premier coming back from Ottawa in 1973 or by this time it may have been early 1974 and reporting on that very significant first Ministers meeting with the Prime Minister to develop a new price for oil in this country, and I could well remember him standing and advising this House, that it appeared we would be receiving many extra millions of dollars for the use and benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. I can well remember him as well saying in his view, and in the view of his government, that the money should be put into a separate fund, a separate fund to be used basic ally for the development of further energy resources in Saskatchewan.

We know, Mr. Chairman, as a result of the Estimates of the Minister of Finance, that only a very, very small percentage of that money has been used for energy resource development. I don't know how much money is in that particular fund at this time, but we know approximately \$105 million was taken from the

fund and put into general revenues because it was deemed by this Government not to be required for the development of energy or other mineral resources. We know as well that the sum of approximately \$220 million was taken from that fund to facilitate the purchase of Duval and Sylvite. We can only speculate as to how much more will be taken if the deal with Alwinsal comes to fruition, if the deal with Central Potash comes to fruition and if the Government keeps on this mad policy of taking over industries.

I want the Premier to be able to explain to us tonight as to when the Government changed its mind and decided to divert these hundreds of millions of dollars from the purpose for which they were originally intended for the development of energy resources, and to take them and to use those moneys to buy something we already own and control. I say, Mr. Chairman, if those moneys had been used properly for the development of energy resources for further development of the North in uranium if the Bayda inquiry decides to allow for the development to proceed, that Saskatchewan will be on the horizon of a new era. Right now we are trying to stay at the same level we were in an old era.

I say that the Province of Saskatchewan can be a better and a greater place to be; it can be a leader within Confederation. If we continue to follow the policies that have been implemented by the Blakeney Government if we continue this mad desire to buy things we already own and control, if we continue to take this money that has come to us from a gift from heaven, our future in this province is going to be bleak indeed.

I think that most of us can only thank God that it started to rain the last few days. We can only thank God that it looks like our agricultural economy is going to be once again buoyant, because I shudder to think what would have happened to the Province of Saskatchewan, if the predicted drought did come to pass, and if we didn't have the agricultural economy to fall back on for next year. I think we all know where we would have been. I think we all know that we would have been facing very serious and indeed difficult times if the farmers of Saskatchewan had not been able to come up with the same income that we have enjoyed in the past few years. So my first question to the Premier — I would like him to tell this House in his view as to where we are going. What are your policies for the future in developing the resources that we have? We know your policy on the potash industry; it's a policy of takeover. What I am asking you is your policy in connection with the other mineral resources that we have. Can we look forward to increased oil and natural gas development in this province as a result of more fair royalty rates to the developers? Can we look forward to the opening of the North if the Bayda Commission should come down with a decision favourable to the increased mining of uranium? Can we look forward to grasping the great future that this province has if we allow at least two of those developments to proceed in the manner of which they should have proceeded the last two years?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to respond to the questions asked by the Hon. Member. I think we start from a somewhat different premise. He believes that Saskatchewan could be a better place than it was and could be a leader in Confederation. I believe it is a better province than it was, and I believe it is a leader in Confederation.

I will deal with as much precision as I can with the questions that he asks. Firstly, with respect to oil, we believe there will be increases in oil exploration. We do not believe that there will necessarily be major discoveries. There has not in Canada been any major discovery of a major new oil field in the southern prairie basin, not in the 1970s. Notwithstanding in the Member's mind ill conceived policies of the Government of Saskatchewan or the well conceived policies of the Province of Alberta, neither have produced a major oil field, so I think it is inappropriate for the Member to suggest that policies of either government would have produced an oil field.

Now with respect we do not by any means give up hope that we can find more oil. With respect to what might be called conventional shallow oil we think that unless we get lucky, these will continue to be small pools of oil which heretofore have not been very economic but as prices move into the \$10 range and more, become economic. And we accordingly expect because of changes in the world price of oil that there will be increased exploration for oil, and I speak now of conventional shallow oil. With respect to deep oil we have to say that is certainly a much less well known area. We can hold out no certainty that there be discoveries. On the other hand because the deep horizons have been less well explored than the shallow horizons, there is always the possibility that we can find a major pool in Devonian or some other deep formation. There has been an increasing interest on the part of a number of oil companies for deep testing, and we naturally hope that one of these will bear fruit. We have earlier reached the conclusion that with natural gas priced at what we felt were unsustainably low prices, it was unwise for Saskatchewan to pump its natural gas, and to use it up when we could obtain natural gas from other places at low prices. That time is passing. We think it is now time for Saskatchewan at least to prove up reserves which have been semi-proven in the past and to explore for new reserves. They will not have gone away in the last three or four years if they are there, and in the meantime we will have used significant quantities of gas obtained from outside our province and have conserved the gas which we have. That policy was reasonably well known, and one can argue about it but I think it was a proven policy. I take it Members opposite feel we should have let us say, drilled out Milk River gas three or four years ago and used it in preference to Alberta gas. If that is so, then we simply have a difference of view as to what the long term best interests of Saskatchewan are.

However, it is now clear that Alberta is reaching the conclusion that there gas is not limitless, and that the day will come when it may not be as easy for us to get permits to transport gas from Alberta as it has been in the past. And we have accordingly announced policies which will encourage the further drilling out of proven, semi-proven gas and exploration for new gas. We think that this will be a timely policy and it will likely produce significant increases in our fully proven reserves over the next number of short years. We are very interested indeed in the prospects for heavy oil, in getting enhanced recoveries of the heavy oil in the ground and getting processes, techniques, which allow the heavy oil to be used for more purposes than is now possible. The problems with respect to heavy oil have never been the absence of the oil in the ground, but the absence of a ready market for the oil or for the products of the refined oil once it has been refined. Buyers in the United States have consistently favoured other oil rather than

our heavy oil. There seemed no pressing reason for us to ship it at lower prices than we felt would be obtained and if we would have shipped it in 1973 or 1974 we would have received \$3 or \$4 a barrel. We can now get \$8 or \$9 a barrel for it, and it seemed like a prudent idea to keep it, and the results certainly indicate that it was a prudent idea.

We have to maintain the industry and it is now operating at a high level. We certainly hope that that will continue and we hope with new processes, both of enhanced recovery and of processes which allow the oil to be used for more purposes we will see a significant increase in the use of heavy oils. It will be known to Hon. Members that we are engaging in extensive research in co-operation with the Federal Government in the private sector along these same lines and that there are tentative, I wouldn't call them plans, proposals for the construction of a plant in the general Lloydminster area which would use new processes which would convert the oil into a commodity which is easier sold than our current heavy oil or the products of the conventional refining of heavy oil.

We accordingly are optimistic about the future of that part of our oil industry in the next five or ten years. I think I cannot give to you the undertakings that the Member for Nipawin did six weeks ago about how there was going to be an imminent announcement. I haven't heard it yet, and I sort of think I won't hear it in the next few weeks. I don't know what imminent is in that description, but it hasn't happened yet.

With respect to other resources, it may well be that current level of exploration for hard rock minerals in northern Saskatchewan does not meet the expectations of the Member opposite. It is as I recall at eight or ten, and I am speaking from memory, eight or ten times the rate that was there seven years ago. I can only indicate that the rate seven years ago was deplorably low. However, there is a great deal of activity in northern Saskatchewan now in the search for hard rock minerals. There are some interesting finds, interesting discoveries of uranium, of nickel and of other minerals. Whether or not they will prove to be commercially viable, depends in part upon future 5 policy decisions on the development of uranium and on whether or not quantities of other than uranium are proved up making it commercially viable. However, I can only be very optimistic about the likelihood of discovering very significant ore bodies in the North. Whether or not that will produce economic activity remains to be seen but I think again optimism would not be ill placed. So I think that the Member sketches a rather gloomy picture of our prospects both in oil, natural gas and hard rock minerals.

I turn now to the Energy and Resource Development Fund. The Member will recall the circumstances under which that fund was set up. It was set up in the first instance pursuant to an agreement with the Federal Government that we would not take money into ordinary revenue and it would not be counted as ordinary revenue for equalization purposes. That was the first deal. Subsequently in the May, 1974, or November 1974 Budget, it's all in your point of view, the Budget that was introduced in May of 1974 and passed in November of 1974, that arrangement was converted into a different arrangement wherein a portion of those extra revenues were counted as ordinary revenue and the remaining portion was not counted as ordinary revenue for equalization purposes. It was at that point when we were going to lose significant equalization payments because we were setting up the Energy and Resources Development Fund that we decided to

compensate the Treasury for an estimated amount of equalization which we would have lost, \$35 million a year. On that basis then, the Treasury was receiving about exactly the same amount of money that it would have received had we not had those extra funds. When I say the Treasury, I mean for ordinary revenue purposes. The amount taken out of the Energy and Resource Development Fund to date is \$70 million. The Member is correct in saying that an additional \$35 million is budgeted in the current year which we are now commencing. Sums which have been expended, I am not sure whether they all technically came out of the Energy and Resources Development Fund for Saskoil would be of the order of \$27 million, and for the Sask Mining Development Corporation, I don't know what it would be but my guess is by the end of this year will be \$25 million or more so they are not insignificant amounts of money going into oil and hard rock minerals, although they are not as large as those going into potash. Sums are continuing to be taken out of the Energy and Resources Development Fund to compensate us for the loss of equalization which we lost because of the split in the extra oil revenue, the split contained in the 1974 Turner Budget which had not been the arrangement when we made the deal in January and March. It will be remembered that there were some words of question, I would say recrimination, but let's call them questions at this time as to whether or not the Turner Budget incorporated into law the arrangement which Premier Lougheed and I thought we had with the Prime Minister. I think that covers the points raised by the Hon. Member.

MR. MALONE: What I had hoped, of course, Mr. Chairman, was something from the Premier that would indicate that he has some grasp of what this province could be and some acknowledgement he realizes or his Government realizes that we have these resources here and that they should be developed and I keep stressing proper conservation techniques being used. But in his answer all we get is, in effect, a recap and a comparison to years gone by. And I know it's the habit of this Government to always compare today to pre 1971 or next week to what it was in 1965, and so on. I usually don't accept those comparisons because we are living in a different world now. You can't compare the world we are living in today in Saskatchewan and the world of Canada now as to what it was pre 1970. I don't think that's a comparison that even the Premier could make when it comes to such things as the development of the resources that we have. It was abundantly clear in those days there wasn't the same demand, whether it be for potash, or oil or uranium or whatever. But it became abundantly clear after about 1973, after the OPEC countries had started to hold the world up for ransom with their new price levels, there was a tremendous opportunity for this particular province, an opportunity that we have never had in the past, never had under the years that Premier Thatcher was Premier, never had under the years when Premier Douglas was Premier, and of course, never dreamed of in the '30s. So I say that to make those comparisons now, in this day and age, is faulty, it's nonsense and it's unreasonable for us to have to sit here and listen to them.

What I had hoped the Premier would indicate to us is, is that because Alberta has said, you can't have our natural gas any more and for very good reason, because they need it in Alberta, that we would be getting into an extensive exploration for natural gas in this province, that we'd be getting some sort of initiatives from the Government to bring in the private oil industry to find new resources of oil, whether they be shallow or deep. Indeed, even if this was with your Government, I think

that if you announced that these explorations were going to be made through Saskoil, we wouldn't have liked it very much, but I think we would have gone along with them. But indeed, all the answer has been is well we're doing a little bit. But I say, Mr. Premier, a little bit isn't enough. It's no good to just say, we're doing a little better than the guys before us. It's no good just to say that we have some of these things and are conserving them.

What I think that people look to governments and politicians for is some foresight, some ability to be able to grasp what we can have, some ability to understand how things may be if we just had the nerve and the guts to take these initiatives and bold measures, rather than continually be satisfied with things as they are, if they are just a little bit better than the way things used to be. I don't think that's good enough in this day and age, for you to get up in this House and answer the question in the manner that you have. But I suppose we can spend all night debating it. I'm intrigued by your answer today. Now I'm the first one to admit that I'm not in the House always and from time to time I miss government announcements and from time to time I don't read everything that's in the newspaper, but tonight is the first time that I have heard that the reason you are transferring \$35 million each year for the past two years and this year from the Energy Fund into general revenue, is to make up for equalization payments that we have lost.

The Minister of Finance, when he was responding to these questions, never mentioned that, while I was here. I suggest, Mr. Premier, that the Act is very clear. The Act sets out that the only way you can use the moneys in the Energy Reserve Fund is for the development of mineral and energy resources and also to transfer moneys when the Cabinet deems that those moneys are surplus to the use of the Energy Reserve Funds. That's what it says in the Act. Nowhere have I been able to find anything in law or anything in the Acts that are before us here, that permits you to transfer that money because we have to make up equalization payments that we may have lost.

Let me continue this though with the Energy Reserve Fund. Is it your intention as government to use that fund for basically three things, one, transfer into normal revenues of a certain portion each year and I suspect \$35 million is a significant portion yearly of the moneys we receive; two, to continue to use the money to buy out potash mines until you reach the level of 50 per cent or more that you indicated that you wanted to obtain; and three, to use smaller amounts, amounts that are extremely large, but when compared to the other things you are using it for, are insignificant, to develop energy resources? Is that the Government's intention for the foreseeable future?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Chairman, that is a partial list. We are proposing to pay our share of the research into heavy oil use, our deal with the Federal Government out of the Energy and Resource Development Fund, our share of the research effort. It may be, and time will tell on this, that investments in hard rock minerals might prove to be very, very substantial. There are prospects which could prove to be very, very substantial indeed in hard rock minerals. So that would not be insignificant.

It is also possible that Saskoil might enter into ventures which are very significant indeed. We have many conversations

with people in the oil industry and many joint ventures, farm-out arrangements and joint venture arrangements in the oil industry, which, if they matured and matured the way we would like to, would commit us to large sums of money. It well may commit us to large sums of money if there was a fair amount of oil uncovered and therefore the money would be readily available even if we didn't have any in the Energy and Resource Development Fund.

Certainly the Member has indicated the major areas in which we'd expect to spend the money, an annual payment to the Provincial Treasurer, or Minister of Finance to compensate for equalization loss and investment primarily in minerals, in oil, natural gas, potash, hard rock minerals and energy research, research into the general field of energy, primarily into enhanced recovery and light research.

MR. MALONE: Getting off the field of minerals. I'm advised by some fairly knowledgeable people in the uranium industry area, that the guesstimate, if I can use that word, that one of your officials gave to the Bayda Commission as to future revenues, was very, very low to say the least. I believe your Mr. Lloyd, or one of your officials, appeared before the Bayda Commission and gave them a guesstimate as to how much revenue could accrue to the Province of Saskatchewan over a period of time if uranium proceeded. I'm advised that this is a very, very low figure that was given. It was probably the bottom level and it would be substantially higher if things proceed as we hope them to proceed, pursuant, of course, to the findings of Bayda. What is your intention with those moneys when they do become available as royalties or whatever? Will they go into the Energy Reserve Fund? Will the money that will start to accrue from the potash industry go into the Energy Reserve Fund? Will moneys that start accruing through, hopefully increased exploration in oil and natural gas, go into the Energy Reserve Fund and thus become a fund in effect, like the one in Alberta, where they are using it for their development in the years ahead, after their oil runs out? Or is it the intention of the Government to just use that as general revenue?

MR. BLAKENEY: I think we have formed no intention on that. Our basic thinking with respect to the Energy and Resource Development Fund was that the oil revenues would be relatively short term. We have seen no oil production in Saskatchewan decline as we indicated it would in 1973, when we brought in Bill 42, from around 85 million barrels a year to around 55 million barrels a year. We expect to maintain the 55 million barrel level for some time and we certainly hope that will be the case. However, we would anticipate that unless some major discoveries of oil are found and unless we find some way of using heavy oil, that our revenue from oil, at least our production of oil will significantly decline, by let's say, 1995, which is only 20 years away. We hope this won't happen. We hope that heavy oil development and an enhanced recovery could see our total oil reserves doubled, from 600 million barrels that we now have to 1.5 billion barrels and we would hope that to be true if we find some way of getting a better recovery from heavy oil, but we're not counting on that.

We're taking the position that this oil revenue is one time revenue and should be invested in some investment which will last longer than 20 years, potash, uranium, some investment which will last much longer.

With respect to uranium, there will be no significant return from uranium, even if development continues for two, three or four years, because of the royalty schedule negotiated. It is possible that the sums would be large and the Member is right in thinking that the figures put before the Bayda Commission pre-supposed a price level, which we think is realistic, \$30, \$35 or \$40 but may turn out to be low, and pre-supposed the level of production, which will be low if no ore bodies, now believed to be commercial are all developed even if no new ore bodies were developed. No one, I think, can say whether both geology and economics will combine to see that all those are commercial, but it's a reasonable expectation that they will be. If this is so then it's possible that those figures could be exceeded. As you saw, some of the figures are rather large, up to 1990 on one set of assumptions, a figure of \$3 billion. That's over a period of 15 years, 10 to 15 years and by that time the budget of the province will be over \$3 billion in a year, so it won't be that much money, but we have not formed any clear policy direction as to how those moneys will be used. We haven't got it yet and we have not decided what to do with it.

MR. MALONE: I'd just like to turn to another matter of concern to me and I think to a growing number of people in Saskatchewan, that is the problems that are being faced by our native and Indian population in Saskatchewan. Now in Question Period some time ago I brought to the Premier's attention a study that had been done by his Planning and Research Department and I think the Premier would concede that some of the findings of that study are, to say the least, alarming. Everything from low education to crime rates, to infant mortality, to you name it, it's in there. It's a pretty shocking picture. What makes it even more shocking in my view is that all indications seem to be that the Indian population is not only increasing, or the birth rate is not only increasing, it's increasing dramatically and that indeed, the very study that I have mentioned, I think points out that by I believe 1980, that ten per cent of the population of Saskatchewan will be of Indian or native ancestry.

I think that governments in the past, both nationally and provincially have failed miserably in coming to grips with this particular problem. Politicians in general, of any political party have usually paid lip service to Indians at election time, perhaps more important at by-election time and tend to ignore them at all other times. I think perhaps the Premier may agree with me that something is going to have to be done in the very, very near future to start coming up with some meaningful programs for our Indian and native citizens. Indeed, if we don't start coming with these programs, not only are we facing a white backlash, if I can put it that way, as more and more Indian and native people move to our cities, we're going to be facing on their part, suggested violent actions and again I'm quoting the report that I mentioned earlier.

The Indian population, the Indian people that I have talked to are indeed suspicious of provincial governments, not of any particular party, but just of provincial governments. They, of course look to Ottawa to be their defender, be their promoter in their projects. I think in many cases Ottawa has failed abysmally to help the Indian people in a very meaningful way, although recently under the guidance of Mr. Cretian I think they have started to come to grips with some of the problems that Indians are facing.

That doesn't mean to me that provincial governments can just shrug their shoulders and say well, it's Ottawa's problem. They can't just say that because some of the native spokesmen have indicated they want to deal with Ottawa rather than with Regina or the provincial capital, that we can again just ignore the problem. I think that there are many things that a provincial government can do, particularly in the field of education, particularly in the field of social policies, that can assist these people to come into the 20th century, so to speak, even if they choose to remain on the reserves, as many of them want to do, or if they choose to leave the reserve life and come into the main stream of our community.

I asked the Premier when I raised this question some time ago, as to what plans the Government had. This was in Question Period of course, and the Premier was somewhat restricted in the time allotted for the answer. But I'm asking you now, Mr. Premier, does your Planning and Research operation of your office have any plans? If so, what are the plans? Are they dealing with Ottawa? Has Ottawa asked for your co-operation? This is a very big field. It goes everywhere from land claims, treaty rights, to social problems. I'm wondering if at this time you can give us some indication as to how your Government intends on dealing with this growing problem in the immediate future?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Hon. Member that governments, provincial governments and federal governments, have failed to solve the problems faced by people of native origin in Canada.

The report to which he referred was a report prepared for internal government use and was designed to paint the picture in a relatively black way, so that agencies of government which from time to time deal with Indian people would be fully aware of the seriousness of the issues involved. So it didn't try to gloss over anything, rather it erred on the side of gloom, rather than optimism. But nonetheless, discounted for its intended shock effect, it did indicate very real problems, problems which we have not been conspicuous in solving. I do not agree that it is because of any cynicism on the part of governments, doubtless there is some, but that's not the primary reason why the problems of native people have not been solved, not cynicism on the part of government, federal or provincial, but rather a simple lack of knowledge of what steps should be taken to deal with the problems as they are perceived. I think that most of us believe that there is a limited amount that governments can do for people of native origin. There are, we hope, quite a few things we can do with people of native origin, to assist them to solve their problems. We're not likely to solve any of their problems for them.

They are indeed suspicious of government. I don't think they are any more suspicious of provincial governments than they are of the Federal Government. They do take the position, particularly Treaty Indians take the position, that they have certain rights which they are entitled to from the Federal Government by reason of the Treaties and by reason of their other constitutional relationships with the Federal Government, which might be impaired if they dealt freely with the provincial governments and therefore they are nervous, apprehensive about dealing with provincial governments in some of these areas. But in this regard our relationship with registered Indians is, I think pretty good, in sorting out with them, at least with the

leaders of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and generally with the National Indian Brotherhood and their recognized Treaty Indian Leaders. We pretty well know where we stand and what they want of us.

The Member asks what programs the Provincial Government has, and I think in keeping with my earlier statement we cannot solve their problems for them, but only with them, assist them in solving them. We don't have any great master plan for the solution of problems experienced by people of native origin. We have instituted a large number of programs which we think are contributing to the solution of the problems, contributing to native people solving some of their problems. And I could give a quick run-down on a number of them. In the Department of the Attorney General we have a native court worker program which provides for court workers to assist native people in dealing with the courts. We have a native JP program whereby recognized Indian leaders are appointed JPs and can deal with some offences, some infractions on reserves and adjacent to reserves where native Indians are involved. We have a native constable program, where people are being trained to be constables.

We move on to another department. There are extensive programs in the Department of Social Services, particularly in the ESP (Employment Support Program), many, many grant programs to native organizations to assist them in funding particular projects. There is a native women's society in Regina which operates two houses, one for single parent families where the parent is a woman, and with children; and another for unmarried native women of 16, 17, 18 years old, so that when they come into the city they have a base. That's a mere example. There are dozens, literally dozens and dozens of those.

There are significant grants to the Friendship Centres, significant grants to both the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and AMNSIS (Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan). And I could go on.

There are a good number of things being done on land claims. Vigorous negotiations have been conducted on land claims and we are hopeful that we will make progress there, progress in terms of completing some settlements before too long.

We have help for native small business through the Department of Industry and Commerce, help for small business in northern Saskatchewan through the DNS programs.

There are a good many things happening in Continuing Education, Canada's one and only community college, and a program based at the University of Regina of Indian studies whereby people on reserves can study for University credits, an elaborate program of adult education for Indians.

If the Member wishes to pinpoint a department I would be happy to try to indicate what's happening there. Through this whole range, the idea is to assist native people to tackle their own problems. We are going to have some failures; we are going to have some failure rates in Industry and Commerce loans; we will have some failure rates in DNS; we are going to have some failure rates in Sask Housing where we are into some arrangements with the Metis and Non-Status Indian for a native housing program where they are building houses and they don't follow the procedures we would like sometimes. We are going to have some failures, but that's the strategy. Those are the range of programs — literally in the dozens. We could pool them all together

and make it look like a wonderful package. I don't think it is a wonderful package; I think it's very credible and creditable, but I don't think it's a wonderful package because it isn't solving the problems although I think it is making a contribution to it and we think on the whole a creditable effort much appreciated for the most part by native people.

MR. MALONE: Mr. Premier, I agree with your comments that you can't do things for Indians, you must do them with Indians, and I think everybody here would agree with that particular statement. But you can go and list all these little programs for another hour, I suppose, and I concede that those programs, in some cases, are doing a worthwhile job. I concede that they are helpful, but I don't concede for a moment, nor do I think any Member of this House concedes you are really coming to grips with the situation. The situation is getting worse instead of getting better. You can talk about native court workers and at the same time you talk about native court workers you can see the Indian crime rate going up and up and up. Now they are not related to the court workers, but obviously these things are happening. You can talk about programs through Sask Housing. At the same time you talk about that you see more and more native people coming to the city, living in sub-standard housing. You can talk about educational programs. At the same time you talk about that you see the drop-out rate of students of native background increasing.

Now I am not suggesting that these programs aren't well motivated. I am not suggesting that you are not trying to in some way come to grips with the situation, but what I am suggesting is that you are not putting enough priority on it. I am suggesting that governments everywhere aren't putting enough priority on it, because the facts are simply staring us in the face, that as the native population, Indian population continues to grow, the problems continue to grow, almost in a geometric way. So what I want to say to the Premier is, notwithstanding these programs that you have, notwithstanding any further funding of those programs, it simply isn't doing the job.

I did suggest to you the other day that you may look into a separate Government department. I acknowledge your remarks that many native spokesmen and Indian spokesmen don't want that because they feel it is some form of reverse discrimination. Perhaps the idea is to expand the old CORE services technique and just keeping it with native people. I don't know. I don't have the answers. But I certainly have the presence of mind to know that the problem is there, and it is the most growing social problem that this province has ever had. It is going to continue to grow and grow until the Federal Government, your Government, the FSO and other Indian organizations start sitting down, start determining which direction you are going to go and start moving in that direction. I don't pretend for one minute that this type of problem can be solved in a month, or a year, perhaps not even in a generation, but I will tell you, unless we start coming to some steps to solve the problem the next generation after us is going to be in an awful mess indeed. I think that we have to start the steps now, rather than handing it on to the generation that is going to come.

I should like to return to your remarks earlier today, about the Western Premiers' Conference. In Ministerial Statements you indicated as follows:

At the same time we recognize that the problems of Confederation cannot be solved with the current status quo. We have accordingly committed ourselves to the pursuit of changes, revisions and accommodations designed to ensure that our Federal system will be more responsive to the needs of all Canadians and the legitimate aspirations of all parts of the country.

The last part, of course, nobody will quarrel with.

What I am asking you now, what are the revisions and accommodations? I am not aware of any announcement coming from the Conference dealing specifically with that and I wonder if you would be good enough to tell us, if you can. Some of these may well be in camera discussions which you can't disclose at this time, but disclose to us what you can as to what revisions and accommodations your Government sees to making this federal system work.

MR. BLAKENEY: Perhaps I should clear something which, when listening to the Hon. Member, I realized the communiqué was ambiguous. It suggested, or might suggest to some reader, that we at Brandon worked out some revisions and accommodations. That's not the case. All we committed ourselves to is the process of revision and accommodation. There were no arrangements at Brandon as to what we want the Constitution to look like. We agreed on that, as 10 Premiers, at Toronto and sent them off to the Prime Minister, the changes which we wanted in the Constitution at that time, and we got a response from the Prime Minister which was in some places helpful and in some equivocal. But since that time we have had the election of the Parti Québécois and there is a general feeling that the arrangements arrived at last October in Toronto are no longer viable, no longer will be acceptable to the Government of Quebec, although we, I think, had no firm statement to that effect by the Government of Quebec. All I can do is say that at Brandon we agreed to the process of revisions and accommodations. All of us are presumably still committed to what we agreed to at Toronto, on 10 or 15 changes guarantees for the French and English language as an example, I can get my notes or get someone else to get my notes and go over them. But that's nothing new, nothing new and I think they were all published back in November. Mr. Lougheed's letter to the Prime Minister I think was published back in November, 1st of November, and I don't think there is anything new since then.

MR. MALONE: Okay, let me deal with the (I'm not sure if this is the patriation or repatriation of the BNA Act), but is it this Government's view that the BNA Act should be brought back to Canada at an early time in order to start facilitating the revisions and accommodations that you have spoken of, or do you feel that it would be dangerous to bring it back at this particular time because of the situation in Quebec?

MR. BLAKENEY: It was our view that the Constitution should be repatriated. We did not put a high priority on that since quite frankly we don't think that the average Saskatchewan citizen loses very much sleep over whether the Constitution is patriated or not. We don't put a high priority on it, but we think it should be done because it's part of the national symbol and we have probably underplayed for too long the national symbols that

any country needs. So we, therefore, agree that the Constitution should be patriated. We don't think that the election of the Parti Quebecois in any way detracts from that. It probably increases the desirability of patriation since it is clear that the part, a small part of the PQ argument is that the Government of Canada, the Federal Government is not really an effective government, its Constitution is in London, etc., and that it would give a little more credibility, a little more presence to the Federal Government to have it operating pursuant to a constitution which was distinctly and definitely Canadian. That's a small argument, not a big argument. But for those reasons I would suggest that there are some benefits to repatriation and our Government, if we can find the formula, agree with patriation at an early date.

MR. MALONE: Just before we get off Item 1, Mr. Chairman, in the Estimates it shows the staff of the Executive Council as being some 21 people, the Planning and Research Department being some 22 people — 43 people there under your direct guidance. I notice in Estimates in past years there have been very few questions asked about the function of the Planning and Research division of your office. I am not sure whether this has been on purpose or whether there have been explanations given at earlier dates about what this function is. If there have been, I have never been here when they were given, and I would like to have the Premier just tell me the concept of the Planning and Research Department — I suspect it is interlocked with the staff of the Executive Council and the function it fulfils and why it's in your particular office, rather than spread throughout the other government offices, Planning and Research vis a vis Mineral Resources, vis a vis Social Services, vis a vis Health and so on. What function does this particular body perform in your office, that's not already being performed at the departmental level under the other Ministers?

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, it has a number of functions. It is staffed to the Planning Committee of Cabinet and to the Premier in the sense of researching things which are broadly intergovernmental in their impact or interdepartmental in their impact. Shall I start with that group? The matter of native programs would be a good example. I think that it would be difficult for us to house, in any single government department, the planning for, planning a common approach to native problems. So one of its main jobs is to promote increased co-ordination of interdepartmental activities and many of the representatives of the Planning Branch, spend a fair bit of their time chairing committees of planners from two or three different agencies, let's say from Health and Welfare, on a matter of Level III and Level IV institutions. It perhaps ought not to be so, but it is my observation that government departments and people who work for the government departments, become quite possessive about their departmental responsibilities and occasionally lose sight of the overall governmental responsibility and while we don't want to do all of the planning centrally, because that's a waste of time, we sure need a small group operating centrally, who can do the co-ordinating function and see that a governmental approach, rather than a departmental approach is brought to bear with respect to many problems of government.

Another major function of the Planning Branch is to be the focus for intergovernmental relations and activities. A number of provinces have departments of intergovernmental affairs. I

can think of Quebec, Ontario I believe, Alberta certainly, and they are quite large departments. Alberta has around 140 employees in their Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. The function is one of the main industries of Canada and I don't know whether people have noticed it lately, but one of the main growth industries has been federal-provincial conferences and interprovincial conferences and there has been just a great proliferation of these activities which involve two or more governments. We have a relatively smaller group. We are trying to keep from setting up another government department, but it grows and grows because of that function of being on the road. I was talking to the Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs in Alberta, socially and he said he's got five directors and he said for the Deputy Minister and five directors to get together is almost impossible at any one time, because one of them is always away from Edmonton. That's sort of the nature of the beast. So that focus on intergovernmental relations and activities is a major activity of the Planning Branch, I suppose not strictly of the Planning Branch but of the Bureau of Statistics. There is the compilation of a great group of statistics which we think we can gather together better centrally and let several agencies use it, than to have statisticians in each agency. I think those are the broad outlines. I can give you, if you wish, what let us say the economic policy research and analysis section does or the social policy one does, but we are split up into intergovernmental affairs, social economic policy, economic policy and research and resource development.

MR. MALONE: My next question is on intergovernmental affairs so let me ask you this. You have a section on mineral development. How does that work with the energy secretariat? Are they performing the same function?

MR. BLAKENEY: The energy secretariat is in the course of being dismantled. When Mr. Roy Lloyd, who is sitting behind me was head of the energy secretariat and he came to be head of the Planning Branch, and we are dismantling the energy secretariat and there is no separate energy secretariat now. It is now split between overall work done by two or three people in the Planning Branch and the detailed work now sited in the Department of Mineral Resources. It was always a makeshift arrangement, in a sense, to deal with a special problem that arose and that, I think, is an appropriate way for governments to deal organizationally with new problems that is to create a new agency to deal with it, but as soon as you can get it back into what I might call the regular mainstream of the government the better off you are, otherwise you get little bits of industry jealousies, but competitions — and it is just better to get them back and we are all now back into Mineral Resources or a small group in the Planning Branch.

MR. MALONE: It is an odd way to dismantle it, as I see that the Budget was increased by \$43,000. Just one final question, is it this Planning and Research office, Mr. Premier, that determines and advises you on such things as to whether or not Bill No. 51 should be proceeded with or not?

MR. BLAKENEY: No, as a matter of fact I certainly could have used

some advice as it now appears, since I am getting so much of it from some ill-informed sources that I could have used some advice from better informed sources and I regret that I didn't have it from the Planning Branch before I began getting it from all sides of the House.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions I should like to direct to the Premier.

The first question, I suppose, one could consider to be one of a philosophical nature. Mr. Premier, the history of your party in Saskatchewan, under its name of NDP now and formerly the CCF, I suggest has undergone some changes and much of the comments that took place between yourself and the Leader of the Opposition were questions, of course, which have been before us in the House and they were good questions, questions dealing with and touching upon the philosophy of your Government.

I was interested to note, and I am sure you read the account of Max Salzman, who resigned as critic of your party in Ottawa. He has opened up a new area of somewhat of a philosophical nature. Before I go into part of his statement, I should like to remind the Premier, I don't know whether he was in Saskatchewan at this time, but I remember very well as a young person in the early days of the CCF, that at that particular time the opponents to the CCF, of course, would make reference to the old 1932 Manifesto. Now we have, today, one of the more outspoken Members of the NDP, drawing some attention to Canadians, particularly in his article in McLeans Magazine, in which he says that he is not a typical today NDPer. He says that he is very much still a CCfer, with moral conservative overtones. He goes on to say that the Socialist Party is no longer a socialist party, but rather a labour party.

I believe in this point in time, Mr. Premier, particularly in Saskatchewan, with the events that followed immediately after the 1975 election, Bills 1 and 2, those two Bills in themselves indicated to the people of Saskatchewan that perhaps you were going back further than what the people of Saskatchewan had suspected, perhaps that you were going back to the total eradication of the private industry.

I just like to point out to the Premier if he does not agree that the party, across Canada, has lost its original intent under the CCF and that it is, in fact, now a total labour party.

Mr. Chairman, with men such as Salzman pointing out that it is no longer a socialist party, but rather a labour party has put some fear in the minds of people of Saskatchewan and, indeed, across Canada, about the NDP. While your Brandon conference was going on, as I mentioned earlier today, some of the larger trade unions including the steel workers of America more or less said that they agreed with the right of Quebec to separate from Canada. I suppose using an axiom, they see within that and your strong ties with the big unions, that somehow a labour government here in Saskatchewan cannot forcibly put forth the idea that people of Saskatchewan want to put forth and that is the retention of Confederation.

I should just like to ask the Premier this question: do you agree with the comments which were made by Max Salzman, and do you agree that the party, here in Saskatchewan has changed its original philosophy from the CCF and is more dedicated not

to the socialist party, but more towards what he calls, the labour party?

MR. BLAKENEY: All I can say we get beaten about the head for everything we do. The Member has spent his time belabouring us because we are clearly too socialist and dedicated to public ownership and dedicated to dogmatic, as I think his terms were public ownership. Our Regina Manifesto and the Member for Rosetown-Elrose now says, isn't it true that we have abandoned all those principles and have gone over not to embrace the trade union movement and you no longer care about public ownership and socialism and the Regina Manifesto and all that sort of thing.

I think that both of them are wrong. I think that the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan is rooted in the grassroots of Saskatchewan as it always was; Saskatchewan has never seen a party that is as deeply rooted in the four corners of this province as this one was and is. We don't, for one moment, suggest that we have one total unified philosophy. The people of Saskatchewan have a progressive turn of mind, but they do not have a total unified philosophy, they don't think that way and our party reflects the progressive wing of Saskatchewan people who has always found its voice in farm movements, co-op movements, labour unions and in a great number of progressive organizations which have been part of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: In 1932, when the Regina Manifesto was hammered out in this city, there was part of the group who hammered it out a group called the Independent Labour Party. The first leader of the CCF was a man by the name of J.S. Woodsworth, who had made his mark in history as a leader in a general strike. So he had some labour roots. He was also a great exponent of the social gospel. He was a voice from methodism, which has always been very strong in our party. The first provincial leader of the party was a farm leader, George Williams.

Those streams have always come together — George Williams was elected in 1934 in Wadena and we have never lost Wadena since and if we could just get a few more seats with a 30 year track record like that, then, I think, that the future of the NDP and the CCF would be secure. I think, therefore, this party which the Member for Regina South suggests that I trace it back a little further and I would be happy to do that. Many of these people came out of a farmer labour party, which had come out of the Progressive party of the 1920's, those ideas that came out of the farm movement, which led to the Progressive Party in the 1920's and then the Farmer Labour Party in the early 1930's led to the CCF in the 1930's and the NDP in the 1960's. It is all the same progressive movement; all has not gone perfectly straight, but it has all reflected the same progressive attitude on the part of a great number of Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: I am proud to say that we walk in that tradition. We walk in that tradition and we believe we are honest and true descendants of that group of people, that W.S. Lloyd or Tommy Douglas or J.S. Woodsworth, or M.J. Coldwell, or all the other

distinguished leaders of our movement, who have been in Saskatchewan and in western Canada.

I am further proud to say that federally we have taken a position and a principled position with respect to the Parti Quebecois; we have expressed, and I say a principled expression of view, of support for some of their social objectives and opposition to their separatist aim.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: We have not played footsie with the PQ, like Joe Clarke. One of the things which Mr. Horner brought with him to the Liberal Party was a few secrets from the Conservative caucus in which he revealed that Joe Clarke had instructed the Conservative caucus not to say anything nasty about the PQ because they were out after their votes.

We have not taken that position. We have what we believe is a principled position and we stand by it and we believe the people of Saskatchewan know what the CCF stood for; know what the NDP stands for. Some recent arrivals on the political scene provincially, are unlikely to dissuade them from this firmly placed knowledge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, it was interesting to hear the Premier. I, today, had met with some former CCF MPs who, Mr. Premier, would go dead against what you said. Mr. Premier I should like to draw to your attention one other point, while we are still on Item 1. We had with us for some time Barnett Cocks, and I know that you have read his report and basically what he said in visiting this Legislature was that there were two things that he would like to see happen and two things which he recommended, one was the position of the Clerk be one of independence and the other had to do with the remuneration, suggesting that the remuneration for the Clerk of the Assembly should be comparable to that of the Deputy Ministers.

I have a great deal of sympathy with this particular report, having read it. I believe there is something to be said for the independence of this position and with the independence, of course, would go with the setting of the remuneration by the Legislature, not by the Executive Council. I wonder if the Premier would care to comment on the report itself.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, we have not had a full opportunity to study the Barnett Cocks report. We have never felt that the Speaker of the Legislature, I should say the Clerk of the Legislature, was under any great pressure from governments, whether ours or the one that preceded ours, but if anyone could offer any comments that would suggest the contrary, why I would be indeed happy to look at that aspect of it. The matter of salary is one which is a broader one.

As I noted Sir Barnett Cocks' argument was basically that the duties were similar to those at Ottawa and that accordingly a remuneration of that order would be justified. We have, in

this province, salary ranges and schedules, which are fairly closely related to those in Manitoba and Alberta and we have tended to compare almost all our positions with those in Manitoba or Alberta. This is true of the Clerk as well. The current salary of the Clerk which is \$24,575 is, I believe, slightly lower than the Clerk in one of the neighbouring provinces and slightly higher than in the other neighbouring province. That is my information, and that it is at the mid point as so many other salaries in this province are. At the top we tend to be, perhaps, lowest of the three, but not always. Generally speaking for most of the senior management we stand somewhere between Alberta and Manitoba. That seems to me to make sense. To adopt the Barnett Cocks' report would be the adoption of a different principle. I don't suggest it is wrong; I am just saying it is a different one. It would cause some interesting relationships since then, Mr. Speaker, who was the nominal superior of the Clerk, would be about \$13,000 light, which whereas now he is maybe \$1,000 or \$2,000 above of the Clerk. That may be something that we would want to consider. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, should be getting an additional amount that would create some appropriate relationships which would then need to be considered as between the Speaker and the Leader of the opposition and the Premier. We have already had a go-round on that one through Judge Hughes. I think there are, it will be seen, a number of relationships which would need to be considered. This is not to suggest that it shouldn't necessarily be done. I am just suggesting that Sir Barnett took none of these what I might call traditional milestones into consideration, but used a different base line. We would have to ask ourselves whether it was appropriate to use this new base line and how would it work with respect to clerks in the neighbouring provinces, how would it work with respect to other senior management. We have not yet had an opportunity to do that, and accordingly I am unable to give the Member any conclusion on the part of the Government to the recommendations contained in Sir Barnett Cocks' report.

MR. MacDONALD: I would just like to add a comment on this particular subject if I might. I would like very much to get into the history of the NDP because I have my own versions on it, but I won't get into that this evening.

However, when it comes to talk about the Clerk's salary I think the Premier has definitely omitted the key point in Barnett Cocks' report, that the Clerk as he now stands is the servant of the Government; it is the Government which determine his salary. Mr. Cocks is suggesting that the Clerk of the Assembly is the servant of the Assembly, and that is the key function right now of the recommendation in his report. I don't think we are talking here about the amount of his salary. I could certainly argue with the Premier when he talks about the Speaker's salary, and I would suggest the Speaker's salary be double that of the Clerk's salary because a Cabinet Minister's salary is involved. His Member's salary is included in the total consideration of the remuneration of a Cabinet Minister and so is it with the Speaker of the House. Therefore, I might argue with the Premier that the Speaker's salary is double the Clerk's salary, when the Premier takes in the Member's remuneration as well as the Speaker's salary. Now when I say double I am not sure of the figure but if you took the Member's and all his allowances, I think you are talking something in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 and you add the Speaker's allowance on top of that, I would suggest it is substantially more than the Clerk's.

The point that the Premier is missing is the purpose of the report, and that is that the Clerk should be the servant of the Assembly and not of the Government. I would hope that the Premier would not take into consideration the specific amounts of the remuneration but would rather consider the principle of Mr. Cocks' report.

Item 1 agreed.

Item 2 agreed.

ITEM 3

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, I notice in Item 3 that we have the same number of positions — nine, but an increase of a considerable amount of money. Would the Premier care to comment on the \$100,000 difference here?

MR. BLAKENEY: The biggest single increase there, there were some salary adjustments which happened to increase that a little bit more than some of the others, since some of the people — they have some lower salaried people who got a higher percentage but the big item as Members will note is in the other expenses item, up from \$95,000 to \$168,000. The big item there is a piece of photographic equipment of \$69,870 — it is a video tape system, that is permitting us to produce video tape rather than films, and allowing us to get material out to the media both more rapidly and more cheaply.

MR. MacDONALD: Getting ready for the election . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, we won't have it in time for any by-elections if they are held in the immediate future.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, \$100,000 is a lot of money.

Also Mr. Premier under this particular Item, Item 3, we note that the number of positions are the same — nine. In rough figures we have an increase in salary of some \$29,000. That means an average increase of roughly \$3,000 per individual. Were these salaries subject to the Provincial AIB?

MR. BLAKENEY: It will be recalled that the figures for last year did not include all of the increases which were negotiated last year. Accordingly the 1976-77 base was \$86,000. Last year's negotiations provided increases of \$19,000 to that which is around 20 per cent, and some of the people at the lower end got that. We also have a figure in here for what we estimate the current negotiations, the ones which are going to be effective on October 1 last, will provide for. So in effect, we have two year's increases in here. There are some increments if you get a group where you get some relatively lower paid employees and not at the top of their scale you can get a relatively large percentage and increment. It just happens that this group had that combination. We have two year's salary increases and some increments. They all produce a total of 31.7 per cent. That's the figure.

MR. MALONE: May I suggest to the Premier that we could bring Yousuv Karsh for two months and probably pay half the amount of money and have better quality pictures than the item here. Let me ask you, we have heard about a certain trip that was taken by yourself to China and certain movies that were made of the trip which are currently being shown to, among other things, NDP meetings, the people who went with you on that trip to make those movies, are they covered by this particular Item?

MR. BLAKENEY: The only person who went with me to make that movie was Mr. Bruce Lawson. I think all of the film in it is taken by him. It wasn't a crew. He took his camera and away he went. He is not covered by this but by — he is in the number 1 Item, the administration, because he is press secretary to the Cabinet.

MR. MALONE: Did he perform any other service while he was there, other than taking movies of yourself?

MR. BLAKENEY: He performed all of the press relations. There were a number of movie clips which were sent back to the waiting public. There were the usual number of press releases. I had a couple of public speeches in Japan. I had a good number of press conferences. All you get is a little box in a Japanese business paper, but it tells your story, at least in part. Only one press officer went with that group, except for the CBC and the Leader-Post who had their own people, doubtless serving very well but not on your money or mine, not directly anyway, and CBC I won't . . . So we just had the one press officer who did all of the press relations together with this film.

MR. MALONE: Seriously, this outlay of some \$69,000 to buy a video tape machine has to be a bit hard to swallow. As I understand this Item and the one before, some have described it unkindly as the 'Government's Propaganda Machine' others have described it as dissemination of information. But \$69,000 to buy a video tape machine seems to be a bit much, Mr. Premier. Surely how can that be justified? Would you give us precisely how often it is used and how often it will be anticipated to be used? What use will be made of these video tapes? What will the video tapes costs? Are they returnable? What is the reason for it?

MR. BLAKENEY: It hasn't been bought yet, so I can't tell you what it costs. That's the estimate. That's why we're dealing with the Estimates and that is indeed an estimate. I am advised that this is equipment required to video tape audio visual film items. It's portable and it will run on AC or a rechargeable battery. The video tapes are produced in colour with voice tracks. The unit contains a small play back monitor. It's part of the camera. The camera is a medium priced unit. The quality of the final BTR can be directly related to the quality of the camera. There will be an editing system. This is basic equipment required to edit video tape bring it up to television standards and prepare for release to television stations.

The master video tape is played in one 28/50 recorder and the editing takes place in another 28/50 recorder. A time based corrector is required to improve the quality of the tape

and enhance the visual and audio, clean up, edit, correct the colour and exposure.

The potential uses, to mention a few, would be recording of general news conferences involving whoever may be giving the news conference.

MR. MERCHANT: Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes, the Leader of the Opposition, right.

MR. MERCHANT: Can't even use the press room.

MR. BLAKENEY: We'll come to that, but I'm surprised to hear that. I don't know what's going on, but Mr. Steuart used to use it a lot.

Film statements by senior officials explain government programs and how they apply to individuals if we want to get a clip out on how FIP may be used or the like, or Safety '77, or whatever; gun safety, driving safety, these clips that we're trying to get out, Moose Jaw air show, that type of thing, government services such as Dental Plan, Hearing Aid Plan, if we're trying to get out some publicity. It must be remembered that we spend some millions of dollars a year on publicity and if we can . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: . . . said earlier.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, it's always remarkable. We're always asked to spend less money, except more on the Aware Program and we shouldn't have any compulsory seat belt legislation; we should just have a massive educational program and we've got three, four, 500,000 in now, but that's nothing, we need another million on that, but we should cut down. This is the general line. When we're spending that kind of money, we better decide how we can make it most effectively used and our advisors tell us that video tapes are probably as effective an advertising medium as can be found and if we can get our tapes on TV news programs we will be making good use of the public money, which we will be voting or have been voting on all of these many department Estimates. There are many agricultural programs which are constantly being introduced and if we have a drought program we would need to have a good number of ads out. Video taping is perhaps the best way we could do it. Anyone who has any better suggestions, I'd be happy to have them, but this is the best professional advice we can get.

MR. MALONE: Well, let me just say this. With all the uses that this is going to be put to, including to cover press conferences, may I ask the Premier, will the machine be available for use when I have a press conference or any of my colleagues on this side of the House in the Liberal Party, have a press conference? We are unable to use the press room at this time. I'm the only one that's able to use that room. None of my colleagues are able to use it. Will we be able to use the machine?

MR. BLAKENEY: Well the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of

the Conservative Party use the press room now.

AN HON. MEMBER: . . . to it.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, I'm not aware of any private MLAs on our side that ever have a press conference.

AN HON. MEMBER: . . . that's their fault . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, all right, that's an argument, although don't suggest that there is discrimination in it.

MR. MALONE: Well, I'll just say to the Premier, that I'm advised that the rule is that the only person, at least on the Opposition side, who is entitled to use the press room downstairs, is myself. No other MLAs are entitled to use it.

MR. BLAKENEY: I'm advised that Mr. Collver uses it frequently. He's on the Opposition side.

MR. MALONE: What about MLAs?

MR. BLAKENEY: If there has been a change, we can't find any of our staff who are aware of it, so that perhaps we can Pursue that item. I'd be very happy to do so. When was it used by private MLAs? Please give us some examples that will help us . . .

MR. MacDONALD: I'll give you an example. A couple of years ago you set up your own little private propaganda instrument where you hired civil servants to come out and take private MLAs news reports and send it all over the Province of Saskatchewan and you didn't let anybody in the Opposition use that private little propaganda instrument. You're doing exactly the same thing with the press room. It always was available to the Opposition, to private Members in the past. Six months ago we were denied that opportunity. And you suggest that it isn't discrimination. I'd like to remind you of that private little propaganda where you hired those little fellows to come out with microphones and take those tape recordings and then send them all over were things that you denied to us. That's discrimination.

MR. BLAKENEY: That's a pile of hogwash, with all deference, Mr. Chairman, and I am still asking Hon. Members to tell me when. I noted the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley stayed strictly away from the question I asked, "When did private Members have press conferences in the news room?" My staff is telling me that they do not know of any change in policy. I don't know of any change in policy. I'd be happy to look into it on behalf of Hon. Members, but I invite them to give me some facts and not allegations about what happened in cubby-holes two years ago When did any private Member have a press conference in the news room?

MR. MERCHANT: The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley and I have had a press conference together that I remember and I've had a couple of press conferences in the news room and had access to the news

room over the years and I'm sure that other Opposition Members have as well. And then about six months ago we were advised through our den leader that henceforth only the Leaders of the parties would be able to use the press conference room and that was the end of it. There was no explanation given and that rule was apparently a rule change that was laid on by some of your staff. Now if the Premier is saying that you didn't intend that, you can't see any reason why that rule would exist and God knows I can't see any reason why that rule would exist; the room is down there; it is far more convenient for the press. The result for the press is that when a Member has a press conference now he has to tote all the equipment . . .

MR. KOSKIE: What . . .

MR. MERCHANT: You are unlikely to ever have occasion to have a press conference for the rest of your life so don't worry about it. It is not a problem for you but it is a problem for some of us who take some pride in what goes on in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: Now if the Premier is saying . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I think we have been able to maintain and keep fair decorum. I would ask the Hon. Members on both sides to try to maintain and keep this for the balance of the evening. I think we benefit much more if we can do that.

MR. MacDONALD: I would just like to remind the Premier, too, that I have had a couple of press conferences in there and welcomed the opportunity. On one occasion I took the Member for Wascana when he was a brand new Member and on another occasion I took the Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner), and then they graduated so they could handle themselves and did such a good job that now we have no problem. But all of a sudden the Premier decided they got so good and they were giving him so much trouble or somebody in the Government decided that six or eight months ago they cut them off. If the Premier wants to know in all honesty, I gave them their subject matter at the press conference. If you like we have got the actual press releases that were involved and I could see that he gets them in his office tomorrow. The Member for Regina Wascana was on Positive Action for Women, the Member for Saskatoon Eastview was on teachers' salary negotiations with the Government. There were two or three other Members but I would be glad to pick up the press reports and make them available to the Premier and to suggest there was no change in policy was an absolute fallacy.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, I thank the Hon. Members for that information for it certainly was not known to me. I would have thought certainly from the point of view of forwarding the interests of our party as such, I lay aside government for a moment, that I could think of no reason why I wouldn't want any Hon. Member opposite to have a press conference. I would think that that could do nothing but good. I will certainly look into the matter and see whether there has been a change of policy. I undertake to do that. There may well be something that I am not now fully informed of so I cannot give you a commitment at

this time but I certainly will look into it.

MR. MALONE: Just before I leave this Item, I asked the Premier earlier about making use of the video tape machine for the Members of the Liberal Party and I don't recall that he ever answered the question.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Chairman, I think that the facilities of the radio room are available to the, as it now appears, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the third party and if the room is available to others, certainly the equipment is available to others. I wouldn't know why it wouldn't be. I am simply not aware of any reason why it wouldn't be.

MR. MALONE: If the equipment is portable will we have the same access to it, to use it as we like, where we like?

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes, and to the extent that it is used for party purpose by our party, you can use it for party purposes to the extent that it is used for Government purposes only and then, of course I would have to draw the line.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Premier, there is one other question. This broadens the perspective of the radio room or the broadcasting services within the Legislative Building. The minute you add a recording device, it means that a politician can go down and use the facilities there and make a production, record it and then use it to send around as political propaganda. May I ask the Premier is it the intention in purchasing that machine that it will be strictly used for Government business, whether it be Opposition or Government or will it be available to political parties to produce their own political propaganda?

MR. BLAKENEY: I think the practice followed in the past would be adhered to. I am not aware of any instances where political propaganda as the Member suggests has been disseminated from the radio room. Perhaps it has been. I am not aware of it, and accordingly I would think that the past practice would be adhered to.

MR. CAMERON: I would just like to make a comment. The subject matter gets some light attention. In my view it is not a light subject at all. What it is, is really a logical extension that previous practice is accepted by the Government. Let me enumerate those and bear in mind this is the background. The Opposition has a legitimate constitutional function in the same way the Government has a legitimate governmental function. It is one thing to advertise government programs and provide some benefit to the people who need to be educated to the benefits that are available to them. That's one thing. It is quite another thing to provide advertising, and when I say advertising I mean time bought and paid for in the various media that's available to government, for other purposes. There is a legitimate area for publicity by government in respect of some of its programs. Now those are clearly the ground rules. What we are now seeing is the process of publicity, advertising of the nature that isn't bought and paid for being heavily weighted in favour of the Government in respect of its constitutional

obligations and responsibilities and against the Opposition's responsibilities.

Now let's look at what's happened in the past two years. I recall it wasn't very long ago when the Government began to use, on a regular basis, paid for by the taxpayers, three or four per week on press releases done in redi-print form and sent to all the weekly newspapers. That's one thing that was done. The Government, therefore, is able to get into the weekly newspaper on a regular basis with press releases about what it is doing and invariably almost always it carries pictures of Cabinet Ministers in the process. We don't have the same opportunities. We don't have redi-print available to us, number one. Secondly, we don't have the funds with which to engage in advertising — to get into the weekly newspapers in the way in which you can.

Some aspect of that use is justifiable but some aspects of it are not considering that we don't have the same opportunities available to us in respect of our constitutional obligations. You have, secondly, a whole series of informational services available to you which we don't have. Every arm of Government has some information budget to it, including your own department. That's an information service which is not available to us, therefore, in that second respect weighted heavily in favour of the Government in terms of it getting its side of the story across.

Now I recall another area a few years ago, if my recollection serves me correctly; the Government bought machinery which permits them ready and direct access by way of radio into the radio stations around the province. We don't have access to those either. Once again you can get that ready quick access to radio stations around the province which we can't. Now we see an extension of all those things, paid for, redi-print advertising in the weeklies, machinery that can get you into the radio stations quickly and instantly that isn't available to us, the same way the redi-print isn't available to us. Now its additional television instruments and machinery that is available to you for that purpose to send to the television stations, a use once again that is denied to us.

Now I ask you, if taking all those things together, you aren't getting to the point where the Government side of things in that respect is very heavily weighted against the Opposition side. And I say that to you sincerely. If you were on this side of the House you would appreciate how very modest are our tools in this respect compared to those that you have. Now I say there is clearly an area where some of it is justifiable but I think this last development is, in fact, an insidious kind of development, because now what you are going to do presumably is take regular clips of various Cabinet Ministers making various pronouncements, saying various things, and feed them out to the television stations. No longer is that function in that respect being left to the media in the same way that no longer is the function of getting into the radio stations around the province or into the weekly newspapers by redi-print left to the press. It is now left to the hands of the Government. And I, for one, Mr. Chairman, am sad, indeed, to see this I continuing development where the tools available to the Government in a publicity sense are not available equally to the Opposition and the gap is growing widely and more widely.

MR. BLAKENEY: A couple of comments. What the Hon. Member suggests can be done with the video equipment can now be done with films. It can be done with the video equipment more cheaply and more rapidly and accordingly since we think it will not add to the total Government bill, we believe that we will, in fact, save money. I know that the Hon. Member will not have meant to leave the impression that these developments to which he referred all took place, in fact, in 1971. He is not saying that but in case anyone felt he was I am sure he isn't. The redi-print arrangement was not started under our Government but under the previous government, the one that the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley was the Member of, and the arrangement between Government and Opposition are the same now as they were then.

It is the conundrum always of the Government putting forward its story. We follow the practices I think which are followed pretty generally across Canada. We are not as vigorous, I think, in turning out printing material or film material on behalf of the Government as, let us say, the Federal Government which uses redi-print in a very heavy way and almost anyone who has a weekly newspaper knows that there is probably more Federal Government redi-print in it than there is Provincial Government redi-print. That's true all across Canada as opposed to just one province.

Well, as I say, I don't in any way suggest that the kind of arrangement is perfect but I am suggesting that it is one which has existed for a long time, that the change which we propose now is absolutely minimal by substituting video tape for standard film; that's the only difference, and accordingly if there are faults with the system they have been there for a good while.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one additional comment and I do this without trying to raise my voice or get in the annual Service Printing debate. But what is really happening here is first, the Government is replacing the press by suggesting that tapes of either voice clips for radio or now the potential use of video tapes in television are hard news. They are replacing the function of those people up there who have the responsibility of providing an independent view to the people of Saskatchewan as to what goes on in the political process of Saskatchewan. And that, as my colleague for Regina South says, is imminently dangerous and has very ill boding for the people of Saskatchewan in the future.

The second thing, is it is rather understandable that we might be suspicious because we have watched the NDP Government use public funds in ways of the advertising media that are questionable. We have brought them up often and I suggest if they were used in Ottawa the particular government that utilized them would be run out of office by the press themselves. I think of, for example, the printing of the Blues and the use of Service Printing. The hundreds of thousands of dollars of Government business has been channelled to their own political party and what it does is in fact pay the overhead of an entire newspaper so that it can be utilized for political purposes. I think of the Government advertising public programs in a political organ called The Commonwealth. I think we could go on and on and on and is it any wonder, Mr. Premier, that Members of the opposition are suspicious about this new step

and this new move. It has an additional danger, number three, that not only can you use it to give the impression of hard news but you can use those video tape productions to create political propaganda and then circulate them around the province and pay for them as political advertisements. Therefore, once again, it cuts production costs that would not be available to any other political party. Send them and circulate them around and it is possible that an entire election television production program could be carried on in the radio room of the Government of Saskatchewan or the Legislative Assembly of this province. That is why Members of the Opposition are suspicious and I think that any reasonable Member of the Government itself should understand the concern that is expressed by the Government and I would suggest that the Premier should take a real good look at this and recognize, as the Member for Regina South says, the function of both Government and Opposition in this regard and move backwards rather than forwards.

MR. BLAKENEY: Just three quick comments. First, what is hard news is not depending on what any government sends out whether they send it out by clips or by video tape or by film or by press release, it is decided by the editors who decide to accept or reject the clips, or the video tape or the film or the printed word.

A reference was made to the Blues. The Blues are given to the printing company that bids the lowest bid. If it happens to be Service Printing, it is Service Printing but the Blues are put out on a bid basis and if you have someone who bids a lower price he will get it.

With respect to the political propaganda, as soon as the Government owns cameras and film equipment the situation set out by the Hon. Member is possible. It is possible that Government equipment could be used to make what he refers to as political propaganda. That has been true for two decades probably. Indeed so far as political propaganda is concerned it is much more likely to be film than on video tape, so-called because it is a little easier to send around in some ways. But at any rate whatever danger there is with video tape it's certainly there with film and it has been there since film has been available to Government agencies and that has been for many, many years and I think it has not been abused so far as I am aware either by our Government or by other governments. I am not aware of cases where Government film has been run for political purposes.

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment upon this same subject by way of one last comment. I think that the Premier ought to be concerning himself with the question that I raise with you that you now have so many tools and so much money available to Government to put across its story as opposed to that which is available to the Opposition and one can't distinguish in quality in a sense between the function because the function is there in the Opposition the same way it is there in the Government. You say that the news editors are still free to make their decisions as to whether or not it is hard news. Nay I say to you there that what you are overlooking is a subtle and in some respects not so subtle form of pressure which government can bring to bear with respect to these things. Government does it in this way, redi-print, for example which

is paid for at the public expense. Then you go to the weekly newspapers with your redi-print and a government advertising contract in the other. You go to the radio stations with your clip messages in the one hand, your paid for government advertising on the other. Now if we get into the television area where we are doing the same things, paid government advertising on television on the one hand and the releases by way of video print on the other.

You could understand, I am certain the kind of subtle pressure that that brings to bear upon those media outlets, pressures which are not available, as I say to the Opposition. It is a development — and I have purposely kept my comments on a non-partisan level because it is a development that is occurring in all governments and one we ought to be concerning ourselves with in the sense, in the deepest sense of democracy. It is a development which each one of us in my view ought to be paying far more attention to. We ought to devise some mechanism, I don't know what it is, some mechanism to make the same tools that are available to the Government available to the Opposition side.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the Premier will have to admit that after the discussion on Item 3, that the Government does, in fact, have some definite advantages, not only in what the Hon. Members have mentioned but I have recalled very well, Mr. Premier, that in debate in this House on Bills 1 and 2, that for some strange reason a Crown corporation in the Province of Saskatchewan started carrying over most of the radio stations in Saskatchewan five paid announcements about the benefits of government ownership, in the particular case mainly Saskatchewan minerals. Most of the purchases if not all of the purchases except sodium sulphate are not from Saskatchewan. Here is a good example, Mr. Premier, what the Hon. Members are mentioning.

During the potash debate which was long and heavy in this House, the Government saw fit to enable the Crown corporation to run five and six paid ads every day on radio, outlining to the citizens of Saskatchewan the advantages of government ownership. When the debate ended so did the radio commercials.

I think the Premier would have to agree that that was a blatant misuse of funds at that particular time. I would like to hear the Premier's comment because it goes without saying that the Government has a very definite advantage during time of debate in this House.

MR. BLAKENEY: With respect to that particular incident, I think that there was at that time some practice of minerals companies, both private and public to advertise. Some of it continued. I note when I listen to the football broadcasts I hear about IMC. I am not aware of IMC selling very much potash in Saskatchewan. It is apparently a custom of mineral companies to advertise the merits of their company, institutional advertising, I think it is called. It seems to me that if it is appropriate for private enterprise it is appropriate for a public enterprise. The timing may have been questionable because there was a debate in the House. On the other hand there was a great deal of other advertising by other private mineral companies which was in a sense equally questionable, since it was equally presumably directed to attempting to influence the debate in the House.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, in raising the question to the Premier, I think the Premier gave us a weak excuse as to why the Government saw fit to involve a Crown corporation in such an advertising campaign. If any Member of the Opposition were to stand in this House and ask a question, and I have heard the answers many times, ask a question of a Crown corporation, they would say, that is a Crown corporation, take it up at a more appropriate time. In that particular case the Government saw fit to manipulate a Crown corporation. I presume they used the Crown corporations money in that advertising campaign. I remember a question in this House as to how much that campaign cost. I don't remember the exact amount now, but it was a very healthy sum. The Government did in fact, because of debate in this House, use either the people's money in one way or another. In one way or another they used the people's money in this province to put forth a very extensive radio campaign and in doing so I believe, and there is no question in my mind and people of Saskatchewan that you violated a particular trust in government at that time by using people's money to advertise for a distinct political purpose.

MR. MERCHANT: Mr. Chairman, before I concede the floor to my colleague for Indian Head-Wolseley, let me deal with a couple of quibbles as I would put them, of the Premier when he is faced with the hard facts from the Members that here we have him spending \$70,000 for purposes which I think most people would find objectionable. The Premier is very good on picking up on a little side argument and trying to deal with those side arguments rather than addressing his mind directly to the problem. A couple of the side arguments which he presents which may fool Members of this House who don't know anything about the media, but I doubt would fool the press, are when he says that a VTR machine, this instant video tape, is really no different from the equipment that they now have to make film. What the Premier fails to mention, of course, is that they never make film of a Cabinet Minister in a press conference, because what they would have to do is go through a process of shooting the raw film and then making a work print and then cutting the work print. Before they had little packets of pre-packaged film to send around to the television stations in the province. The film would be about two weeks old. It wouldn't be used anywhere. Yes, that is right as you raise your nose in the air. You can't use the raw film you have to make a work print or else the projector tears the film and you can't use the film more than once. What happens is you never see anything used on television stations except the raw film which is good enough for news purposes. But you can only have one raw film. You have to develop that immediately and you use it in your station. You can't bicycle that film from CKCK to CKOS to CITL or whatever.

You can, however, bicycle around VTR productions or you could take a video tape production, make copies of that and bicycle that around the province.

The Premier says that this is going to save money because we are already making film in other areas. Aside from the quasi-political area, he implies that we are already making film of such things as the Aware program. The Premier should know I and I suspect does know that all of that is done by film and done by agencies. It is not made here. It is not made in these

offices; it is made by your NDP agency friends. Those productions are made well in advance of their use and they are going to be using your \$70,000 propaganda machine. In fact, all this will be used for is to get actuality material, good actuality material of your Ministers out to television stations that wouldn't ordinarily use actuality material; they wouldn't have it available. So the effect will be that a dull story, if you just have the news reader reading on CKOS or CITL or CKBI or even CFQC, a dull story of a ministerial announcement suddenly is a far more usable story because you have got actuality. You have the Minister there. For the little stations like Swift Current and Lloydminster, that actuality makes the story far more likely to be carried.

Something else that is even more insidious about it, instead of picking from a prepared news release the material that they want to use or picking up from their stringer which would be a radio tape and picking what they want to use, instead what you I will bicycle out to them is about a 50 or a 60 second clip. I do just that in federal elections. I do just that on behalf of Cabinet Ministers but the Liberal Party pays for that in a federal election. I say if you are going to be performing that kind of a process then the NDP party should be paying for it on a continuing basis.

Some of the larger stations have had the good sense to say no, we won't have anything to do with that sort of thing, Merchant, when I bicycle that kind of information to them. I think they may be right. What they have said is, the Liberal Party can afford to send that, and we know that the Conservative and the NDP either can't afford to use the resources in different ways. So they say, we won't take them at all because we don't want to give a greater exposure to your policies than we do to others simply because you have bicycled around to us actuality material that is 14 or 16 hours old. That was the attitude for instance that CKCK radio took under Frank Flegel, quite rightly, when they said, we won't even take your instantaneous material when you wanted to put a Telex machine into their studios. They said we won't take that because we don't think that the Government should have that advantage over the Opposition parties.

Mr. Premier, I say to you that this further use of Government funds for political purposes is wrong in just the way that the Member for Regina South and other Members of our caucus have explained it to you. I think indeed, that you well know that this is just another step. You can say, well, that is the direction we have been going. But it is another step of using government funds to further the political purposes of the government party.

MR. BLAKENEY: Let me make two brief comments. We've heard these speeches. One of them indicating I obviously don't understand, and I clearly don't understand the technology as well as the Member for Wascana, when he talks about taking a week or so to develop film. I am puzzled since I remember sitting down on a Monday and doing a show of three minutes or five minutes on VTR and another one on film and being assured that the film would be up at in Lloydminster by Wednesday night. I don't know how this was done in two weeks, but it was done in two days or a day and a half, whatever it was. That is the way it was done. The VTR was sent to some stations and the film was sent to others.

With respect to the other point that the Member raised about material during elections and what he sends around paid for by the Liberal Party during elections. Note very carefully what he is saying that we are going to be doing this during elections.

MR. MERCHANT: That is what you do best. You pick on one little word, or one paragraph and then you misrepresent it. I didn't say that, and I think you are too bright to have heard it that way. What I said was, you will now be doing, as a government, exactly what I do as a political process and that is wrong. I think you know that is wrong. I think you also know that you can't move film around because you have to make copies. You can make one raw cut of a film and you can shoot it tonight and develop it in about six hours. But you can't make copies to send all around the province. When you said that this would save money because you would be using less film by using VTR instead, I think you may have even known that that wasn't right, because you don't send film of Cabinet Minister's announcements. You don't have that facility and you don't use the government in that way. This new process will allow you to package what Ministers say and get extra actuality coverage on the outlying stations. That is the purpose that you are spending \$70,000, \$70,000 of taxpayers' money and then you use taxpayers' money to man that film and make VTR copies and bicycle it around the province. That is wrong.

MR. BLAKENEY: I am glad the Hon. Member cleared that up. He says now that we propose to use this equipment to bicycle VTR tape around the province at election time.

MR. MERCHANT: I didn't say that!

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes, he did! There is no question about that. He said we would do what he did during the political process and when he outlined it first he said during an election campaign. He knows, I know, that we do not carry on government advertising during an election campaign by VTR, by film or by any other means. He knows, I know, and the Member for Regina South knows that we are the only government in Canada that has barred political advertising during campaigns.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: He knows, and I know that the Liberal Party which he is supporting during these federal campaigns is carrying on its advertising during the election campaign. He knows and all of them know that our Government has put a stop to that, has put a stop to the abuse which we saw election after election when Members opposite, like the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley sat on the Treasury Benches. One does not have to go back any further than 1971 to remember those abuses. We put a stop to it. We put a stop to it even in by-elections.

Members can talk all they like about their political purity, but until they have done some of these things which our party has done in order to even the scales during an election campaign, then it seems to me that their words are a shade hollow. They might — either of the Members referred to — the Member for Wascana or the Member for Regina South may use his influence with the Federal Minister of Transport to see whether they can get him to adopt similar rules. I think the answer is that our record in

this regard, while not perfect, as no government is perfect, stands up very well to records of previous governments in this province, records of federal governments now bearing the party label of the Members opposite . . .

MR. MERCHANT: From one quibble to another.

MR. BLAKENEY: It is not a quibble whether government money is used during election campaigns to advertise.

The big issue is whether or not we are using, in the mind of the Member for Wascana, whether we are now using VTR to do what we are doing now; whether we will be able to use VTR to do what we are now doing by press releases, by clips and by film. That technological change is what he regards as the greatest change. He is again ignoring the fundamental issues about how governments do use advertising during elections and not during elections.

If he suggests for one moment, for example that the Federal Government does not have similar equipment, then I think he is wrong. It seems to me that protestations of purity would better come from people whose track record is a little better on some of these issues.

MR. MALONE: I think the Premier's comment can't go unanswered. The Premier once again has demonstrated that he has selective hearing over there. He hears what he wants to hear and he turns off when he hears things that he doesn't want to hear. Indeed, he sometimes hears things that weren't even said.

What the Premier just did a moment ago was twist and distort and turn the remarks of the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) to use to his own advantage. At no time did the Member for Regina Wascana talk about the things that the Premier said he talked about, at no time whatsoever. What the Member suggested to the Premier, which is abundantly clear now to everybody, is that this new machine, this video tape machine will be used by the Government opposite, not during election time now and the days to come before elections. It will be used to tape the speeches of Ministers. And you will take those tapes of those speeches and you will send those tapes to television stations across this province.

Well, some of those television stations will have enough sense not to use those tapes because they recognize those for what they are, Government propaganda, CKCK-TV, CFQC-TV, all the larger television stations hopefully will have the sense not to use them because they know what those tapes are. What the Member said and what the concern of the Opposition is and what the concern of everybody should be is that there are certain stations that won't be able to resist the temptation of showing a Cabinet Minister on television because they don't have facilities to get a Cabinet Minister on television on a daily basis like the other stations do. They will be sent out daily I am sure by Government, or Information Services to these smaller television stations. You couple that with Government advertising being sent out as well and it becomes almost irresistible for those stations to start using the spoon fed propaganda that is sent to them. That is what the Member is warning against. That is what he made abundantly clear. He didn't at any time suggest that you were going to be using it during election time; in fact he gave the example of doing it in Federal elections and

showing some respect to the stations that decided not to use those tapes.

The Premier got up, twisted the Members remarks the way he did, is inexcusable and I say that the Premier knows full well what he did and I say that everybody in this House knows full well what he did. I only hope that those listening in the Press Gallery will report just how he did it, because I think the time has come that this type of action, this type of twisting and turning and using Members remarks that aren't made and using them to his disadvantage, basic untruths, in the way that those remarks are twisted and turned, is improper and we on this side have had enough of it.

MR. BLAKENEY: I will want and would invite all Hon. Members to look at the printed transcript and make up their own mind what the Member for Wascana says.

MR. MERCHANT: I said it twice; I corrected you.

MR. BLAKENEY: That is right and you referred the second time to your earlier reference about elections. As I indicated about the Federal Liberal Government and to the rest, and I invite anyone to look at it and see whether my meaning was a fair and reasonable meaning to take from it. The allegation of twist is I think unfounded. However, let's go on to the point which the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) raised.

Of course, it is true that a radio station or a television station in this instance might use the VR tape in the same way that they might use the printed press release with the picture of the Minister and the press release read by their announcer or the picture of the Minister with the voice of the Minister coming over the clips. That has at least some actuality because at least the voice is the voice of the Minister. Of course, this will be in some respect a better medium since it combines both the face of the Minister and the voice of the Minister, no one denies that. Of course, it is a simple use of the current, of a slightly different technology to do what is now being done.

MR. CAMERON: Persistent even though he knows better.

MR. BLAKENEY: I am just unable to accept the criticism of the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) that there is anything very different about this from what we are now doing. Of course, it is different but not very different. What is so different from our VR tape from a file which could be used but as the Members say is not very often used or a picture with the speaker's voice, with a voice over. We have seen a lot of them done. I have done many election ads and we have debated whether we should use file or video and voice over and/or stills and voice over and we felt that there wasn't a great deal of choice very frequently between video and stills with voice over.

MR. MERCHANT: You are not asking us to believe that you became Premier knowing that little about it?

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes, that is right, because while I obviously am not as well versed on this as the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) but I will advise him that I have put together a number of television commercials which we have indeed used for elections where we have indeed used stills with voice over and felt that, they had rather more impact than the VTR, that was in elections when we were doing rather better than some other parties that I can mention.

However, the point that I invite all Hon. Members to look at is what we have done with this radio room, what press releases have gone out, what dip stuff has gone out, and whether or not anyone feels that that has had a party bias. It obviously puts the point of view of the Government but I suggest to you that it has been down the middle so far as being proper stuff to come out of a Government department and we can file the 1,500 press releases if you like. You can go over them all; you have heard stuff that goes out over the clips and I say to you that it has been solid governmental informational stuff and unlike some other ads I have heard sponsored by governments, it has not been party promoting but Government program promoting.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Indian Head-Wolseley) Well, Mr. Chairman, after listening to the Premier, he has informed the Members of the House that he is going to do exactly what we are afraid of. And now I want to test whether the shades of hollow sound with a positive protestation of purity are really sincere or not. There is one safety device, Mr. Chairman, and that safety device is a rather obvious one, that what is available to the Government should be available to the Opposition and therefore I know that after listening to the Premier and all those protestations of purity and the sanctimonious utterances that he tried to convince the House that I am going to move a resolution that the Premier will get up and support and he cannot help but support, because it will protect the Government, it will protect the people of Saskatchewan and it will be the safety device that he will be able to assure the people that there is no discrimination, that the opportunity to perform the function of Government is also available to perform the function of the Opposition. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I might even ask if the Premier would like to second it but if he won't perhaps I can ask one of my colleagues.

It is moved by itself and seconded by Mr. Cameron, if the Premier would like to second it:

That all communication devices now owned by the Government of Saskatchewan to facilitate information to the media be made available to the Opposition including:

- (1) Redi-print for the weekly newspapers
- (2) Clips for the radio stations
- (3) Video tape for television
- (4) Radio room for press conferences.

And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if the Premier is really sincere that these communication devices and new technology are being used justifiably in the democratic process

that there is no way in the world that he and every Member of the Government cannot support that resolution.

Debate continues on the Motion.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Chairman, it is rather clear that the Members opposite want to get their party program paid for out of the public purse. The views of the Government are that it is available for Government but not for party publications. It has been available for Government and not for the New Democratic Party and it has been used scrupulously and I think that accordingly I see no reason why we should not carry on as we have done. If Hon. Members can point to instances of abuse in the past and they now have a six or seven year track record, rather than pointing out what may happen in the future, then we could pretty obviously reconsider. But in the light of what our press releases of the order of 2,000 or 2,500 a year and in the light of the Hon. Members not being able to point to one which they feel was inappropriately or at least not pointing to one which is inappropriate, and then having a similar number in the year before and in the year before that dealing with such matter as when the road ban will go on and when they will come off and that type of thing, if Members Opposite are not able to put forward some basis for suggesting that; this whole process should be open to political debate, which it has not been up until now, then it seems to me that it would be unwise to use the radio room and all of the facilities for what will undoubtedly be a vigorous political debate.

MR. CAMERON: You are going to use it for party purposes.

MR. BLAKENEY: That is precisely what I am saying that the Government has perfectly legitimate information to put out to the public which is non-political in its content. The Party has political things to put out that we put out from the Premier's office and from the office of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan when we are putting out political stuff that a grant is provided so that you can counter our political stuff with your political stuff and that we have severed and segregated those items which are political and those items which are not political. And I invite Hon. Members to look at the material that goes out from the radio room, also look at the material that goes out from Ministerial offices and that indeed is sometimes political, and ask yourself whether or not the appropriate arrangement is not the one we have, the one where we turn out Governmental, non-political material from the radio room and where we turn out things which may have a political colouring from our Ministers' offices or from the office of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Malone) or the offices of the third party. We get public funds to do that you get public funds to do that and the political process is permitted. The public is able to get the political flavour of these items from these releases and they are able to get totally unbiased material from the radio room, I think that is the way it should be notwithstanding the desire of the Opposition to politicize the everyone of the 2,500 press releases dealing with such weighty items as the road ban comes on.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, that is the worst political speech,

the most biased utterances I have ever heard the Premier give.

First of all here is what he says. You are going to use it for political purposes. I say it was to use for the Opposition's function. Once again he distorted and twisted the remarks. What he does is very simple. He says, "I ask you to trust the NDP but do not trust the Liberals and the Conservatives", that is exactly what he said. Here is the Government that uses public funds to advertise in The Commonwealth, that uses public funds to keep its own party going. It uses the radio, the public funds on the potash, when you want to talk about abuse, for three months or two months, daily, hourly turning around with that potash propaganda when the Bill wasn't even passed. Talk about abuse, I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman, but all I am going to say is that the public of Saskatchewan will be aware of exactly what the Premier said tonight. The NDP wants to use every device that is available to perpetuate the imbalance between the Opposition and the Government for its own propagation and perpetuation. That is really what you want, nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. Chairman, I say this is a very, very disturbing twist, this whole process here tonight. It is a clear indication of the real intention of the Government. It is a clear indication of what information services want and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if the Premier and all Members of the Government vote against that resolution it is a clear indication that it is a political move, it is for political propaganda. I want to tell the Premier again, if ever the Opposition used those devices for political purposes and they abuse it we are subject to vindication, or the vindictiveness of the public when it comes to voting the same as you are, and we will have to pay for that in the future the same as you will and all I am saying to you tonight is that if you are telling us to trust the NDP and don't trust the Liberals and Conservatives or whatever party comes, that is a shame. That is a dirty shame and it is beneath the dignity of the Premier of the province.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not asking you to trust the NDP. I am asking you to prove your case. We have issued hundreds maybe thousands of press releases. If you say we are using that for political purposes don't come and tell us, show us. You have the copies of them all. You have the copies of them all. What is the point of Members opposite coming in here and alleging that the use of this radio room has been, or presumably will be, some sort of a political tool. Why do you not point to the thing which has emanated from the radio room either by press release or by clips, or by any other method which you think bordered on political propaganda or were, in fact, political propaganda. It is not as if we had kept it under cover. It is there to be seen. If there has been abuse let's have it! I am aware, Mr. Chairman, and very well aware of the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley because he sat on the Treasury Benches in 1971. He is now suggesting that I should dredge up examples prior to 1971, which he hasn't been able to dredge up for 1976 and 1977.

I well remember when the last year we got money from the office of the Leader of the opposition, the amount was \$12,000. We are now providing at least three times that for Members opposite so they can carry on their political duties — three times and more, three times and more for their purposes. Accordingly, I say again, tell us how we have abused any of this equipment or any other equipment in the radio room; tell us so that

your argument that this new equipment would be misused has some basis other than allegations and you have a six year track record. If we have abused anything tell us and then show us and then we could believe you when you utter these protestations that this new equipment will be abused. I do not believe that it will be abused; I do not believe that it will be abused any more than the equipment which has been there for six years has been abused. I believe that we have used it scrupulously for government purposes. We have not tried to make political points out of that. The people who are operating the radio room have been given instructions not to accept press releases which have a political slant. it is always possible that one got through, who knows, but of these hundreds and of those thousands you ought to be able to find some if you think it is true. And if you don't think it is true, if you think that all those thousands you are unable to locate press releases which you think are unfair, and you can see that they are, in effect, straight government news, then why do you suggest that this should not go out by VTR, when it is apparently all right to go out by radio or by press? It seems to me not very believable; it seems to me that Members opposite are trying to allege, once again, that everybody operates a government the way they did when they were here prior to 1971.

MR. MacDONALD: When the Premier gets up and says a press release by a Minister of the Crown is not political he is being juvenile and he is asking us to be juvenile to even accept it and believe it.

He talks about the government, we were the Opposition, why we only got \$12,000. When I first became involved in politics they wouldn't even let the Liberal Party have an office in this building. Isn't that a fact, Mr. Premier? I suggest to the Premier, give me a copy of those radio scripts for all your political advertising; give us a copy of all that information. We have had informational things from individual Members talking about and done in the Information Services, about political meetings. I haven't got them with me, but there are lots of them.

What the Premier is really saying is, we want the Government to have all the facilities, modern technology, promote ourselves. That is wrong. There are two functions to government, one governmental and one Opposition and that is the point that the Premier refuses to acknowledge and he knows he is wrong.

MR. BLAKENEY: Note, Mr. Chairman, he has once again said that these are going to be used "for the New Democratic Party", and you heard it, and I heard it, and I once again ask him to show one example of all the thousands where that is true.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse) Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments. While my life in this House has not been long, only six years, I think what we have heard tonight has been one of the most degrading statements of any Member of this Assembly and that is the words that have been uttered by the Premier of this province.

We are debating a resolution that is before us. That resolution does not include you or accuse you or your government of anything. That resolution does not accuse any Member of this

House of anything. We are debating that resolution and all that resolution asks for is that the services of the media facilities in this building be extended to all Members of this Assembly, including the Opposition.

What the Premier has said in his remarks is first of all, he is accusing me, as an individual Member, of not being honest. He is accusing me of not being able to adequately use those facilities to the betterment of the constituents which I represent. As well, you have accused me of not being able to take part in the government process of this House, which he is saying in other words, are the only people in this Chamber who are capable of taking part of the government process, the 18 Members sitting on the Treasury Benches. There is more to government than 18 Members; government involves 61 Members of this Assembly.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier owes me and he owes every Member of this House an apology for those accusations that he has made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Chairman, I have been in this House for 17 years and I have never asked for the use of the radio room to communicate with my constituents the ideas which I wanted them to accept on behalf of the New Democratic Party.

I have been in government and I have been in Opposition and all the while it has been recognized that the radio room is to get out non-political information. I have never asked to use it to get out my political line and I don't know why the Member for Morse should want to use it to get out his political line.

The Member for Morse is busy telling me what the function of an Opposition is. I know what the function of an Opposition is. I was there for seven years. I think that I know the role of an Opposition Member and I think I know it in political terms and I think I know it in constitutional terms and I think I could state it as well and as fluently as the Member for Regina South. I well appreciate the fact that there is a function. I am saying that that function is discharged through the office of the Leader of the Opposition and my function, as a political leader of the Government, is discharged through my Cabinet Office and my function as administrator of head of the Government is getting out non-political information, is discharged through the radio room and there is no corresponding function of administrative head on the Opposition side.

A government is an administration and it is a political organization and I say, in respect to my administrative function, we send it out to the radio room and in respect of our political functions — and we are pretty careful about that — we send it out through the Cabinet Ministers and I say that we have been scrupulous at that, and I am vindicated at that because nobody has come forward with any, which they feel, are part of the political function as opposed to the administrative function of government.

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the response to the non-response of the Premier.

It is going to be brief and let the records show, and let

the press read what that record says tomorrow. Our Leader accused the Premier of twisting what a Member said, twisting it to his own advantage. At no time in my remarks did I say that the reason why I wanted it was to promote my political line; at no time did I say that and that is exactly what you said in rebuttal to my remarks. You said that my main purpose for my statements was because I want to use those services for a political line. I ask you, and I challenge the press to look at that statement tomorrow morning and find out who is twisting the facts and who is twisting the truth.

Motion negatived on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 9

Malone	Merchant	Thatcher	
Stodalka	MacDonald	Nelson	(Assiniboia-
		Gravelbourg)	
Wiebe	Cameron	Anderson	

NAYS — 23

Blakeney	Robbins	Tchorzewski
Bowerman	MacMurchy	Shillington
Romanow	Mostoway	Vickar
Messer	Whelan	Nelson (Yorkton)
Snyder	Kaeding	Allen
McNeill	Koskie	Kowalchuk
Faris	Thompson	Matsalla
Cowley		

Item 3 agreed.

ITEM 4

MR. C.W. THATCHER: (Thunder Creek) Mr. Chairman, perhaps for some of the junior Members in this Assembly you could tell us what this department does. What do they plan? What do they research? What sort of people do you have doing it? I notice you have 22. Are they top level people — when I say top level people, are they highly degreed people or are they party hacks or are they top level civil servants? Would you briefly describe this department.

MR. BLAKENEY: There are a number of senior people — the Chief Planning officer. I am not always impressed by university degrees but we have a fair number of them around here. The Chief Planning Officer is Roy Lloyd, who is sitting to my left and he has a bachelor degree and some post-graduate work in Economics; Robert Wiese, who is Director of the Inter-governmental Affairs Branch and he has a Master of Economics and some work towards a PhD Thesis not completed; David Hocks who has a MA in Political Science; Joanne Sutherland who has a BA in Economics and two years towards an LLB degree from the University of Manitoba; Ralph Smith — and I should give his initials because he is not another Ralph Smith, who may be known to you. This fellow has hair and he also has a BA in Philosophy and a BA Honours in English. He has just been away at the University of Manitoba doing some work; we have a Kenneth Swenson, who has a BA in Sociology and a MA in Sociology. I think he has a class or

something to complete there; we have a John Stewart who has a BA in Economics and an Honours BA in Economics and some work towards an MA; we have a Bryon Hindle, who has a MSC in Economics from the London School of Economics. Those, I think, are the professionals. We have a number of clerical as well; Donald Taylor who has a MA and BA in Economics and a MA course in Economics and still has a thesis to do. That is the group which is there.

There is a Research Officer I, who has a BA and support staff are a clerk steno IV, who has the usual; a clerk steno III, a clerk typist III, clerk steno III, clerk steno II and that is it.

MR. THATCHER: Mr. Premier, with all due respect, and I know none of these people, but as you rattled off their qualifications would hardly leave one particularly impressed, academically anyway. A BA in philosophy really doesn't mean all that much; a BA in Sociology or even an MA in Sociology in this particular area doesn't sound particularly impressive. It seems out of place. Then we had the list of political science majors, which while they may seem out of place here, they are probably out of place in most departments also.

Mr. Premier, in looking at the expenditures for that department I note that you have a provision for 22 people, some of whom are stenos, and you read off the classifications. I note that the average salary for this particular department is \$21,114. Now I am sure that your stenos, and I don't know how many stenos are in this department, obviously some, your stenos are certainly not paid that figure. So obviously some of the people that you have rattled off the names for, with the qualifications, appear to be extremely — and I will rephrase that to say, very adequately paid people.

Mr. Premier, what I am curious about, you didn't tell me what they planned and you really didn't tell us what they researched and again I would ask you if you could in view of the time very briefly tell us what do they do?

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, they do economic analysis on forecasting so that they try to tell us where our economy is going to be and they turn out economic reviews and statistical reviews so I guess they don't strictly turn out statistical reviews, I guess the Bureau of Statistics does that. And on the basis of this forecasting we attempt to figure out what our revenue is going to be in the next year, judged by what the crops are going to be and all that sort of thing. We've recently taken on Andrew Sampson, an agricultural economist. We felt we were short and he was just transferred the last two weeks, I guess from agriculture. We do such things as the review of the economic impact of the development of uranium industry and to prepare that for the Bayda Commission, for example, for ourselves when we are trying to estimate or trying to figure out what royalty arrangements should be worked out with the uranium industry and Mr. Lloyd did the great bulk of that work. A review of housing policy with a possible impact on the construction industry in our attempts to schedule construction as to bring it onstream when the rest of the private industry is down, that's a difficult sort of thing, continues the plans to cover events such as a possible increase in unemployment as the

population bulge makes its way through, review of let's say the Federal Grain Income Stabilization Plan to see whether it's likely to kick in and what the effect would be of a high initial payment that we have had and whether this will cut down the amount of payments, which we think it will, by the way, and review oh something like Federal Competition Policy, that sort of thing by the economic people. There is another group of things on the social policy, provincial manpower policies, Indian and Metis problems, a bunch of things on resources, reviewing and assessing the impact of the potash reserve tax and consultation with the industry and many of these people spend a lot of time on that, and then the Inter-governmental affairs. I've tried to outline literally hundreds of federal-provincial conferences. We don't try to go to them all from here but we try to keep tabs on most of the, the big ones and the big money ones.

MR. THATCHER: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I've been one of the fortunate ones in that I haven't been in this House all that much the last few days. I've been doing something that not very many of you on that side of the House would know very much about, and that's working for a living.

You know to step back in here and listen to what's going on here tonight and to listen to the answers the Premier just gave, you know its easy to see why people have become so cynical about governments, about politicians and a level of things that go on because I suppose when you are here all the time it doesn't seem all that bad, but when you've stepped away for a few days and stepped back in, you just simply have to shake your head. Mr. Premier, you have budgeted a fair amount of dollars here. I didn't hear very many PhDs rattled off. I heard a few degrees of Masters, etc., I heard sociology, political science, and after talking about these degrees you've suddenly described what these 22 people do. If they are doing a job with even 10 per cent accuracy, they are doing a very commendable job because I always thought that estimating revenues, etc. was done by the Budget Bureau, but apparently from your description they would supersede the Budget Bureau. Supposedly these people are in a very complex relationship with the Federal Government Mr. Premier, I don't think that even you believe that they perform the tasks that you just described because it's physically impossible. I don't know how many of them are top level people. Here you've listed 22. There are probably a dozen secretaries in there, so to give you the benefit of the doubt and say you've got a dozen people with 10 or 12 people doing all this, it's physically impossible. Mr. Premier I wonder how many other Government departments you've got like this. We stumbled across some in public accounts that make you just shake your head and you know the frustrating part of it is that you know full well that for every one that you trip over, there are probably countless dozens that you never get near, and that you can't probably ever hope to find in that bumbling mass of bureaucratic giants that people like yourselves and the Federal Government have created. I am not going to belabour this point because we want to get out of here.

In closing I would like to say, Mr. Premier, the answers coming from you this evening are not of a calibre that I would have anticipated coming from yourself, because even though I might not sound like it, I have a fair amount of respect for your ability. I think you can do a little bit better than this

and I just wonder if perhaps your tired answers tonight are not an indication of a very tired Government over there. You've scoffed at predictions of about 25 months in the tenure of office for this Government. Mr. Premier, I think you need a holiday because your answers are tired tonight. I'm afraid you people are on the way out.

MR. BLAKENEY: I certainly accept the Hon. Member's suggestion that I take a holiday but it may be somewhat delayed. There may be one or two intervening items that need to be attended to but as soon as they are attended to I will accept with alacrity his suggestion and summer cometh, and in due course we'll all be back with renewed vigour, and with renewed confidence in our great province.

Item 4 agreed.

ITEM 5

MR. BAILEY: It is getting late and I want to be a little more charitable but I do have something to say on this Item.

Mr. Premier, in the entire Budget you will recognize that in one way or the other you were spending about one dollar for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan assimilating public information and a good amount of that is in advertising. We have discussed at length the \$70,000 purchase of the new machine. The Provincial Inquiry Centre, Mr. Premier, cost the people of Saskatchewan about 25 cents for man, woman and child and as I said I was going to be charitable. I think this is deserving of this particular Item. I feel that the Government for the amount of money that is spent, as I mentioned 25 cents for man, woman and child, is the only item within the Budget where I really feel that you are getting your full value, and certainly you are with the Provincial Inquiry Centre.

Item 5 agreed.

Items 6 to 8 agreed.

Vote 10 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

LEGISLATION — VOTE 21

ITEM 1

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, just one brief question. Seeing the Premier seems to indicate that the Leader of the Opposition office must perform all those political functions, has he considered an increase in the Leader of the Opposition's allowance this year?

MR. BLAKENEY: We felt that it was appropriate to follow scrupulously the recommendations of Mr. Justice Hughes, and we have done so in accordance with our always scrupulous conduct.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 12 agreed.

Vote 21 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:39 o'clock p.m.