

April 19, 1978

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I have the extreme pleasure today to introduce a group of students from Saskatoon. They are from St. Goretti Separate School. There are 44 Grade Eight students and I believe some special classes as well. They are accompanied here today by Mr. Wilde, Mr. Oliver and Mr. Melynk. I might say to the members of the Assembly that unfortunately, St. Goretti School was burned down about a year ago and the students of St. Goretti have had to divide themselves up between two other schools in Saskatoon.

I was by the site of St. Goretti School over the weekend and I noticed that a new school has sprung up there. I am informed that the students will be in the new St. Goretti School, probably in the month of May. I am sure all students are looking forward to that new school because it looks very modern and I am sure that it is the best in educational buildings that are available in Saskatoon at this time.

I know all members will join with me in welcoming the students from St. Goretti School.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — It is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the House, a group of 33 Grade Eight students from Sutherland School. They are sitting in the east gallery incidentally, Mr. Speaker, and they are accompanied today by Mr. Hill and Mr. Dyck. I might just take this opportunity to notify members of the House of the particular interest which that school showed in Participation in Saskatoon and we congratulate them for it.

I hope that they have a really enjoyable day here in the House and I will be meeting with them a little later in the gallery. I hope that thereafter, they have a safe journey home. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, 45 students from Central School in Swift Current who are also seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by Mr. Myers, the principal, Mr. Yee and Miss Darroch.

I know they have had a big day and are looking forward to some other festivities or activities. I look forward to meeting with them at 2:30.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Last Mountain-Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, Grade Eleven and Twelve students from Earl Grey, along with their teachers and their bus driver.

April 19,1978

We extend to them a most sincere welcome. We hope their visit here in the Assembly will be a very educational one and a very enjoyable one.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Prison Guard Demotion

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. One of the major factors in the Moore Inquiry was the Chester matter, Walter Chester, a prison guard who was probably not properly dealt with by the Correctional Division of the government. Mr. Chester was demoted because of an assault charge. Now yesterday in the district court, in the judicial centre of Prince Albert, an appeal decision came down in that particular case and Mr. Chester was found not guilty of an assault and completely exonerated, I might add, Mr. Minister. Is it now the government's intention to restore Walter Chester to his full position at the Prince Albert Correctional Centre with all back pay reinstated and no loss of seniority, an action I think the Minister will agree would be fair and just?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, as usual the member is wrong in the premises on which he bases his question, and that is not uncommon because that is 95 per cent of the time he does that. He makes a false premise and then asks the question. Mr. Chairman, (interjection - inaudible) — I will answer the question. If you have a question you can get up in the House and ask one. I will answer the question right now.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chester was not dismissed because of the assault charge. The assault charge, as such, had nothing to do with the demotion of Mr. Chester. It was an addendum to the list of things that finally convinced the department that action had to be taken. I think it was proven during the investigation and I think the department submitted a number of reasons as to why Mr. Chester was demoted; so when the member says that Mr. Chester was demoted because of the assault charge he is simply not stating the facts. I have not got the papers or the evidence with me, Mr. Speaker, but I can provide them to the House. I think there were at least a half a dozen incidents in the past when Mr. Chester was employed at the correctional centre. I believe these related back to 1967 or 1968 and these were substantiated. It was felt that Mr. Chester could not, and he said he could not, abide by the policy of the department. It was for these reasons that Mr. Chester was demoted.

Mr. Chester has another alternative, Mr. Speaker, and that alternative is to go before a grievance committee. I will make no decisions at this particular time until the grievance procedures are completed. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I will hopefully make a decision in regard to Mr. Chester.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I refer the hon. minister to page 68 of the Moore Inquiry Report, which he would be well advised to read and reread and read again. In that, is stated 'The attempts by the Department of Social Services and its deputy minister to undermine the course of justice by interfering with judges and with the Attorney General's Department.' Now, in that particular page to the Moore Report, it is referred to the statement that the Attorney General's Department would consider appealing the Chester decision because the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take the next question.

Cable Television

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — I am advised, Mr. Minister, today that there are approximately 48,000 homes hooked up to the private cable licencees, that there are approximately 8,000 homes hooked up to CPN. Some will be a duplication. I am advised further that in order to facilitate the delivery of two messages, as it were, to CPN and to the private licencees that we will need approximately 40,000 filters and 8,000 converters to be able to facilitate both of these networks operating. My question to the minister at this time is how many filters and how many converters do you presently have ordered to do this particular job? Secondly, do you have any absolutely proof that these filters and converters will work and thirdly, how long do you anticipate that it will take to have at least 40,000 of these filters brought into Saskatchewan?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, first of all dealing with the number of general questions contained in the preamble, may I advise the hon. member that Sask Tel has arranged to have the drop wires installed for those people who, for those residences and apartments and the like, will want either cable or CPN service and in so far as the quality of the wire, the wires are capable of carrying either type of messages. The wires do not distinguish or discriminate in that respect and therefore, Sask Tel is at present contacting all people in the cities to determine if they want the drop wires installed and they are doing that. Sask Tel is presently doing that.

How many of the converters have been ordered? There have been firm orders placed for 10,300 converters. Will they work? The answer is that to the best of my knowledge they have even been approved by the CRTC. There are 10,300 of them ordered. The company was unable to meet its original target date for delivery of the converters because the supplier for the company was unable to meet the target date to supply the metal box that contains all this magic hardware, which I am sure the hon. member for Lakeview understands. The company has indicated that commencing the first week of May, deliver 500, the second week of May, an additional 500 and thereafter, they anticipate their production and delivery to be 1,000 units per week.

MR. MALONE: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister, when he answers this supplementary, would also address himself also to the matter of filters — you didn't answer that question. So what you are saying to us is that you have 500 in the first week in May, 500 in the second week in May, then after that 1,000 a week. Now, would the minister give us his assurance, give the House his assurance, that these converters will work — because all of the information that I have been able to receive, indicates that they have yet to devise a filter or a converter, that will work; also that the converters that they presently have, have not been successful because they interfere with other signals.

MR. BYERS: — I think they may be experimenting with some temporary filters, some filters that are not of the standard that Sask Tell will have delivered from this eastern company the early part of May. Will they work? My understanding is, that the filters on order have been approved by all the regulatory bodies — that is the information given to me.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary.

April 19, 1978

MR. MALONE: — When will you answer my supplementary question? Now my final supplementary to you is this. Notwithstanding what happens in the court battle that is presently going on, is it not true that Sask Tel is going to find itself in the position of not being able to abide by whatever direction Mr. Justice MacLeod chooses to give? That is, if he directs you to take CPN off the air, you are then in breach of contract with CPN; if he directs you to take the other licencees off the air, you are then in breach of contract with them. Is that not the case?

MR. BYERS: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speculate on what Justice MacLeod may or may not decide — and I doubt if he is any more competent than I am to decide on the adequacy of any filter. That is a field of neither of us. I am confident that the . . .

MR. MALONE: — How many filters?

MR. BYERS: — Well, we don't know how many we needed because both Regina Cable and CIN are still in the business of recruiting customers and how is anyone to know what the anticipated number of filters will be. That is simply not a rational question.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Attorney General. Regarding the court case that has been referred to, you have used to indicate that you would not be prepared to answer. However, the court case is going to mean that the contracts are, in fact, going to have to be made public in the court action. Would you now be prepared to table in this House the contracts and agreements between Sask Tel and CPN and Cable Regina, which will become public in the few weeks, so that the House will have an opportunity to review the contracts and really get to the heart of the matter?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member can read more clearly the mind of Mr. Justice MacLeod than I can but I don't think it's open for him to say that the contracts will as a matter of course be ordered by the courts. They may be or they may not be. I think we'll have to cross that bridge when we get to it. I think for the time being the question with respect to contracts and Sask Tel is the position that we have taken in the past. We have obligations with respect to clients, obligations which we intend to honor and to keep as best as we can.

Number of People anticipated to sign up for Cable TV

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head - Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question once again to the Minister for Sask Tel. Is it not a fact, Mr. Minister that the anticipated total number of people to sign up with conventional cable in Saskatchewan is 100,000. The estimated number to sign up with CPN is 40,000. It is also a fact as the member for Lakeview has indicated that there are now 40,000 conventional cable and 8,000 CPN. Would the minister not agree that each individual client, whether he has cable television or regular cable or CPN, must have a filter in order to filter one or the other out so that the eventual requirements in the province of Saskatchewan will be at least 140,000 filters and if there is a duplication some will require two in each house? Would the minister agree with that?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I doubt if the question of debating and explaining every element of hardware that's required to deliver cable or CPN television is an appropriate matter for discussion within the Legislature and what size of screw nail holds them together and all that sort of thing. I have heard Liberal estimates whereby they were going to deliver cable television to the farms and private lines to the farms and they didn't count the cost and when you added up their cost it was over \$3 billion but they never counted the cost and, therefore, I never take Liberal estimates on the eve of an election very seriously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Supplementary. Would the minister now tell the House whether or not it is a fact that CPN has not collected a five cent piece for the service it has provided to anybody in the province of Saskatchewan, not a five cent piece? Would the minister tell me when he anticipates that the filters will be provided to all clients regardless of the estimates, that have signed up with CPN and Cable Regina so that CPN will be able to start charging its clients, when will they be able to do this in order to protect the \$2.6 million that your government has guaranteed to CPN?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, when do we expect to be able to meet the ultimate and final demand for these? I hope that there will be an endless demand for them because if this matter is settled we will then be able to expand the role of CPN and the borders of the boundaries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Intercontinental Packers

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Minister, some years ago your government purchased an interest in Intercontinental Packers for approximately \$10.5 million. As I recall that was about 45 per cent of the equity.

Could the minister tell us if anything has changed in that situation; have you put any more equity money into Intercontinental Packers? Do you still own 45 per cent of it? Could the minister tell this Assembly what has been returned to the government treasury in terms of dollars and what is your approximate rate of return on this investment in today's dollars?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge the equity that we acquired several years ago was the same then as it is now. But, Mr. Speaker, to be certain I will take the question as notice. I will check it out to make sure that there are no differences, but to my knowledge there are no differences.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, could you tell this Assembly what returns there have been to the province from this original investment, either in terms of dollars or in terms of per cent, in relation to that because, Mr. Minister, we have no place that we can possibly go to to acquire this information?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, the returns to the economy of Saskatchewan by our acquiring 45 per cent of this company have been very, very significant. If we had not acquired 45 per cent of Intercon, it is possible, Mr. Speaker, that that particular plant might have been acquired by some other company. We have seen Burns Corporation close down its processing plants in Saskatchewan, regretfully, even though as a government we were very anxious to see Burns maintain plants in Saskatchewan so that we have the processing capacity, but this did not happen. It is possible that had some other company acquired a portion of Intercon or all of Intercon, we would have seen the same fate for Intercon as was the case in Burns.

We have, as a result of acquiring Intercon, two plants in operation, some 1,100

April 19, 1978

employees employed; we have a large processing capacity which serves the beef and hog production, which serves the people of Saskatchewan and, particularly, our farm community very, very well. We are getting a good return for the investment that we have made.

MR. THATCHER: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, specifically then, would you tell this Assembly if there has been any return whatsoever on the \$10.5 million, not in retort, but in dollars. What have the taxpayers of this province got for their \$10.5 million? What dividends, Mr. Minister?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, I think that there is an opportunity to make those questions in Crown Corporations. The dividends to the people of Saskatchewan are very significant. I think it is important to have 1,100 jobs where there is a payroll of millions of dollars where there are taxpayers and where the company pays taxes to the people of Saskatchewan and to the government of Canada; those are good returns, Mr. Speaker.

Second Cable for CPN

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — A question to the Minister in charge of Sask Telecommunications. I ask the minister whether in light of all of the difficulties that you are having with the filters, both technological difficulties and also the expense, whether Sask Tel would not now agree with CPN who states that they believe you will have to install a second cable and go to the expense of installing a second cable if you are going to keep one system separate from the other?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I think we have in the last few months seen more doom and gloom preached by the Liberal opposition. They don't want anyone to develop filters that will work. They are going about the province preaching that we do not have the technology nor the ability to develop the hardware that is needed to develop this service. May I say to the hon. member that it was in the latter part of December, 1977, that the decision was made that CPN would go as a competitive service. In three short months a converter has been developed that is unique; there isn't another one like it on the market. I can well understand the frustrations of the Liberal Party because Sask Tel and the government has acted to develop this technology.

MR. MERCHANT: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, of course in three short months you have gotten yourself into two lawsuits. I ask the minister whether it is not true that you now face, once the filters are installed, the technical problem that they will be very simple to take apart and that you will have to seek Criminal Code amendments to make it an offence to steal either CPN or cable by paying for one and then removing the cable filter and then in essence stealing the second facility, that you now face the technical problem of having to get Criminal Code amendments to make that a criminal offence?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I will accept the hon. member's word who is a lawyer that it is a criminal offence to steal; he is an expert on that.

MR. MERCHANT: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Minister in charge of Sask Tel whether he is aware of the fact that the only reason that it is a Criminal Code offence to steal by way of installing an illegal telephone is because of specific Criminal Code amendments and I ask the minister whether you have considered the problem in relation to cable that you will not be able to stop people from removing the filter and then stealing the product though it won't be stealing in the sense of a criminal matter?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to leave the matter of the Criminal Code to the very competent representatives we have in the federal parliament of Canada.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — A supplementary to the minister. In light of the answer given previously by the Attorney General that he refuses to table the contracts, will it be your Sask Tel counsel position that it will refuse to give to the courts, the contracts . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take the member for Kelsey-Tisdale.

Answer to Gas Storage Question

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — The member for Estevan asked a question several days ago which I took notice of — actually two questions, one in regard to storage caverns for gas, and price. I want to convey to the member that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has four storage caverns in Saskatchewan, one at Regina, a second at Prudhomme, a third at Melville and a fourth at Landis. The caverns together, are capable of storing something in the neighborhood of 4.4 billion cubic feet of gas and they have a daily rate of production of something in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 cubic feet. They serve three purposes. One is to provide a backup in case of a pipeline break to avoid or limit the curtailment of industrial customers and to minimize if possible and when possible, gas supply costs. In regard to price, the prices paid, Mr. Speaker, for gas from the Trans Canada Pipeline are the sum of the Alberta border price established by the Alberta and the federal governments pursuant to the Petroleum Administration Act, and the pipeline tariffs established by the National Energy Board, in other words, the law of the land, Mr. Speaker.

The reference that the member made in his question (the member for Estevan) and I quote 'ten times the price'.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have a little order between the member for Wascana and the hon. Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the rules of the question period are that when a minister takes notice of a question, he utilizes the time in the question period to answer that question when he has the information available.

If I may continue, Mr. Speaker, the reference to 'ten times the price' may be related to the exchange agreement with Trans Canada. The corporation is buying that gas from Trans Canada at a much higher price than the contract called for. The same situation applies to the case of the Unity contract and the general service contract. The federal government has in each case, overridden the contract's price provisions.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the difference in the exchange gas agreement is that the corporation has contended that the National Energy Board's jurisdiction does not extend to contracts of that type and is currently appealing the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, rather than comment on the statement made by the minister, I would like to ask a new question.

MR. SPEAKER: — I thought the member was rising on a supplementary.

April 19, 1978

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Minister, you didn't quote the rate though and how much gas you had used that was picked up from Trans Canada at the higher rate.

MR. MESSER: — The rate is as I stated, the price that is established at the Alberta border and that is set by the Petroleum Administration Act federally, and that rate fluctuates. I can I guess, provide to the member, the rate as of a specific day but I don't have that available now and if that is what the member is looking for I would be more than happy to provide it to him.

DNS RAP Problems - Deficient or Incomplete Work Contracts

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the DNS. Over the past several months, Mr. Minister, I have asked a few questions concerning the DNS RAP (Regional Assistance Program) problems in the North, some pertaining to Thompson Plumbing and Heating in the Cumberland House area.

Mr. Minister, I have learned now that this is not an isolated problem in the North and that some of the same type of problems of deficient or incomplete contracts exist in the Sandy Bay area also. Could the minister inform this Assembly today what steps the DNS is taking to ensure that the recipients of the work are going to have the work completed by these contractors that was started and left over a year ago?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I advised the member some days ago, when these questions were being asked, that I would take the questions as notice, in order to get for him a proper answer and a complete answer, some things which I did not have at my disposal when the question was asked. I advised the member that I still have not received a complete answer from the Attorney General with respect to the investigations which are being carried out by the RCMP. When I receive that answer, I will provide the member with the detail.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think I will take the Minister of Finance.

MR. WIPF: — I guess you will.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, the hon. member for Thunder Creek asked a series of questions respecting the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. I think his first question related to a 102-unit project in the city of Saskatoon. Mr. Speaker, in 1978 a tender was awarded for the construction of a 102 public-building unit in the city of Saskatoon and MBS was the low acceptable bidder. Fidelity Construction had submitted a lower bid; however, that bid was qualified. The Review Committee, consisting of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation and CMAC, rejected the bid because of it being qualified.

Mr. Speaker, the matter was also referred to the Saskatchewan Construction Association which indicated that the Fidelity bid was properly rejected and, Mr. Speaker, may I put on the record a letter that was received by Saskatchewan Housing

Corporation from the Saskatchewan Construction Association. In part, it reads this way. 'We have reviewed your instructions to bidders' and, under paragraph four, 'tenders refer you to two conditions which state 'no alteration or additions to the subject matter shall be made' and tenders must be delivered as described above to be considered.' 'We believe that these instructions, you have quite clearly indicated, the subject tender would not comply and would not be considered.' For that reason MBS, Mr. Speaker, was the lowest bidder and received the contract.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member also has questions about kitchen cabinets. My information is this. The standard procedure is to specify, in tender documents, the type and quality of cabinets required in preference, generally made to a particular manufacturer's design, where design brochures are available from the manufacturer, so that all manufacturers can easily determine the specifications required for the cabinets. However, other manufacturers are invited, in the public tender documents, to submit their products where they feel they meet the standards required. In essence, any manufacturers can submit a bid.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation was contacted by the Star West of Moose Jaw. The company was advised to contact the project architect, which is not our architect, it's the project architect, to have their cabinet designed and specifications reviewed to determine if they meet the required standards, Mr. Speaker. The corporation did not hear from Star West's representatives again until the second week of April, almost two months after the initial inquiry from Star West and almost one full month after the contract was awarded by the general contractor to the Saskatoon distributor, Mr. Speaker.

Now I also have the specifications that were required and it makes it very clear . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think the minister is treading on the patience of the House with the kind of answer he brings in. Now, order, order. I think that members, when they put questions in the order period should put questions that require a brief answer and the minister should bring in that type of answer accordingly, or he should say that the member should submit a written question if it appears to the minister that a written answer is going to be long and detailed. I think some responsibility falls on the minister if he recognizes the situation to be one that requires a long and complicated answer. Then he should say, submit a written question.

I am not going to allow the question period to continue any further because we have already gone over the question period by at least four minutes. I will take Ministerial Statements.

Point of Order on Question Period

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention that the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Wipf) was not allowed any supplementary question to his answer and at the same time by overruling any allotment for supplementary question you allowed the Minister of Finance to get on and ramble at length for five minutes. Now we get cut off if our questions seem to be going on too long. For example . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! If the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland is asking why I cut off the member for Prince Albert, I would be prepared to answer that. The answer to that question is that the minister said that the member had asked the question

April 19, 1978

previously and I seem to recall that when the member asked the question previously the minister took it as notice. At that time I allowed a supplementary. The member is back asking apparently the same question again and the minister says that the member has asked the question. 'I am preparing an answer, I will get back to the House with an answer later.' (I hope it is a short answer), 'and that will satisfy the question.' I'm not prepared to allow innumerable supplementaries to questions when a minister says, 'I'll take it as notice.'

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, question that I had asked the minister related to the DNS RAP Program but it was another question in another area of the DNS RAP program. The previous one had been on the Cumberland House area with one contractor; this was in another area of the province in the North with other contractors.

MR. SPEAKER: — I apologize to the member for being unable to distinguish the subtle difference between the questions, I am sorry.

MR. MERCHANT: — A rat of a different kind, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order regarding the answer of the hon. Minister of Finance. I accept that the question was a complicated one and I am not particularly critical of the length. I do say to your honor and I think you are aware of the problem, I would have had supplementaries, I suspect that the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) might have had. A problem does arise if ministers choose to rise late in the question period, give lengthy answers and thereby preclude supplementaries particularly about a very delicate area.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, to the point of order raised by the member for Wascana . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Was the member for Thunder Creek rising on the same point? I'll take the member for Thunder Creek.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Wascana for commenting on that but seeing it was my question that was put to the minister, Mr. Speaker, I did ask the minister a fairly lengthy question and the minister was quite right on that. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of public urgency because the matter is presently being dealt with so to have put it on the order paper, Mr. Speaker, means that some six to eight months may have gone by or whatever amount of time, and the matter would not have been current and the matter would have been settled. It is still open.

Mr. Speaker, the minister was very effectively answering my question and I thank the minister for giving a detailed answer but, Mr. Speaker, he was not allowed to complete it. Now, Mr. Speaker, how do I find out what the answer was? The minister was not allowed to answer and I believe it was quite a legitimate question and I think the minister will agree with me. Will the Speaker tell me how I now proceed?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order and I'm not even sure this is a point of order so I'll be as brief as I can. I'll be as much in order as the two previous points of order that have been raised, that's for sure, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make this observation, Mr. Speaker. I've been in the situation myself where I tried to get Mr. Speaker's eye to answer a question that I have taken notice of in an earlier question period. I can attest to the fact that the Minister of Finance was trying to do that during the entire question period. This is very difficult for Mr. Speaker

because if he recognizes the minister too early he could be criticized by the opposition. We would be eating into the question period time. If he recognizes him too late he gets criticized for not having enough time to have supplementary questions. My point of order is, Mr. Speaker, this: that it is important, if I may say, from our point of view that the questions be of an urgent nature related to public policy. If members ask detailed questions which require detailed answers they can not be heard, with all due respect, shouting the Minister of Finance down, calling him to order, as the members of the Liberal caucus were on this occasion, and thereby hounding him to take his seat having asked the basis of the question. So I say, Mr. Speaker, my point of order to you, Sir, is that, it is very difficult for you, but I would ask that at question period you cut off questioners when they get into the detailed questions which can be better put on the order paper, not better, properly put on the order paper and allow us to answer public policy questions, which is what the question period, I submit, is all about.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I have three people speaking on the point of order and I would like to deal with them now.

The member for Wascana was, in part, reiterating what I had said earlier about the long answers and I don't altogether disagree with the member for Wascana.

I can say to the member for Thunder Creek that at the bottom of each question period I write, continued tomorrow. That is probably when he can get the rest of his answer if the minister is prepared to give it to him. I wasn't prepared to allow the question period to go on any longer.

I think some of the points the Attorney General was making were points that I was making, or that I understood. I did see the Minister of Finance attempting to get in earlier. I would advise ministers that after the initial two or three questions have been dealt with in any question period, that they rise until I notice them, and I will try to work them into the question period. I don't like recognizing a minister at the end of a question period and then not being able to permit one supplementary at least. You heard my comments about a long and detailed question requiring a long and detailed answer and it should be on as a written question.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As far as I am concerned, and I express this and I think maybe Mr. Speaker should consider. I think the two people who infringed upon the rules were the two ministers involved. First of all, the rules very clearly state that the reply must be short and precise, the same as the question, as you have pointed out to us on many, many occasions, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest, that if the minister is unable to answer the question, orally, he should not be allowed to read a long detail. He should send it across to the member and answer it very briefly. And as you say, Mr. Speaker, the member can always ask an additional question.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. MacDONALD: — The ministers' replies, today, were clearly out of order as the rule states and as the Rules Committee turned around for the rules of the question period in the House, clearly out of order!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think we are pawing old ground now, because I have already stated to the minister that I felt that his answer was a little long and I thought the

April 19, 1978

other answer was a little long from the minister, as well. I think I have advised the ministers to shorten up their answers. When I see a minister turning a page on a piece of paper, I realize his answer is far too long.

MR. SMISHEK: — The member asked several questions.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think there has been some point made here that members ask several supplementaries. Well, I think the minister is only obligated to answer one question at a time and just ignore the rest of the supplementaries. Don't accept, don't take the bait, if there are several supplementaries. I would ask that the members who are putting the question - I know members get up and they have a series of questions and it becomes so obvious after a while, that there is a string of questions, that the minister has to answer. Then the members get upset because the minister takes a long time answering their string of questions.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

I am not sure, exactly, how you wish me to proceed, but we had a situation today, in a reply, Mr. Speaker, and it is a prima facie case of privilege, of what I perceive to be a deliberately erroneous answer being given by the Attorney General.

That was on the matter of tabling of the contracts, which are the subject matter of a court case. Now, the Attorney General knew full well, when he replied to my question as Chief Law Enforcement Officer of the province, that when a breach of contract is a subject matter of a court action, that obviously the contract is going to have to be filed at the court, that is basic law. He gave a deliberately wrong answer in attempting to evade the question. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we as members of this Assembly are entitled to the truth from the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Are there any further comments on the so-called point of privilege?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that point of privilege because I think it involves me somewhat.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, my point is that I believe the question by the member for Qu'Appelle displayed the kind of arrogant attitude towards the courts which I was so critical of yesterday. This matter being before the courts and referring to the matter before the courts, I find — and I can say this with as much sincerity as I have in me — I find it absolutely disturbing that the opposition parties make comments while the matter is before the courts with reckless disregard to the proceedings before the courts. That is the ground rules from the PCs and the Liberals, then, fine, those are going to be the ground rules with respect to matters before the courts. That is point number one.

Point number two, I don't see how there is any point of privilege on an answer that I give. The hon. member says that I deliberately misled the House. I ask the hon. member to back up that claim with a piece of specific evidence, right now, or withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! We have a so-called point of privilege which I am not prepared to waive notice on and I will take the matter under advisement and report back to the House on a later time on the matter.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Party): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on another matter that just occurred. The Attorney General has just stated to this Assembly and to the members of the opposition, and I believe I am quoting correctly, 'If that is the way that the matters are to be dealt with on matters before the courts then so be it, so will we.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment is a threat to all members of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Second Readings

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Faris that Bill No. 22 an Act respecting Elementary and Secondary Education in Saskatchewan be now read a second time.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head - Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, my comments today are going to be very brief. I had intended to get into this debate on a rather lengthy basis but because of the fact that reports emanating out of the Cabinet meeting between the government and the trustees' executive for the province of Saskatchewan had indicated that compromise position is being taken, I therefore, feel that it is now time to get on with that third reading, past second reading. I understand my Conservative friends wish to say a few comments. I am glad to hear that perhaps the problem is solved or at least appears to be solved and now they want to get into it. I think that is great. What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I do think it is now time to get on with the third reading and as far as our party is concerned we encourage anyone else to get up and speak on it if they so wish. Now I am going to indicate to members of the House and put on record some of the amendments that we are going to introduce on third reading so that the minister himself will have an opportunity to study them; appraise or assess their value. Then we will see just exactly what his attitude and what kind of a compromise position the government is willing to take in relation to the meeting with the government and the trustees. If they don't then I am sure they can expect a great deal more of discussion and debate in third reading, which of course all of us have a complete opportunity to do so. So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to put on the record and explain very briefly some of the amendments that we are going to move in third reading because the minister of course has asked on a number of occasions for us to bring forward the amendments, so now I am going to do so.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, is on section 92 and as the minister is aware, section 92 is the section which indicate and enumerates the powers of the Board of Education in the province of Saskatchewan. But one of the things that the minister did was very effectively eliminate the enabling clause at the introduction of that section, which would give the trustees the power in Saskatchewan to do whatever other things are required to provide the education services for the children, other than those defined in the act. Therefore, the first one, Mr. Speaker, will be an enabling clause which would make that possible.

In section 92 we will amend . . . which will say, insert after 'a Board of Education may' the following words:

April 19, 1978

By resolution to anything not inconsistent with this act and the regulations that it considers necessary and advisable with respect to the educational services of the division and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Board may . . .

Of course this is an enabling clause which was previously in the education acts and I am sure that the minister will understand the reason behind it, because once again any act that specifically only defines responsibilities that are permitted does not provide the enabling one of course, limits. Education is a very volatile and changing thing and this of course will make it possible for trustees and boards of education to deal with new problems as they arise.

The second one, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to go to section 227 before I get into the one (the very controversial one) on the Board of Reference. Of course this is the one that indicates the quality of education. One of the problems that the teachers in Saskatchewan felt was that old section gave practically the sole responsibility for quality of education to the teaching profession. We have re-inserted a section which indicates some responsibility to the teachers (or a reduced responsibility) in regard to their role in the education of the child. I think that it would in some way eliminate the total responsibility of quality being on the shoulders of the teaching profession, but at the same time indicate again the importance that surely there is a responsibility on the educational system in Saskatchewan to provide not only education but a certain degree of quality of education.

Therefore, section 227, the preamble to section 227 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

A teacher shall be responsible for the quality of his teaching services (you will notice that this is a change from the old section); co-operation with staff colleagues and administrative authorities in advancing the educational standards and efficiency of the school; participation in educational planning by the staff and the Board of Education; regular advancement of personal professional competence and without restricting the generality of the foregoing the teacher shall . . .

And then it goes on, of course, with the remaining portion of the clause.

I think that this, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister would be a very welcome addition to this bill.

Section 227 is also amended . . . section (a) or (a) portion . . . to be amended by striking out all the words on the printed bill and substituting therefor:

(a) diligently and faithfully teach the pupils in the educational program assigned to him by the principal (and as I understand even members of the teaching profession seemed to indicate to the STF that they didn't request that this be withdrawn from the act, it seems to have generated from the Department of Education) so, therefore (a) diligently and faithfully teach the pupils in the education program assigned to him by the principal is re-inserted and amend subsection (1) by deleting the word 'immediately' in the third line of the printed bill and substituting therefor: 'by the conclusion of that day.'

When I go to that, Mr. Speaker, if I can find that for you to explain it very quickly . . .

— See how helpful we are Don, we've done all of your work. That's what you call a constructive opposition. Mr. Speaker, I will come back to that one, just so I can continue.

Then, of course, section 91 we want to amend by deleting the word 'authorize' in the first line of the printed bill and replace it with the word 'determine'. This is, of course, a little semantic one, but the trustees of the province and the boards of education felt quite strongly about this, that 'authorize' was merely to pass on some one else's authority and yet because they are the elected officials and have been given the responsibility of determining the educational services of the board, they felt very strongly about this and, therefore, I think the minister should reintroduce this particular word.

Then, also, we want to amend section 43. Of course, this is one that I would hope the minister would look at. As he knows that in SARM Act or the RM Act, electors can elect someone to become reeve or councillor in a district even though he does not necessarily live in that district as long as he farms or owns land in that district.

All of us are aware that most towns now and even small villages are incorporated. This will mean that if a farmer who lives a mile and a half outside of the town, lives in the community, that, he too, can stand as a school unit trustee in the district where he farms, let alone from the town that he resides. And, therefore, we are going to change that in section 43 in the printed bill, in the second line following the word 'elector' the following words, 'or the registered owner of taxable real property'. I think this would be then consistent with The RM Act. It broadens the opportunity for someone who is sincerely interested in education, who happens to live in the town even though he owns and pays taxes on property on his farm outside the community and that gives him an opportunity to stand. That's right - and particularly where there is a consolidated school district in the town, as the minister is aware, and this would then make it an opportunity for him to run as a school unit trustee.

Section 217 is hereby amended by deleting the words, 'unless the Board of Reference otherwise determines'. I am going to go to that one, Mr. Speaker. This one, of course, is the one that I think is the most important. I am going to read 217 and I think the minister is very familiar with it.

The scope of the investigation and the findings of the board of reference thereon shall, unless the board of reference otherwise determines, be limited to the reasons given in the written notice of termination of the contract of employment.

To me, Mr. Speaker, and I think to trustees and everyone involved in education, and I am sure even the teacher, this is the most dangerous clause and the biggest weakness of Bill 22, is the fact that all of a sudden the Board of Reference can come in and not only be called together to decide upon the reason for dismissal, whether it was just or unjust and then take upon themselves the investigation of all of the teachers or any other matter that they so wish, in the school. But to me, Mr. Speaker, a board of reference in a community, and I am sure the minister is aware, is a very dangerous thing to begin with, because very often they become a walking side show.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, a board of reference or a board of conciliation in a small

April 19,1978

community is open to the public. It becomes accusations one way, accusations another way. All of a sudden to students and parents, it becomes almost like a walking side show. This is an extremely bad section of the act and, of course, one that we are very, very insistent that it be deleted and I am hoping that the minister will take this, because I think it is a weakness in the act. I think that even his legal friend from Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) would certainly have to agree that no board of reference should be given unlimited scope of power to investigate anything they want to in relation to the school system; that it should be limited to the reason that the board of reference was called and that was the reason, whether the dismissal was just or unjust. I hope that the minister will accept this in all good faith, because without question, there is no reason that every little piece of dirty linen in the school system, should be made at the power of the board of reference to investigate and throw open to the public, to the children, to the parents and everybody else within the school system. I cannot understand why the minister put that in, in the first place. I hope he will listen with open ears and an open mind, to that request, not only of the opposition, but also of all members, all parents and all people who are interested in education in Saskatchewan.

Amend section 221, is hereby amended by deleting subsection (d) and substituting therefore, the following - and I am going to go to section 221, subsection (d): 'make any additional order or recommendation that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.' We want that one removed. Let me read a suggested amendment to the minister:

'(d) wherein the circumstances it is in the opinion of the board inappropriate to order continuation of the contract even though the termination of the contract was unjustified, the board may award damages in lieu of reinstatement in such amount, having regard to the age and length of employment and prospects for employment as a teacher elsewhere in Saskatchewan, that is fair and equitable.'

I think the minister will understand. I think the member for Regina South has indicated the reason for this. For example there are many, many occasions when a teacher may have been dismissed; the board of reference or the board of conciliation in the past may have found that it is unjust and would therefore feel that it was incumbent upon it to order the reinstatement of the teacher, but because of the physical surroundings of that particular community, that teacher would be unable to really make a satisfactory contribution in that school system. It might therefore be deemed otherwise that a severance pay might be the best thing for the teacher, might well be the best thing for the students and certainly might be the best thing for the administration. Therefore, we have added that particular amendment to section 221 and I think the minister would agree that that is a wise one. It will give some additional protection to the teacher. It will also protect, I think, the school board which would not be forced to take back the teacher who in their judgment, even though the dismissal may have been judged unjustified, but in their judgment will no longer make a worthwhile contribution to the school system within the system. Of course that would then make perhaps a better harmony within the school system, make better harmony within the school itself and better relations between teachers who are still teaching within the system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one more section (e) 'make such order as to the costs of and incidental to the proceedings as it deems fair and equitable.' I think also that the member for Regina South when he spoke, indicated our position in this regard, that if there is no assignment of costs as to the responsibility of the person who moves or requests a board of reference, and even though the school teacher may certainly in his own mind feel that the decision to dismiss him was completely justified, he might feel

that he may get some award of costs by a board of reference. He may be able to vindicate himself for a future teaching position and therefore he is going to ask for a board of reference anyway and we are going to go through washing all of the dirty linen in public. The board of reference is going to be forced to be called; they are going to go through the public inquiry because that is what it is in a small community. Both sides will probably have great costs and bring lawyers in — parents, students and everybody else are watching this educational system wash its dirty linen in public and then all of a sudden he is — the board of reference says the dismissal was justified. The teacher then goes away and says, well I tried, but if he has a responsibility for costs, he is then going to consider very carefully whether or not he feels in his own mind that it is justified or unjustified and of course the board of reference is going to take into consideration, the availability of the costs, etc., that the teacher can pay and also the school system as well.

Now we have one other major section, Mr. Speaker, that we have indicated that we have wanted to do and that is, make an appeal procedure available to the courts. In other words, even though a board of reference comes in, makes a decision, the decision is binding by bill 22 (and it seems that the minister is insistent on retaining the binding arbitration) we feel then that there must be some way of making an appeal to the courts.

One of the great difficulties in making an appeal to the courts of course, is the fact that perhaps it will take an indefinite period of time. So we have two objectives in this particular amendment. We are not quite satisfied and we have one little clause we have to work through a little better in order to make it completely satisfactory. We feel that somewhere along the line we must have an appeal to the courts but that appeal must be handled by the courts in an expeditious manner or as quickly as possible so that the case doesn't drag on and the school system can get back on with the job of continuing the education program within a school system with the matter disposed of once and for all.

We have attempted to bring forward an amendment and I am going to see that the minister gets a copy of this one which will turn around and look after that particular problem. There is one little portion of it that isn't quite complete.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to start with first of all section 222 of the printed bill, strike out section 222 of the printed bill, that is the first and technical part. Then there are some technical things that have to be done and I am just going to repeat them and then get to the guts and the substance of it. Amend section 223 of the printed bill, (a) by striking out, 'shall be filed within 14 days', in the second line, substituting the following, 'may where no appeal is taken pursuant to section 226 be filed' and, (b) by renumbering the section as section 222 of the bill. This is a technical technicality because of the appeal procedure. Section 224 of the printed bill; amend section 224 of the printed bill by striking out 'each' in the first line of subsection 2 and substituting the following, 'subject to any order as to costs under clause (e) of section 221 each' and, (b) by renumbering the section of section 223 of the bill. Of course this passes on the same idea of the assignment of costs.

Section 225 of the printed bill, amend 225 of the printed bill (a) by striking out the last three lines of subsection (1) and substituting the following, '(a) an application under section 212 or where an application is made until it is disposed of and, (b) an appeal under section 226 or where an appeal is taken until it is disposed of but the board may in its discretion employ a substitute teacher pending the disposition of the application of the appeal' and, (c) by renumbering the section as section 224 of the bill. Once again

April 19, 1978

that is a technicality to move it along.

Section 226 of the bill, amend section 226 of the bill by renumbering the section as section 225 of the bill. Insert the following section as section 226 of the bill, and here of course is the guts of the matter. We are not completely satisfied simply because there isn't quite the time limit that we want but I am going to read it to the minister; he will certainly understand the substance and what the intention of the amendment is. It is an appeal first of all to the Court of the Queen's Bench. We had initially suggest that we would like to make it to the Court of Appeal but because of some problems in drafting and so forth, we have decided to make it to the Court of the Queen's Bench.

Section 226: '(1) A teacher or board of education that is agreed by an order made under section 221 may within 30 days from the day on which the order is made, appeal to a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench who may upon hearing the appeal make any order' — maybe I will stop there and just explain — means either a teacher or a board of education, whoever the ruling of the board of reference goes against, '(a) confirming, reversing or vary the order made under section 221 indicating that the judge may confirm or reverse; (b) respecting costs that the judge considers equitable (2) The appeal shall be by motion, notice of which shall be served upon the respondent and upon each of the members of the board of reference within 30 days from the day on which the order is made under section 221 and not less than 10 days before the day on which the motion is returnable (3) Upon receipt of the notice the board of reference shall forward to the appropriate local register a certified copy of all documents in its possession relating to the order from which the appeal is taken. (4) There shall be no further appeal — of course we still have one little problem to solve; we hope by the time third reading comes along that we have now cleared up the fact that they have to serve notice by a specified time in order to bring it before the courts. Now we have got to find a way to work with the courts in order to insist that the judge or the Court of the Queen's Bench hears the appeal as quickly as possible in order to solve the problem.

Mr. Minister, I wanted to put those . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I have been listening very carefully to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and it seems to me that the discussion of the broad general overall principle of this bill has been lost in a detailed attempt to stress what the amendments will be which I expect will be attempted in committee and I just want to ask the member if he doesn't think that it would be more adequate to discuss that in committee rather than in second reading.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly on most occasions would agree with you 100 per cent. I realize this may normally digress a small portion from the normal procedure in second reading of the bill and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have now completed my remarks with that detailed analysis. But the minister has indicated that he is very interested in hearing some amendments, also of the fact that the controversy that exists out in the public, particularly between those factions who are involved in the educational process and of course I mention teachers and trustees as well as parents and children, has been so well documented. There is public advertising going on in newspapers, on the radio and public advertising, public meetings being called all over the province and each side is now projecting their particular thing. What is happening now by means of this continual agitation by continuing ads, newspaper ads and so forth, including the government, is that they are continuing to aggravate a very unpleasant situation. I think that it is unfortunate in the province of Saskatchewan. So what we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is indicate that when the minister gets up to

speak on third reading that he can indicate whether or not the principle of these amendments are acceptable. When he indicates that then I think he can stop some of the things that are going on in the province, some of the protests against Bill 22 and he can try to bring it to a quick and satisfactory resolution, which is really the intent of these amendments. As the minister has asked on many occasions, please, give us your amendments. I also want to tell the minister that we have only indicated to him those major portions of concern that have been expressed publicly. I do have many other small amendments on other portions of the bill that are not really sources of aggravation and conflict within the province but rather what we consider weaknesses in the draftsmanship and rather on a technical basis.

I also want to point out that as far as I am concerned I have not changed my position in relation to a binding arbitration. The government has indicated to the trustees that that will be a fact. If that is a fact then I think that the most important thing that the minister can do is accept the spirit of the amendments that we are offering because then it will provide, first of all, a limiting of the scope and the power of the board of reference and restrict it to the cause of dismissal or the reason for establishing the board. That is very vital in our judgment. Second of all if he will listen and provide an opportunity for appeal, then I think once again that then at least the binding arbitration that is being foisted on Bill 22 will at least have perhaps healed some of the wounds by many of the parents and trustees and those responsible who are elected to run education in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would hope, Mr. Minister, that the spirit of my remarks today have been very conciliatory as he can see, very, very constructive. We have tried to follow the recommendations that he has indicated in the past. We have presented our amendments. We have also made it public to the press this morning so that they will have an opportunity to view them objectively. I hope that the minister now will listen, will respond when he closes debate and I would hope then that the minister would be equally as nice because if not in third reading of the debate we will resume with all the vigor at our disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I so indicate to the minister and hope that with a spirit of generosity he will accept the amendments I have introduced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to address myself to the principles of Bill 22, I would first of all like to make a brief comment on the speaker that has just sat down in his chair. It is interesting to note that the Trustees' Association which met with the Premier and was questioned in this House, met with the Premier I believe four or five days ago, announced - and I will get back to that in just a moment - announced that there were amendments that were in order and coming from the government on some of the concerns that they had raised. The Premier when questioned in this Assembly also said that only one, only one item that he had discussed with the trustees remained contentious and that was the compulsory binding arbitration. The Premier was adamant that the government would not change its position on that but on the others, both the trustees and the Premier, announced that they seemed to have come to an agreement that there would be House amendments made by the government. And today it seems that as a result of the trustees' hard work, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley seems to think that the people are going to believe that the Liberal Party somehow dreamed up these amendments. Now he is going to produce these amendments in second readings. It is the first time certainly in

April 19, 1978

the three years I have been in this Assembly that we have listened to an entire speech. You will recall, Mr. Attorney General, that we have listened to an entire speech in second reading, talking about . . . (interjections - inaudible) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I will continue when members to my right get over their chagrin . . . (interjections - inaudible) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might proceed without the rat-a-tat from the members to my right, who are expressing their chagrin at having the obvious brought to their attention. I would like to suggest that that kind of behaviour certainly is not going to be believed by the people of Saskatchewan and that the people . . . (interjections - inaudible) . . . and that the people of Saskatchewan are going to understand much more clearly, than the party to my right seems to think, the procedures that go on in this Legislative Assembly, which are that you address yourself to the principle of bill on second reading and to the — (interjection - inaudible). If the member for Quill Lakes would relax we will get to that in just a moment. On second reading you address yourself to the principle of the bill and on third reading you address yourself to the amendments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the purpose outlined by the Minister of Education and by the Premier, on many occasions, for Bill 22 was twofold, as I understood it. It was to bring together a great many acts pertaining to the education of our children in Saskatchewan into one relatively clearly-worded act that people could understand. That was goal number one. Goal number two, as I understand it, was to modernize and update the educational system. That was what the Minister of Education said were the goals and targets of Bill 22.

MR. PENNER: — Modernize and update?

MR. COLLVER: — That is what he said, 'modernize and update.' Modernize and bring it to the modern era from all those ancient bills that they were accumulating.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what in fact has happened with regards to Bill 22? Have they achieved those two goals? First of all, in goal number one, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland outlined, in fairly concise terms, the poor draftsmanship of Bill 22. The member for Quill Lakes laughs but I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes time for House amendments from the Minister of Education, there will be a great many amendments correcting the poor draftsmanship of Bill 22 — a great many! Not just one or two! (Interjections - inaudible).

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could call order, not only in the members to my right, but to the member behind me.

MR. SPEAKER: — I want to comply with the member's request for order from all sides of the Chamber so that the member can be heard.

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker — including the one behind me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first goal of the act was to tie the acts together. Well certainly they brought all the other acts under one roof, a 141-page roof. They made a lot of mistakes in doing so, but I would give them fair grades on goal number one. They brought the act into one act and they put it in relatively new terms, compared to the old acts. But on goal number two, the government of Saskatchewan gets a zero.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the course of the discussions on the white paper during the course of discussions on Bill 43 and during the course of the discussion on Bill 22, one single dominant theme came from every single organization, every single speaker before those inquiries. The single dominant theme was that the Department of Education had too much power, was superimposing their will on local school boards, was superimposing their will on teachers, but most importantly of all, the Department of Education and the government of Saskatchewan was superimposing its centralized will on the students and the parents in the province of Saskatchewan.

That was the greatest theme that came out of those hearings. What has been a very fundamental basis of Bill 22? Mr. Speaker, the very fundamental basis of Bill 22 was outlined by the former Minister of Education, the hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy), who stated in this Assembly that the major rationale behind this bill was this: the constitution grants power to the provincial government said the minister. 'The provincial government grants power to the Minister of Education,' said the minister. And the Minister of Education grants power to the local school boards ..inaudible interjection . . . No, that is not what the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood said, nor is it indicative, Mr. Speaker, by Bill 22.

The fact is that what this government honestly believes, I think, is that the Minister of Education in fact grants the power out to the school boards; that the Cabinet, in their secret wisdom, grants power out to the school boards and, therefore, should have the power in their own possession. The Cabinet and the Minister of Education have power in their possession to change, at their discretion, the wishes of either this Legislature or the participants in the educational system.

Now, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this bill was fundamentally based on that and that all of the provisions of the bill rotate around clause No. 372. If you take clause No. 372, in its entirety, it specifically states that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, first of all, may change any definition in this act and that the minister may - and I read from section (r): in his opinion change government procedure: 'governing the procedure to be followed with respect to any proceeding or thing authorized by this act in any case where the provisions of this act are, in the opinion of the minister, insufficient or inapplicable.' And it goes on in section (s) to say: 'respecting any other matter considered necessary,' by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, or 'advisable' by them, 'to carry out the purpose and intent of the act.'

In other words you change the definition to make the purpose and the intent different and then you can do anything you want, anything you want, to change the act in Cabinet and in ministerial secrecy.

Mr. Speaker, to the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan this is unacceptable power in the hands of the Minister of Education; is unacceptable power in the hands of the Premier and his Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, we envisaged, an education act that would be presented to the people of Saskatchewan, that would, in fact, create a climate of confidence in the providers of the educational system, not a climate of confrontation.

What the government has done, the NDP has done, is attempt to use the children of the province of Saskatchewan as a means by which they would achieve their political ends of confrontation between groups. They have, over the backs of those children

April 19, 1978

attempted to create a situation which the providers of education are at each other's throats.

Mr. Speaker, the minister need only pick up any newspaper, or listen to any radio station, to know the confrontation that has been created by this very act.

Mr. Speaker, surely then, if this act in its entirety, is causing that, rather than exactly the opposite, which should be the purpose of the act, then the principle of the act is wrong. Now, Mr. Speaker, we believe that there are a great many views that can be taken by the providers of the educational process as it relates to some of the clauses in this bill. The member for Saskatoon Eastview, a school superintendent, takes a particular view on a particular clause, the member for Maple Creek does the same. The member for Rosetown-Elrose, a school superintendent, has the experience of administration of education on a particular clause. But the purpose of the debate in this Legislative Assembly as it relates to the entire provision of the educational system in our province is, is this act achieving what it set out to do and that is to modernize and update and bring to the modern era the educational system and the answer is No. There is no suggestion in the act at all of any improvement in the professional status of teachers, something that the teachers themselves have asked for for years and something that every parent and every students wants. The higher the professional standard and status of the teaching profession in our province the better off are going to be the students, the recipients of that . . .

MR. PENNER: — The higher . . .

MR. COLLVER: — And the higher yet, are you saying it is as high as it can go? I am sure that the member for Saskatoon Eastview is not suggesting that there can't be improvement in professional standards for teachers. Mr. Speaker, we also believe that the government of Saskatchewan in Bill 22, in retaining all of the power in the hands of the Cabinet and the ministers, is denying proper and appropriate debate for changes that are undoubtedly going to be necessitated through practise of this education is denying debate in this Legislative Assembly by all political parties. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, the government is specifically setting up a means by which continued confrontation will occur because under our system one political party has government, one political party, and if debate over something as important as education in our province only takes place in Cabinet, only takes place by the minister and his assistants, then the people will believe that any change that is made by regulation, as is the minister's entitlement under this act, is being made by one political party to the detriment of all other political thought in the province. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an unacceptable standard of conduct for any government in this country. Something as important as the education of our young people to be politicized and polarized by this kind of autocratic rule by the present government, by this insistence, Mr. Speaker, on Cabinet and ministerial rule. Cabinet and ministerial discretion means that a continuation of that polarization and politicization in education must of necessity continue if we are to accept the principle of this act.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is particularly interesting to note that when it comes time to listen to the Minister of Education I remained in my place, when it comes time for the Minister of Education to listen to the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party he did not remain in his place. I think that's particularly interesting, Mr. Speaker . . . (interjection) . . . Well, I'm sure you wouldn't because Mr. Faris, as the Attorney General has so kindly stated from his chair, is secure in his knowledge that this act if passed will give him total power over the educational processes in our province. Through the

Lieutenant-Governor in Council, he can read and ask a lawyer to read section 372. Get your own interpretation, Mr. Member from northern Saskatchewan, and then tell the people of the province of Saskatchewan . . .

MR. KOSKIE: — . . . good lawyer . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Well, in answer to the member for Quill Lakes, my lawyer is pretty darn good.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we in the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan cannot support that kind of centralized power in the hands of the government of Saskatchewan, that kind of control by Cabinet and the minister. We cannot accept it, we will not accept it and when we change the government of Saskatchewan, the people through their elected representatives, will have the opportunity to debate changes in bills as this government obviously is not prepared to allow them to do. Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to vote against this act in principle.

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose the member for the Battleford Plains in the House, his position as being a veteran as a MLA here and I suppose this afternoon in speaking on Bill 22, I have the right to claim that I'm the oldest one in the field of education in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I can say that it is a pleasure for me to address this bill or not. For it is a very sad day to me and it's a very sad day in many respects to the people of the province that we have in fact allowed, over the years, this situation to develop in the province that we have today. A situation, Mr. Speaker, that has taken us apart from the basic purpose of the amount of moneys that is spent on education. People taking sides and lining up, concerned about trustees, others concerned about teachers. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my thoughts to every member in this House on a total non-partisan basis. That we must take a look at this act as what we do and the responsibilities that rest on our shoulders in this Legislature are going to be directly goaled to the classrooms of this province. I think it's incumbent upon every member of this Legislature to forget about the political advantages that may be possible by lining up with one group or another. Forget about that. Mr. Speaker, I don't mind the politics getting into the Department of Industry and Commerce, into SEDCO, into any other field but I can tell you, as a native son of Saskatchewan, I am deeply concerned at this particular time that we are taking a risk. Every single member of this Legislature, the responsibility that hangs in here on the way that we enact this bill. I have yet to hear anyone in this House, Mr. Speaker, inside this House or outside this House say one thing about what is the best thing for the students in the classrooms of Saskatchewan. And that's exactly, Mr. Speaker, the matter on which I want to speak.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that education is a debt owed from one generation to another. In October, 1948, which will be 30 years ago this fall, I had my first taste of education in Saskatchewan. And I now can tell you that I have seen many changes in Saskatchewan. I have watched the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation strive for the betterment of the profession, to move from a very small building in Saskatoon into a fine office building to promote the cause for the teachers of this province. And they have done an admirable job. I have watched the trustees from a small, little group that would meet to hear the bright oratorical speakers. Now, they themselves are planning a fine new structure in the city of Regina. Mr. Speaker, both of these groups and the leaders of those groups and those that occupy offices within those two groups must, as we do here in this Legislature before we pass this bill, forget our personal prejudice, forget our personal politics, throw these things out the window and come back to the

April 19,1978

basic question. What is the best thing for those students in the classroom?

Mr. Speaker, I made a statement in the House, the other day, and I'll repeat it. Because I want to refer to it in an editorial from the Leader Post, a little later on. That is, let's get the politics out of the classroom. Mr. Speaker, it is with some pride, that I speak of this bill. It is with some pride that I look back on the experience that I've had in this province. I'm proud of Saskatchewan. I'm glad that I've never left Saskatchewan in education. I've had opportunities to do so. I'm not always proud of what happened in the field of education; we had some tough times back there. Without the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, we would never be where we are today. And I'm proud of that organization, of which I'm a member. But that does not mean, Mr. Speaker, not at all, that one can't analyze the power struggle that goes on between the politics, goes on between the STF and the SSTA. Oh, I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are people in this Assembly who don't think too much of the educators in this province. They think that somehow they are a second class profession. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't. I received, over the years, a great deal of kibitzing from my own family, from my own brothers. There were five of us in the family. They went on to bigger and more lucrative things than I did. Into medicine, one, one, a dentist, one into the news media has done well. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they've never had the personal satisfaction in their careers like I've had.

You know, Mr. Speaker, back in 1950, I remember a former high school superintendent telling me something which ever since then, I've called the 'big lie'. I suspect that he didn't mean to do so but it was the biggest lie that was ever told to me. That was about 28 years ago. He said, 'I'm going to tell you something, Roy.' He said, 'Once you get these teachers better educated and once you get those salaries up there, all of our problems about operations of schools will disappear'. That was a big lie, Mr. Speaker. Part of our problem is that we have become so structured in our organizations that we forgot about the basic principle of owing education to the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I heard someone, as he was waiting for me to speak, someone yelled from the opposite — they were talking about, well we'll get it from the member for Rosetown-Elrose, and I heard the comment — something about, he's a board man. Mr. Speaker, when somebody says that I am a 'board's' man, I take it as a compliment and I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker.

If you want to go outside Regina here about 20 miles, a little more than 20 miles, you would go to the first school which I took over completely by myself. There are still some people living in that community. Those were the days before the larger school unit where you went and you negotiated your contract directly with a three man board. There were 36 students in that school and there were 10 grades and one of the biggest problems that I had was the 18 horses in the barn — the families fighting over where they would be parked. But I wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, the very best job that I knew how to not only satisfy the parents but to satisfy the board of that school and if that is what you call me in being a 'board's' man, I am proud to take that criticism.

I will tell these members opposite something else. We have some gentlemen sitting in this balcony right now who employed me for a period of 20 years. From 1951 to 1971 I was under their employment. I didn't always agree with this group of people but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, they were always my employer and I always did my job, not only to satisfy them but to satisfy the local board of the school of which I was a principal. I will tell the members opposite that I am very proud of being a 'board's' man. I am very proud of attempting to deliver the best possible service that I knew how to deliver in the name of education.

Mr. Speaker, when that group of people selected me as a principal that is the chance that they had to take. There was an obvious reason I suppose in their minds, as to why I was selected as the principal. In 1971 and since that time I have served the Eston-Elrose School Unit as a superintendent. I guess there was quite a bit of competition for that job. I wasn't the oldest one who came along but out of some 30 applications I think they interviewed a dozen or so and they selected me and I am still attempting to do the best job that I know is possible for the board.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that we have to correct in this country. That is the one thing that breaks my heart to hear of in the educational circles in Saskatchewan, is to turn to the teacher and say, are you a teacher or are you a board boy. It is up to us and the profession to rise above this conflict which has partly been created here in the delivering of the educational services and we are not doing it.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971 in the election of that year I was not involved in the election. I was not involved in any capacity but I saw something that was very dangerous in the province of Saskatchewan. I saw, through the organization the use of the political process in the election of 1971. I saw in the teachers' bulletin and they have a right to do so, the worst picture of Dr. Cliff McIsaac that they could ever put forth, using the organization in the field of politics — I don't like it in the field of education. They have every right to do so. I didn't particularly like it the other day when I opened up the newspaper and saw an ad in the paper that was sponsored by the SFTA which in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, was slightly distorted.

I'm not criticising the trustees for doing so nor am I criticising the Teachers' Federation as such, but it doesn't do any good to the classroom. It doesn't do any good to the profession.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about this bill and as we go through this bill I think what we have to do is say this to ourselves, in all conscience everyone of us here, is this in the best interests of the students of Saskatchewan. Teachers are secondary; superintendents are secondary; trustees are secondary. The primary purpose of education is for young people, it's a debt we owe them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to an editorial which appeared in the Regina Leader Post of April 18, and it is a very good editorial. The editorial zeroes in very directly on the problem facing us here. We watch people, both inside this House and out, wondering which is the best way to go politically, where are we going to get the most votes politically? Well I tell you, in education you go principle first and worry about where the votes come in second. I want to read a portion of this editorial, Mr. Speaker. 'In the interests of Saskatchewan's elementary and high school students and sometimes their apathetic parents' .. (and I want to pause there for just a moment) .. because what has happened is that education has got caught up in this political machine so that it is getting further and further away from parents. That's something that bothers me a great deal.

... it is high time that Bill 22 soon to be passed and proclaimed The Saskatchewan Education Act were firmly amended by Education Minister Faris so as to satisfy both the teachers and the elected school trustees.

I suppose the editor, Mr. Speaker, had something that I would want to do too, let's get

April 19, 1978

the thing over for the betterment of the schools.

'Bill 22 has become a political football', and to that I will say, amen. Later on, Mr. Speaker, I want to show you and members of this Assembly how it became political football. There are four specific points which I will raise later on to show you how this government made it a political football. The editor goes on to say: 'It should not be, because the real objective is the delivery of the best possible education to the students.' He's right on. 'Not unruffling the feathers of the organized trustees, the organized teachers and often' ..(this is beautiful, Mr. Speaker) he calls it 'the organized trustees and the organized teachers and often the disorganized politicians.' You know why they are disorganized, Mr. Speaker? Because they are putting votes and politics ahead of the real issue. That's why they are disorganized. They are thinking more of their political careers than they are on the principle of the Act and what is best for our young people in the classrooms. I'm glad to see it quoted.

'It is time to get politics out of the classroom,' says Roy Bailey, Conservative MLA for Rosetown, and he is right. And I will say amen to that too, Mr. Speaker, because that is absolutely right.

When all the blizzard of words enacting recently the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Education Department is analyzed, it would appear that the real sticking point in the controversy is the local school board's right to hire, manage and fire teachers, in fact to regard teachers employed in its schools as school board employees.

When the proposed legislation was introduced as Bill 47, in the Legislature's fall session, it drew strong objections from the STF, who saw it as an exercise in upgrading the powers and prerogatives of the elected school boards while downgrading the teachers. Teachers, the STF said, would be denied any effective appeal procedures if they were fired for what the trustees specified as bad conduct, or incompetence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, later on this afternoon if there is enough time I am going to tell you all about boards of reference. I think that I am the only one in this Assembly that has been through them.

MR. PENNER: — No!

MR. BAILEY: — No, have you been through them? But I will tell you that the rest of the members of this Assembly don't know the gruelling things we had to go through to go to a board of reference. And I will tell you that if members opposite and on this side of the House listen very carefully they'll have some second thoughts as to where they stand and vote on this issue.

Doctor Sterling MacDowell . . .

Interjection by an hon. member.

MR. BAILEY: — Did you want to speak on Bill 22?

MR. ROMANOW: — Sure.

MR. BAILEY: — Well when are you going to speak?

MR. BYERS: — . . . hasn't had anything to deal with boards of reference . . .

MR. BAILEY: — Did you want to speak? You know, the government over there, Mr. Speaker, is the most edgy, uneasy government when somebody is speaking. They get nervous and they get fidgety. I don't blame them, I don't blame them. I will tell the truth.

All right, just a minute. If I didn't answer a question in this House, Mr. Minister, any better than you did I would be the last one to interrupt the speaker.

Doctor Sterling MacDowell, the Teachers' Federation Executive Secretary, called it the most repressive labor legislation that could be imagined.

Well Bill 47 died on the order paper, when the fall session ended. Mr. Speaker, that's exactly where the government intended that bill to die. No question. You couldn't fool the press, you couldn't fool anybody in the gallery, you didn't fool anyone in this Assembly. That's exactly what the government wanted to do. A very deliberate attempt and I'll challenge anyone opposite and you will have your opportunity in questions to go through this bill to deny that very fact. You know very well what that was put there for. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the government has attempted, the government has attempted to do one thing. Let's just take a look at the politics — as bad as the politics of 1971 — and that will have to rest on your conscience — that has to rest on your conscience. The minister came out with a White Paper on Education . . .

MR. BOWERMAN: — Don't get political Roy.

MR. BAILEY: — I am going to be above politics. I am not going to down to your level, you can be assured of that. He came out with a White Paper on Education and he scurried all around this province, and you know what the basic theme, you know what basically thousands of people across this province said, when we asked about the White Paper ..430 briefs and thousands of letters . . .

MR. BYERS: — 450

MR. BAILEY: — 450 brief and thousands of letters, that's right Mr. Minister. Do you know what they said? They said, 'We want to have more control in the operation and the destiny of our schools' that is what they said. That is what they said. And then this government very carefully and very cautiously moved with Bill 47. What for, Mr. Speaker? They were setting the political wheels in motion at that time. They had no intentions of even bringing Bill 47 to this Legislature. When I asked about it in this House if there will be amendments, if in fact they would withdraw the bill, on two occasions, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education said, 'No we won't withdraw the bill.' Certainly they were going to withdraw the bill — they had no intentions of letting that previous bill. And now what have they done? No, you had no intentions of putting it there in the first place. What did they do? They moved it back to Bill 22 and set the political wheels in motion. 1979 is the election year. They want to repeat 1971 and drag education through the mud of this province again — just as they did in 1971 — absolutely the same, and who gains from it? There are some political gains! You know, the only time the member for Quill Lakes ever speaks is when someone writes a speech for him. Did anyone on this side of the House hear the member for Quill Lakes speak on this Bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No.

MR. BAILEY: — No. Or anything else?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No.

MR. BAILEY: — I have never heard him ever speak before — or intelligent either. And now we are all geared up. We have gone the process, Mr. Speaker. Now we have got Bill 22 here. Mr. Speaker, the sides are drawn. We have got the battle lines drawn up — we have got the trustees of this province extremely angry, and I have a great deal of sympathy with the trustees. They got the teachers then, satisfied in part with Bill 22, and now they are playing the option game — they are playing the game of wait and see as to which is the best political advantage.

April 19, 1978

Mr. Speaker, just take a look at the trustees of the province and let's understand in this House some of their concerns. Let us be honest about this. You people realize that in poking fun at these people who are elected, and I am talking from the local board level to the Unit board level, most of these people (even though the unit board members receive payment for the day they attend), most of them do so at a loss of money to themselves! I have members on my school board, Mr. Speaker, that get a per diem allowance of something like \$35. And they are losing \$100 to do so! I have people, Mr. Speaker, on the local board level — who meet very faithfully at every operating school in my unit — strictly voluntarily once a month. Don't fool yourselves, you members of this House — on both sides of the House that the trustees of this province haven't got a real concern at this particular time. I can tell the members of this Assembly that there is a new breed of trustees in this province — a brand new breed, and they are not going to be easily satisfied like some of the trustees were in the past. They are a group of people who are about to stand up and fight for accuracy — and I got all the sympathy in the world for them.

Let's take a look at what is happening — let us take a look at what is happening. Here we have a battle — here we have a group of people donating their time for the most part, long hours, worrying about the expenses, responsible people and I challenge anyone in this House to the comments which I heard, to try to tell me that the trustees don't represent parents. Let them stand up in this House and say that. Let them say it to me. Let them say that the trustees don't truly represent the parents in education! I will give you an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, look at the trustees position. A few years ago we went to provincial bargaining. I am not quarrelling with that. The government opposite use the lame excuse that we give out something like 55 per cent or 58 per cent, therefore, we will put five members on that board and four trustees.

MR. BYERS: — So what?

MR. BAILEY: — I will tell you so what. Your argument doesn't hold water — you put more of a grant than that to hospitals and you don't put your government trustees negotiating the nurses' salaries do you? You give me one other case where you got grant operated institution like a school where you dominate the negotiation process. Shame on you people over there saying so what! And so here you have it — here are the trustees being hacked away and hacked away at the government end, and on the other end more options for teachers to negotiate more and more from this end. What is happening, Mr. Speaker? The boards are caught between the whole process and they are wondering and they are fighting back. I say all the more power to the boards for fighting back at this particular time. I know what you people think of school boards. I know very well what you think of them.

MR. BOWERMAN: — You are being political.

MR. BAILEY: — No, I am not being political. Mr. Speaker, I want to show you how political they were. This is a sad day for Saskatchewan. When the Minister of Education — ever since we have gone to provincial bargaining — I want every member of this House to look at four points here very carefully just to show how there was some fuel to the political fire in this bill.

1. The provincial negotiations between the government and the teachers came down earlier this year than it has at any date since we went to provincial bargaining.

2. It was the lowest amount, the lowest percentage increase since we went to provincial

bargaining.

3. Bill 22 was introduced in this House by the Minister of Education at the exact same hour as agreement was reached on the bill.

4. The minister's speech on Bill 22 coincided perfectly with the STF council being held in Regina.

Now, Mr. Minister, you tell me or anyone in this Assembly tell me that that wasn't a very carefully, calculated plan on the part of the minister. No question about it and the members opposite know it.

Mr. Speaker, there are people in this province, you can go any place you like in Saskatchewan, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I received more letters from people that I know in every corner of this province. I haven't an idea what their political doctrine is and I don't care but the general theme over the last year in letters that I have received is this: Education is getting farther and farther away from us as parents. That is what their concern is. Somebody can say, well, Bailey why don't you practise what you preach? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I do practise what I preach because I can guarantee you that in the Eston-Elrose School Unit of which I am proud to be the superintendent, we have more local input; we have more consultation with local people; they meet more regularly with their superintendent; they have more responsibilities in the operation of their local school than any school unit in Saskatchewan. I am very proud of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the profile right now, the profile of debate on Bill 22 and what has been deliberately planned to drag education through mud again is not really helping the situation in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the term the other day, we let everybody have free collective bargaining, it is a motherhood term, free collective bargaining at this end of the trustee spectrum. Well free collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker, with no ground rules to mean everything from the types of desks in the teacher classroom to the number of students that are there to the colored toilet paper in the bathrooms. Free collective bargaining can be expanded and expanded to the point where the local government board, which is the Board of Education, simply could not operate. And yet very carefully, Mr. Speaker, over the last four decades in which I have been in education. I have watched this gradually eroding of power chipping away. People are concerned. I want to tell you they have a real reason to be concerned.

We got caught up in words I think. The member for Humboldt and I were talking about this the other day, these words to teach faithfully and diligently. If I was a teacher in this province right now, I'd be insulted with those words being removed; I really would. That would bother me. That would bother me, when I take a look at legislation before 1905; before we became a province, that was part of the requirements, they will teach faithfully and diligently. I am kind of proud of that phrase in the field of education and I would like to see that remain. I am quite sure that phrase is going to come back. Trustees were upset about this and I don't blame them. I don't blame them for being upset about this. They replaced that with, what was it, to provide instruction. The janitor can provide instruction, Mr. Speaker, and some of them do. They do a good job of it. I don't think that is good enough for a profession, that particular term. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, there was a reason for that, there was a reason for taking out 'to teach faithfully and diligently'. That's to let you know that reason is to let in a little air.

April 19, 1978

MR. KOSKIE: — Paranoid.

MR. BAILEY: — No, the only person who is paranoid is the member for Quill Lakes, Mr. Speaker. He reminds me of a little terrier dog, you know the kind we used to have. There would be a big dogfight going on and he would be running around in a circle yap, yap, yapping, but he never did get into the fight. He never got into the fight, Mr. Speaker. He just yap, yap, yapped all the time, just like he is now - yap, yap, yap and he never did get into the fight and it is the same way with him in the House. He yap, yap, yaps, but he never stands up to speak. If he does, Mr. Speaker, then he runs downtown and gets somebody to write up his speech for him, because he can't stand up and speak.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, . . . did you want to speak on the bill?

MR. KOSKIE: — I will in my own time.

MR. BAILEY: — Well, you run on downtown now and get somebody to write your speech for you. You run on down because you don't know enough about it to make a speech.

Mr. Speaker, to go on. The one thing that has concerned me with the bill, is something which has happened recently. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that if we really take a look at the bill, that some very important people in the educational process are given enough protection by Bill 22. I have not heard anyone mention this yet in the discussion on Bill 22, but I think the people whom we appoint as principals, to operate our schools, must have a great deal more protection in the operation of the schools than Bill 22 gives them. These are very responsible people, Mr. Speaker. They are selected, very carefully, because of their ability both in the supervising way and administration way and I don't think that the principals of Saskatchewan have enough protection under this bill and when we come to that I will be talking about it.

Mr. Speaker, we come to that of the binding awards of the boards of reference. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan at the present time I have some real criticism of the boards of education who don't have the courage to do the job many times that they have to do in the way of the personnel in the classroom. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that everyone in the field of education - we have people who are being protected under the board of reference as it is now, because we have boards and superintendents who don't have the courage to go out and do what they have to do, to bring better education to the classroom of Saskatchewan. And that is a fact, that is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the city systems do, that we can't do in the rural systems? They get someone who is a mediocre teacher in the classroom, either they just move him from school to school because they have enough schools in this system that you can superannuate before he runs out of schools. And that is a cold, hard fact. A cold, hard fact, because I am not talking about boards, I am talking about people like myself in the administration who don't want to face an issue right on. I will tell you something else. I am not ashamed to say that to the minister for Cutknife I am not ashamed of it. I will tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, that out in rural Saskatchewan we can't do that and many, many times, many times because people who know the machinery of the difficulty that it is to get rid of that half of a percent or one per cent and why we have to spend all of this time worrying over this part of the bill, when we let the other 98 per cent of truly professional people, who have no concerns whatsoever about this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to describe to the members opposite the last board of reference that I was on. I want you to listen very carefully, because you have to have some conscience as to how you are going to vote on that particular part of the bill.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, you have attempted, as a superintendent or director to make some improvements with that individual teacher. You have worked through the principal of the school; you have reported faithfully to the local board; you have reported faithfully to the unit board; the situation is not improving; the teacher has tenure. As a matter of fact the situation is getting worse. Now there are two things you can do, Mr. Speaker.

You can close your eyes to it and then you have to go home and say, 'What if that was my child in that classroom?' That is the assessment, Mr. Speaker, that has to be used. 'What if that was my child.' So you serve termination notice and the teacher has a right to appear before the board and he has a right to a board of reference at the present time. What happens? How many people have been involved?

You have the superintendent and if he has an assistant you have him; you have the principal; you have the people on the local board of that school; you have got the unit board. So a miniature court is set up and everything comes out. I will tell you, the track record of a board of reference in this province in the past was something that would almost bring tears to the eyes of any administrator. It has been such a terrible track record. Do not blame the boards for standing up and fighting this binding award this time because, very fresh and clear in their minds is what has gone on with the decisions of the boards of reference in the past. I could go on and name you at least a half a dozen cases which would make members of this Legislature ashamed. Now you see why the people are concerned about this. After you have involved local people duly elected to the board, after you have involved the principal of the school and the unit board and the superintendent, so we have a board of reference, and we bring somebody in from Regina, to say make a decision. They have the powers of that decision, Mr. Speaker, of now even saying 'You put him back in the classroom. Give him \$500 because you bothered to upset his equilibrium.' That is the power they have. Why do you think boards are fighting it? Three people are going to come in and tell the people who have worked with the province all these months that they are wrong?

Let me tell you about the last board of reference, Mr. Speaker. We went through this thing. It was proven, beyond any shadow of a doubt, that there was negligence but the board was in the minority ruling; they said he should be re-instated and the unit board said 'no way.' That particular gentleman took off and got a job and, subsequently, was fired before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with people who are welding front-end loaders; we are not dealing with the assembly line. We are dealing with people who are teaching our children. That, to me, is important — I do not blame the lawyers here for looking at the legal part of it not at all; but I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, that I have lived long

April 19,1978

enough in this province almost 30 years, to know that when any board goes that far the situation has to be pretty terrible.

I would think that the teaching profession, Mr. Speaker, whether they think they are going to gain some moral victory by this particular thing — I say to the teachers of the province, and I have never met any teacher in this province who has gone through this process or seen it when this — and they come up and say 'boy, I do not want that.'

Mr. Speaker, I was talking to a principal just the other night, asking him about a certain resignation forthcoming — a very, very intelligent young man. I said to him that if Bill 22 was in place and that resignation did not come forth voluntarily and this particular teacher wanted us to challenge this the way it is under Bill 22 there is no question with the track record; we would lose it. I said, 'As the principal of the school, let me ask you this question. What would you do? There was a 30-second pause on the phone and he said that you would be looking for a new principal. You would be looking for a new principal.'

Mr. Speaker, people may not think much of educators, but people who occupy the position of myself, my colleague for Maple Creek, my colleague for Saskatoon East, were selected to do a job, Mr. Speaker, because of certain particular abilities that we have. We were elected to do a job in the interest of those hundreds of parents who send their children to the schools for which we are charged. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I am going to see, and I cannot support a quasi-judicial body, making decisions on the welfare of students for which I administer the education within the jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just give you one other important thing which is coming up and this is a historical thing. You know, Mr. Speaker, it has not been a problem in the past. It is not a problem in the city in which you have, if you want to reduce the staff of a certain school because of the urban sprawl, because of the numbers — there are always positions there. We are running across, in rural Saskatchewan at the present time, a very unique situation. Historically it is a first. It has never happened before, to my knowledge. Here you have a 17-room elementary school and, because of the drop in enrolment, it is designed to become a 16-room school. You have no resignations. There are no resignations coming. Somebody has to decide which teacher on that staff has to go. You have to get a resignation.

Now I know what the law in the business jungle and work jungle says, 'last one on, first one off.' Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with that. I cannot agree with that philosophy. Does the government opposite agree with that? We have people who are Cabinet ministers in the government opposite and they were elected in 1975. We have members that have been in for years. The government doesn't believe that. Go to a hospital, the oldest doctor isn't necessarily the head surgeon. The matron at the hospital is not necessarily the nurse that has been there the longest.

Mr. Speaker, I know what's going to happen, as well as anyone who knows the educational process. In my own particular case the last one on in that staff, she is a superior teacher one of the best people that I have ever seen in the classroom. But if, in fact, Mr. Speaker, one other member of that staff who are all tenure teachers — if we don't let the best teacher go on staff in our opinion, we'll have a board of reference. I know what the board of reference will say, last one on, first one off. That's what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker. I come back to the basic fundamental question which all of us have to ask ourselves, is that in the best interest of education? (Interjection - Yes)

Somebody said to get rid of the best teacher was in the best interest of education. You heard it, Mr. Speaker, as well as I did. That's a real shame. I am sure the minister of Sask Power wouldn't believe that.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . Already done it . . .

MR. BAILEY: — Oh, all right. Make sure he was because I can remember that one up here pretty carefully.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. While members opposite, during this short discussion that I have had with them, will agree that perhaps I was getting political. I pointed the out the measures in which you were political. I say to this Assembly at the present time, I say to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, I say to the School Trustees' Association of this province and I say to the government opposite and to members on this side of the House, let us not get back into 1979 what we did in 1971. Let us think about the students to whom we owe a responsibility and let us not have superimposed powers upon boards of education in Saskatchewan that are struggling to exist. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be associated with education. I am proud of my province. I am proud to be in this province but it is a sad day indeed when we have taken sides and we have deliberately set up sides on an issue which is very dear to my heart. Mr. Speaker, I cannot (I know the government is bringing in amendments) under any circumstances accept binding awards and be able to say to myself that that is in the best interest of young people in the classroom. You members opposite can expect that you will hear a great deal more from me when we come to Committee of the Whole of this bill.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in some ways the speech that we have just heard is an interesting speech and a speech which I think requires further thought by all members of the House. I am going to adjourn debate for a number of reasons. Basically I am going to adjourn debate because I do want to have an opportunity to peruse the remarks made by the member for Rosetown-Elrose and give the Minister of Education and opportunity to make some comments or rebuttal remarks if he would like, before closing the debate. The Minister is engaged at a function out of the city of Regina, previously committed. That's where he is and I think members opposite realize that we as MLAs do have commitments. I think that we should avoid, parenthetically speaking, Mr. Speaker, the practice which I think we all tend to get into from time to time, namely of pointing at empty desks and the like, knowing full well that can do nothing but not only harm the individual MLA but harm all of us knowing that we are not here very often but still on very important legislative MLA work.

Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the debate I would like to make a comment or two with respect to the speech that we have just heard. I find the speech an interesting speech from a number of points of view. I find the speech an interesting one, not necessarily in this order of priority but firstly because the member for Rosetown-Elrose has taken a significant departure in a number of key areas from the official position taken by the members of this caucus with respect to Bill 22. I think that the member for Rosetown-Elrose has indicated to the members of this House and to the members of his caucus that in at least two areas, he opposes the official education critic of the PC Party and presumably the official PC Party position.

Firstly, the member for Rosetown-Elrose says, with respect to the scope of collective bargaining that should be in the area of the local boards. But scope of collective bargaining should not be expanded. He says that this is a direction which is the one

April 19, 1978

direction to go in areas of school law. The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland who is the official PC education critic when he spoke on this matter indicated exactly the opposite position.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a look at the record to elaborate on this a little further when I next pick up this speech. Because I want to take the words of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland and compare them directly with the member for Rosetown-Elrose. But that is a very fundamental difference and a division within the PC caucus that exist on this very fundamental point which is before the members of the House. There was another aspect as well, which is very significant. And that is on the question of the binding reference and the question of whether or not he supports it or does not support it. Now, I think that the member for Rosetown-Elrose made it clear and in a sense, I give him full marks for at least laying his true feelings on the table here, in some areas; he made it clear that he is opposed to binding references set up by Bill 22. Note, however, Mr. Speaker, the official position taken by the PC education critic when he spoke on this bill, in particular, a few days ago. Because he takes the exact opposite position. The official PC critic, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, Mr. Speaker, ended up in his totality of criticisms of the bill saying that he would oppose it. Not on these two important issues, fundamental issues, as the member for Rosetown-Elrose articulates, but because he says that the bill, (I'm talking now about the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland) was poorly drafted, that it was an abomination from an legal point. There were some clauses which were unclear to him, some sections which were unclear to him. And that in sub-total compelled the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland to vote against the bill. But not so, the member for Rosetown-Elrose who has taken a totally contradictory position from the PC caucus, Mr. Speaker.

Now I suppose that there is nothing written in law about the fact that a member should deviate from the official PC caucus line. There's nothing in the political world which says that the PC position is destroyed or that the member for Rosetown-Elrose's position is destroyed as a result of these two fundamental contradictions. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the province of Saskatchewan who are concerned about education are entitled to ask one fundamental question. Who speaks for the PC Party on education policy? Is it the member for Rosetown-Elrose? Or is it the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland? Will it be the member for Rosetown-Elrose who will be setting out the education policy for the PC Party if they should be elected to power? Or will it be the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, Mr. Speaker? I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not something which members in this House can lightly pass off as a difference. This is a fundamental difference which exists. This is a difference which the organizations, the SSTA, and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the concerned parents of this province have a right to be absolutely clear on as the policy points that are on review because clearly the position taken here is very contradictory. And I want to tell the member for Rosetown-Elrose that I commend him, while I disagree with him, I commend him for at least having the guts to stand up in the face of the leader of his own party and setting out his position. I have to give him full marks for that. Because it does take guts in any kind of a political party organization to get up and say, I disagree so fundamentally with the rest of my party. That I have to give him credit for.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, while I may give him a personal credit, unfortunately, he is a part of that very political process which he decries. He is a part of a political party that I must judge, as the members of this province must judge, not the individual statements of one individual MLA but the official party position of the PCs with respect to Bill 22. And we know what that position is on those two important areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I found the speech an interesting one as I've indicated. I found it interesting. I found it in many areas as contradictory. The member says that the original education bill was brought in and the government never did have any intention at any time of doing anything with it. It was going to die right there on the order paper. Nothing was going to be done with it. Yet, he turns right around and says, this original education bill was introduced and then because of political pressures, the government all the while . . . remember how he read out that sort of scenarial of how the bill was fortunately tabled on the same day that the STF council was meeting and and on the same day that there was an agreement with the teachers and the trustees on salaries this machiavellian talked all the while. This original Bill 43 was introduced only to be amended by Bill 22 by the New Democratic Party. One might say that's a minor discrepancy with respect to the contradiction of the operation. Perhaps so. I found it passing strange as another contradiction that this member was waxing so eloquently about how dedicated the members who work for school boards are. Now, I, Mr. Speaker, personally agree with that. I think that the superintendents are dedicated. And yet on the other hand the hon. member goes around and says not so the city superintendent. Why they play these little games. They move the incompetent teachers around. They are not so dedicated not to do the school system injury, just some superintendents are dedicated not to do the school injury. I find that very contradictory, Mr. Speaker, as well. But I think that I found one of the most interesting contradictions through the entire theme of the speech of the member for Rosetown-Elrose, was his statement, which he asks us to believe, that there should be no political comment and there is no political comment from him with respect to this particular speech. None whatsoever. But, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the comments made, he says right after he made those comments that the government, the party drags education through the mud again. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I never do hear a partisan comment from the member for Rosetown-Elrose if I have to judge by that particular comment. He says that the government drags education through the mud. He says let's get politics out of the classroom. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I want politics out of the classroom. Take a look at the position of any government. The government introduces a bill to consolidate education law which it says is a white paper and wants discussion on it. That's what we did at the time. The fact of the matter is that there are two competing points of view, at least, if not more, a point of view between SSTA and the point of view within STF. Now the government is trying to make adjustments and make compensation, for the particular law that is before us, trying to do it as best we can and I remind you, Mr. Speaker, trying to do it as best we can all the while while we are being harangued by the PC member for Nipawin and the Liberal member for Lakeview about the politics of the situation and then the member gets up and says, let's keep politics out of the consideration of Bill 22. I'm not political whatsoever in this consideration.

MR. BAILEY: — No, none.

MR. ROMANOW: — Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, the member for Rosetown-Elrose said, you know what he didn't like about the 1971 election, he said he didn't like the 1971 election because the STF made a political issue out of the 1971 election. Mr. Speaker, what in the world is the STF or for that matter the SSTA or for that matter any other organization to do if they disagree with a law or a policy in the province of Saskatchewan? What are they to do, Mr. Speaker? If you accept the member for Rosetown-Elrose words what you are to do is simply roll over and play dead and say nothing about it. If you take the member for Rosetown-Elrose words, no STF member, let alone the organization, has a right to express an opinion about the Education Bill or the education law because that would be in the member's view, playing politics in the

April 19,1978

classroom. Somehow they would be playing politics. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the STF does not play politics in my judgment. I don't believe that the SSTA plays politics in my judgment. I think both of these organizations are doing what they are mandated to do and that's to speak for the individual members in the best interests of the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But I'm going to tell you who is playing politics, Mr. Speaker, in this House. That's the member for Rosetown-Elrose, that's the PC member for Nipawin and the Liberal member for Lakeview, the Liberals and the PCs, they are the ones that are playing politics. If anybody is trying to drag this through the mud that's their operation. But, Mr. Speaker, to condemn the STF out of hand as the member for Rosetown-Elrose does, to say that somehow they are playing politics, to make these insinuations about boards of reference, to make these insinuations about the fact that the . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I notice that every time you give the PCs a little dose of truth it makes them very itchy and loud. I wish they would just kindly listen for a minute, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say to the members of this House that this kind of a speech which I have described as interesting, Mr. Speaker, is one that both commends the member as I have done for having the guts to stand up to his leader. I think that is something which is commendable and is also one which is to be condemned, condemned for the reasons that I have talked about because of its attack on the STF and indirectly on the SSTA. Mr. Speaker, I am in government. When I see a full-page advertisement, whether that advertisement is from the SSTA or the STF I have a personal, natural unease about what happens if that ad is criticized in the government. I wouldn't be normal or natural if I didn't. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this government and I would be the first one to defend that this government and I would be the first one to defend the right of the SSTA and the STF to put out those kinds of ads, and as individual members, to take part in the political process, something which the member for Rosetown-Elrose decries and doesn't agree with.

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the insinuation that the only person who is concerned with keeping politics out of the classroom, somehow is the member for Rosetown-Elrose. I do not accept the insinuation that somehow by debating education on the floor of this House that we are doing education a disservice. I think that in many areas, Mr. Speaker, without a doubt the debate is questionable. Lord knows I suppose I have contributed to questionable debate in this House from time to time which this may or many not be an aspect of, depending on your point of view, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that to insinuate that no one else in this House, as I say the member for Rosetown-Elrose did during the course of his remarks, is interested in the welfare of our students and our children is an absolutely wrong tack for the member to go on and he spoiled what I think was an otherwise fairly commendable speech in some ways. Mr. Speaker, he is not to be supported with respect to that particular view.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude before I adjourn the debate that I am very concerned about the politicization of Bill 22. I am concerned because as I have outlined, the difficult task that faces any government. When we came into office in 1971 the seeds of distrust between teachers and trustees had already been sown, Mr. Speaker. They had been sown by the actions of the former Liberal government. I don't know what kind of a picture Dr. McIsaac had in the paper, in the STF bulletin in 1971 — I don't know and frankly I don't think it is relevant at this particular time, but those seeds of discontent were there in 1971. We all know that. We all know that you couldn't run an election

campaign without a political party telling the people of the province where they stood on the education issues of that day. And, Mr. Speaker, we will ask the same thing of the Progressive Conservative Party, notwithstanding the obvious split between the member for Rosetown-Elrose and the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, exactly where they stand on the educational policies. You can't avoid that nor should we avoid that. That's healthy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my point is simply this, that when it comes to Bill 22 when we are trying to balance the competing interests and the conflicting views and the particular pressures that are being applied on us, I think the Minister of Education has done, by and large, a pretty good job with this Bill 22.

It is very easy for the Leader Post to talk about keeping politics out of the classrooms but let them draft a bill which gets the approval of teachers and trustees. It is very easy for the member for Rosetown-Elrose to get up and talk piously about keeping politics out of the classroom but how would he balance a bill, especially with the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland sitting on his government if he was here to do that? It is very easy for the Liberals to say the same thing, Mr. Speaker, but let them come to the task of balancing these particular points and views. It is not good enough to say that the bill is not drafted legally or loyally but good enough to talk about the principle issues that are involved here, Mr. Speaker. I say that the Minister of Education has done a very good job under very difficult circumstances and he deserves not the political backbiting that we have been getting from the Liberals and the PCs. He deserves the support of this House.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION - VOTE 16

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. We are dealing with Highways and Transportation Estimates, page 57. I will ask the minister to introduce his support staff, please.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to introduce the acting deputy minister, to my left, Jack Sutherland. He is, I think I should inform the House, he is acting deputy. Our regular deputy is on loan to Indonesia, helping them to set up new highway administration procedures and contracting procedures. Mr. Gentles was chosen by an international firm, Lee and Associates, from many people, many competitors among Canada. We thought that it was a compliment that they would ask our Saskatchewan deputy to do that particular job, at this particular time. Fortunately, we have good backup staff and so we are missing our regular deputy until some time later on this year and we are wishing him luck in advising the government of Indonesia. They have nearly as many people as Canada in the setting up of an administration that, hopefully, will become equal to ours.

Mr. Chairman, I also have Myron Herasymuk, Director of Operations, behind me; Doug Simpson, finance and Glenn Middleton, accounting. That is the staff.

Before I sit down I want to suggest to you that this budget again, this year has had a

April 19, 1978

generous and, I think, a sensible increase. Our capital budget for building, this year, will be approaching \$100 million and the administration budget and the maintenance budget, accordingly, is up by a fair number of percentage points.

I would like to tell you that the general outline of the changes in these administrative budgets should help members on both sides of the House, to understand what they mean and, perhaps, save some time in dealing with these estimates. Those who have examined these administrative budgets will have noted a number of points.

First, some budgets show increases some sections show increases, while others have been reduced; some staff positions have been moved between administrative units. There is an overall reduction in the total staff complement and, finally, the sum total of all the administrative budget shows an nominal increase of slightly more than one tenth of one per cent - one tenth of one per cent in our total administrative costs.

These changes are attributable to two things - shifting of funds and staff between the administrative unit result in the department's ongoing review of priorities and reallocation of available resources according to need.

Secondly, the reduction in staff and an overall nominal increase in funds is evidence of the department's response to the declared intention of this government to achieve greater and better administrative economics. I just have a note here and I would be happy to lay it on the Table. Each year the department checks its general operating efficiency by comparing its administrative expenditures on a percentage basis to its expenditures on delivery programs. This comparison shows that the department has succeeded in reducing the percentage of its expenditures on administration, from 9.1 per cent in 1972-73 to an estimated 7.6 per cent in 1978-79. Our estimates at the beginning of the financial year was that we would reach 7.9, we beat that and it is actually going to be 7.6

The delivery programs that this department does is rural, naturally rural and urban service transportation, air transportation, aggregate location, that is gravel pit location, property purchases, legal surveys and overall maintenance of 13,000 miles of highway.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I am happy with the increase in the budget this year. I think it will suffice to continue to provide the service that Saskatchewan people have become accustomed to. We have also improved the riding quality according to the scientific check by about one point, which would be about 15 per cent to 20 per cent average improvement in riding quality of the overall highway system.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to entertain questions.

ITEM 1

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to open up with a few questions of the minister relating to the overall policy of the government of the province of Saskatchewan with reference to project array, for a start, in the current year.

The minister will recall that last year there were commitments around the province of Saskatchewan to build a certain number of miles of oiled roads, a number of miles of gravel, a certain number of miles of pavement and so on. Last year was probably, I

would guess and I am sure the minister will correct me if I am wrong, the finest highway building season in the history of Saskatchewan. In other words, the weather in the year 1977 throughout the province of Saskatchewan, I would guess and I don't think there is any statistic, perhaps the minister has it, throughout the province on an average would have been the finest weather conditions ever faced by the Department of Highways in the province of Saskatchewan. My question then to the minister is this, why then is there such a large carryover of work that was committed to last year presently being led into this current year?

MR. KRAMER: — Well, first of all, I can understand the assumption possibly that the weather was good. The summer was good but anybody who farms will know that there was a lot of misgiving last fall, tremendous crop losses last fall in grades because there was the total fall period which is really the best period of construction. Usually the greatest output is expected in the fall.

MR. COLLVER: — Last fall?

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, yes. I don't know where you were? Yes, last fall.

MR. COLLVER: — Best time for construction?

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, it certainly is. It is certainly the time I think, statistically we have got more production from contractors during the September, October, November periods, especially September, October, because during the summer it is difficult at times to keep people on the job. They too like to have a little bit of time out in summer with their kids and so on. However, I am not arguing. I am simply stating a point of fact. Ask any farmer, they know, any farmer, except in the southwest they know. Ask any contractor. We have had for instance contracts let with a starting date on several highways and I can give you some projects where they scarcely got moved in. Botkin, for instance, paving on No. 4 Highway north of Glaslyn was supposed to have started in mid-summer. He didn't get started, he scarcely got started last fall. When he moved in there, the water table was up, he couldn't move into the gravel pits. There are a number of other instances like that. If members want to ask about specific projects, uncompleted, I think we can do that. I think there are sometimes other reasons for projects not being completed. The weather was one of the main problems in all but the southwest sector, in the fall of the year starting, as any farmer knows, just about the time harvest was starting. It got to be pretty rough. Well, you might assume that we had good weather. You better not tell the contractors of Saskatchewan that because I don't think they would agree with you.

MR. COLLVER: — Yes, Mr. Minister, could you possibly provide us then — you say the spring and summer was certainly a good building season as you will recall, an exceptional building season. Even I think, in terms of construction, the first couple of weeks in September if I remember correctly last year were quite exceptional for construction. It was only about mid-September that the construction season started to slacken off. Now certainly the minister will be well aware that the agricultural community in Saskatchewan last year was a little disappointed with August. I don't think that he could suggest that the construction season was significantly shortened during the period of time as he suggested. Could he suggest to me, for example, I know the department retains these statistics. What were say the total number of days, on an average, in the various districts in Saskatchewan and I am sure you do it on a province-wide basis, what were the days available to the Department of Highways during the last season on an average across the province of Saskatchewan?

April 19,1978

MR. KRAMER: — We could probably, by checking with the contractors . . . did you want an answer to the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The minister was replying . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Well I do want an answer, I'm waiting for an answer.

MR. KRAMER: — If the member wants an answer to the question I would expect he would listen and not carry on a conversation across the floor.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Minister, I can certainly speak to the person here and hear any answer that the minister has to give. My goodness, anybody could hear him in North Battleford, if they were listening. So, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate an answer from the minister, yes. How many days in 1977, of building season did you have?

MR. KRAMER: — I would have to ask each particular contractor to provide me with his log book on the amount of time that he had down. I couldn't give you that answer because we don't keep that kind of records. It is the business of the contractor to finish in a certain length of time, weather permitting. Now it is up to them to provide that information. I think I could get some of that information for you, but our people do not keep those records.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, again, the minister this year now tells me this is another set of records that the minister doesn't keep, that other departments of Highway across the countryside do keep. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this is of particular significance to realize statistically, Mr. Minister, what your construction season is across the province of Saskatchewan in order to plan for the future. I am sure that that's a reasonable request. You say your department doesn't keep these statistics. Do you not think that it would be advantageous for your department to keep a set of statistics with reference to the number of operating days that the various areas of the province are able to do on an annual basis in order to plan statistically how many days per annum they've got to construct highways for future? Do you not think that that would be meaningful statistics to keep and if so, would you commit that from now on you will keep it?

MR. KRAMER: — I don't know what the member is asking ..if you are asking me to provide an average for the total contracting road building industry, if we were to take each particular contractor and provide that information, I believe we could within a reasonable time come up with some answers. Each contract is different and weather doesn't maintain the same pattern in all parts of the province. Some may have been going along at a pretty good clip. It depends on when the contract was called and where it was called. Now we talk about . . 25 per cent of the time available is generally lost due to weather and an average figure over the province. Now that's just about what I was saying. The fact is that you can't turn the weather on or off. Maybe you have those super powers. I don't. I'm saying that normally the heavy ..and I said on here . . the heaviest 1976-77, the payments to contractors were \$5.5 million and \$6 million and October, the year before, \$5.75 million. During the last fall that I refer to . . what are you amused about?

MR. COLLVER: — I would be happy to rephrase my question so the minister could stop fumbling around on the answer he is giving now.

MR. KRAMER: — I'm not fumbling around on the question. I am reading from a piece of paper and you are chuckling around and I think you are trying to kill time as you have been doing for the last three weeks.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order please! I know that it is getting close to 5:00 o'clock hour, but let's try and keep this on an even keel where I think it is fair for both and I ask both of you to try to adhere to the rules, please.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, the question I asked is quite simple. Last year, in this Assembly, the Minister of Highways instructed us here and the people of the province that the province of Saskatchewan was divided into areas. In each one of those areas there are generalized weather conditions, in each area. Now each area has a supervisor or an assistant or some member of the Department of Highways, that gets up in the morning, can go outside his door and say, the weather looks like - and he can assess it. He can even have a little chart sent out to the head office that says, under these weather conditions construction can commence; under these weather conditions construction cannot commence. He reports that to the Department of Highways. What is the reason for this, do you think, Mr. Chairman?

Well, it is a pretty simple reason. The minister has high rate contracts with contractors that say, weather permitting they have to finish. But the minister has just told this Assembly that there is no way for his department to tell whether or not weather permitted or not. If the contractor is dodging it, if the contractor misses three or four beautiful days in the summer because he has taken his equipment over some place else to make extra money, or to pave roads for an NDP constituent . . . The member for Kelvington-Wadena laughs. He laughs. I know that the minister of Highways suggests that about the primrose path. We are going to be presenting over the course of these estimates, Mr. Minister, a number of primrose paths in the province of Saskatchewan, a number of them, I know the Minister of Highways has presented to this Assembly, on a great many occasions, the great and wonderful story, every year, I am sure that we will get it this year. This year we will get it again because some Liberal is going to make the minister upset and he is going to go into his story about the primrose path. Well, we are going to give the minister, this year, a number of primrose paths.

What we are asking the minister is a very simple question. If your contracts read, as they all do, that this contract shall be completed by such and such a time, weather permitting, then why doesn't your government have a record of what the weather was in various areas? Because, Mr. Chairman, there are areas in the province, from 1977, there have been a number of areas and I am not talking about Nipawin, today, Mr. Member for Kelvington-Wadena, but we will be talking about Nipawin before these Department of Highway Estimates are over, and also Tisdale, because obviously the member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) didn't have much influence last year in his own particular area because in that area he didn't get any primrose paths from the Department of Highways. Unfortunately, he didn't do his job in that area, Mr. Chairman, last year, and he knows that too. He knows the kind of road condition that exists from Carrot River to the road leading from Tisdale. He knows that particular road.

MR. MALONE: — He flies all the time.

MR. COLLVER: — Does he fly all the time? I didn't know that. I thought maybe he had a skidoo if he was riding on that particular road.

April 19,1978

Mr. Chairman, the point is that last summer the weather conditions in many areas in the province of Saskatchewan were very, very satisfactory. Yet construction jobs were left and the construction crews stopped work, when the weather was good and the jobs weren't finished. What does the minister do? What did the government of Saskatchewan do? Where did the contractors go? No reports! The local communities say, my goodness, why when the weather is so good can't we finish this road? Why hasn't the government of Saskatchewan completed its work that it said that it would do in its budget, so that it would get all kinds of wonderful press. Project array and the minister was riding around on the hood of the car with a cowboy hat, whaling around and saying it is a terrific project the way we are doing it. And he is great, the best promoter we have in this entire Assembly, no question, and he promotes project array, except that the people in the local communities would like to see project array come to fruition. They would like to see the roads. After all that is what a department of highways is for, to build roads.

Mr. Chairman, I gather it is 5:00 o'clock and the members would like to hear more of this I am sure and they will in the future.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 p.m.