

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 28, 1978**

The Assembly met at 10:00 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, today on behalf of the Minister of Health, Mr. Tchorzewski, the member for Humboldt, I wish to introduce to you, a fine group of students, Grade Eight students from Bruno, seated in the gallery to the left. They are accompanied here today by Mrs. Gail Dust and Mrs. Sharon Smith.

I hope that their visit here to the Legislature will be very educational and informative. Mr. Tchorzewski is unable to be here. He is having a meeting in Humboldt today and in Bruno right in your home town, so I will be taking pictures later on today and we will see them later on.

I am sure that the members will all join with me in wishing them a hearty welcome and I also want to wish them a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. N. SHILLINGTON (Regina Centre):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. through you and to the House. I would like to introduce 25 students from the Cornwall Tutoring School Project, accompanied by a staff member Tom Warner.

This is a kind of a different school, Mr. Speaker, in that it is a school which, by and large, adults attend. The students, by and large, run the school and make the most important decisions. It seems to have turned out very well and seems to be a very successful school.

I will be meeting with this school later on in the morning. I hope they find today educational and enlightening. Thank you.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House, I would like to introduce a group of 13 students and their teacher. Mr. Bernie Etchevery, from Luseland School.

As far as I know this is the first trip that students have had from that school. It is a long way and they are going to be spending part of the weekend here. I will meet with them later and I would like you to welcome them to the Legislature.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Quill Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House, I would like to introduce some 20 Grade Twelve students from the Leroy High School. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher. Mr. Bellamy and bus driver Mr.; Weisgarber, I understand the students are going to be with us in the gallery from 10 o'clock until 11 o'clock. This should give them a good opportunity to

witness the question period and some of the other proceedings of the House. I want to welcome them here and to indicate that I will be meeting with them shortly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **QUESTIONS**

### **Boards of Inquiry**

**MR. E.C. MALONE** (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Last night, according to the radio reports and this morning, the Minister of Mineral Resources spoke to the press club in Regina and to say the least, was very critical of boards of public inquiry and in particular, the Bayda Inquiry, because of the delay in that report coming out. His criticism was to such an extent that I suspect he was announcing government policy in connection with boards of inquiry and showing some dissatisfaction on behalf of the government, with the inquiries that are currently taking place. My first question to the Premier is, as a result of these statements by the Minister of Mineral Resources, can we now assume that this government will no longer be conducting public inquiries into matters of public interest, such as resource development, land use and so on? And secondly, are the existing boards of inquiry, the Bayda Inquiry, Land Use Inquiry, the inquiry about Nipawin, Coronach and so on, are they going to be discontinued? Is the government just going to proceed with projects on the advice of their bureaucrats and civil servants?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, the answer to both questions is, No. No, we do not have any desire to discontinue existing inquiries, and no, we do not propose to refrain from using inquiries in the future .

**MR. MALONE:** — Supplementary questions, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it then that the minister was not speaking for the government but was speaking on his own and if he was, I think an explanation is in order from the Premier. Do I take it from the minister remarks that the government is just going to proceed with whatever plans they have and if those plans comply with the recommendations of inquires, fine, if they don't comply with recommendations of inquiries, they are just going to go ahead anyway?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. .Speaker, no. I think it would be very unwise to assume that the government was not going to pay due regard to the reports of inquiries. It is my belief that, based upon the record of our government since 1971, we have had inquiries, good inquiries, and have paid due regard to their results. I believe that our record stands in sharp contrast for example, to the record of the previous government when they established a pulp mill without any environment inquiry of any kind, and it proceeded to create circumstances which did have a serious environmental impact.

To return precisely to your question. We propose to continue to use inquiries. We propose to consider with great care, the results of the inquiries and we believe that we have done that in the past and expect to continue to do so in the future.

**MR. MALONE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier would explain to me then the reason for these inquiries when you consider the words of the Minister of Mineral Resources when he talked about the general public of Saskatchewan in demeaning terms saying they are 'Joe Lunchkits.' I suggest to you that the only proper inference from the minister's remarks is that you don't particularly care

what the general public thinks. If that's the case, what's the purpose of the inquiries? If you find that the remarks of the minister were inappropriate (that is 'Joe Lunchkit') and I believe they are very much inappropriate, would you ask the minister to apologize to the people of Saskatchewan for those remarks?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I most assuredly will not ask the minister to apologize. The minister was making clear that in his judgement: (a) there should be inquiries and (b) that the inquiries should involve participation at the broadest possible level. He talked of student inquiries, student participation. He talked of participation by ordinary working people and he called them 'Joe Lunchkit' and he makes no apology for that. Nor, I suspect, are our ordinary working people nearly as upset by the idea that they carry a lunchcan as members opposite are because they believe there is something demeaning in carrying a lunchcan and I say there is not.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — So I say, therefore, we propose to continue to have inquiries and we propose to continue to have the broadest possible public participation. Our record stands and it stands in stark contrast to the records of the previous government or the records of other governments in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Status of Bayda Inquiry.**

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources in scanning the Regina telephone directory, I couldn't find any listing of Mr. Lunchbucket. I wonder, are you saying that the statements made by you last night, that inquires such as the Bayda inquiry are for the executive branch of government and are not the concern of the thousands of Mr. Lunchkits in this province?

**MR. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — I think, Mr. Speaker, the member should have been listening to the response of the Premier. I will repeat for that member, Mr. Speaker, that I was in no way critical of inquiries and I am disappointed in the interpretation of the Leader of the Opposition. I think it's a matter of listening to the press releases. If he hasn't done so, to undertake to listen to them. I think the press could verify for him, if he undertook to inquire of them, what I said last night at the Press Club. I said that this government was far superior in the holding of inquiries compared to any other province in Canada. We felt that they contributed in a very significant way in assisting the government to make its decision in regard to projects such as uranium mining, thermal plants or hydro plants and that it was a course that we would continue to follow. But, I was disappointed in that there was not a greater level of public participation in those inquiries and that we should undertake to try and encourage (as the premier pointed out) student involvement, university involvement, trade union involvement, a greater involvement of the general public of the people of Saskatchewan in order to give us better information in making those decision where we think inquiries are necessary.

**MR. LARTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, it would appear from your statements that you either have the Bayda Report or a transcript thereof. Are you admitting that you have information from the inquiries that the Legislature does not

now have?

**MR. MESSER:** — Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, and I think I make it clear in my remarks in the Press Club last night that had no direct communication with Mr. Bayda. In fact I do not believe that I have ever talked to Mr. Bayda or any of the people on the inquiry since it was announced by this government. I registered no criticism on Mr. Bayda. I think that the inquiry has been conducted in a very competent manner and when that report comes to the government it will be made available to the public and a lot of the final decision of the government will be based on the content of the inquiry.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I think I will take a new question from the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

### **Prohibition of Liquor Advertising**

**MR. MALONE:** — I have a new question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to either the Minister in charge of the Liquor Licensing Board or the Premier. Do I understand the government's policy on liquor advertising correctly when I say that in any media under your control, be it radio or TV or local newspaper ads, you are going to prohibit the advertising of wine and spirits? Obviously you cannot interfere with national publications like MacLeans, Time Magazine and so on but, aside from those, it is your goal as a government not to give information out about liquor advertising about beer, wine and spirits: is that correct Mr. Minister.

**MR. N.E. BYERS (minister of Environment):** — Mr. Speaker, as I understand the present Liquor Act, it has a general prohibition on liquor advertising. That prohibition applies to the printed media, to radio and to television and the purpose of the amendment now before the House is to extend that prohibition to cable television.

**MR. MALONE:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's remarks I would like to refer him to a government of Saskatchewan publication called The Saskatchewan Travel Guide, in particular page 3, in which half the page deals with information as to the availability of beer, wine and spirits in Saskatchewan. At the top of every page in this government publication information is set out as to where one can find licensed restaurant, licensed dining rooms, cocktail rooms and beverage rooms.

Now in view of this information in a government publication, and in view of the position of the government on advertising, would the minister not agree with me that the position of the government, to say the least, is hypocritical?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, I have perused the latest edition of the Saskatchewan Travel Guide. The prospects for travelling in the immediate future do not look very bright at the speed this House is going but I would say to him that there are no specific brands being advertised in there. This government has responded to the request of those people who cater to the tourist trade in an approved rating of facilities and I am sure that it is appropriate to identify in a travel guide when a certain centre has a police station or a hospital or a first aid station or a licensed restaurant without promoting any particular brand.

**MR. MALONE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I do, I take it then from the Minister's answer that if the liquor companies, as a group, wanted to put in advertising on TV or radio or newspapers without naming a brand, just saying where you can get a bottle of beer or a drink of scotch or a glass of wine in Saskatchewan, that the government would find that permissible advertising, that they would be allowed to do that? Is that what you are telling me, Mr. Minister?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is challenging whether the advertisements in the Sask travel guide do not comply with the liquor laws in this province, I invite him to have that referred to the proper authorities for interpretation.

### **Television Coverage — Meadow Lake Area**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — I would like to direct a question, if I could, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. If I can preface, there is a matter now with regard to television coverage in Meadow Lake and area. The people of Meadow Lake have requested that they get their television coverage through a CKSA feed, which would, in fact, give them access to both major networks, CTV and CBC. I understand that the Attorney General has indicated to the CBC and the people of Meadow Lake that he takes a different view and that he believes that the people of Meadow Lake should get a CBC feed from the CBC outlet in Saskatoon, thus cutting down, in fact, the access to CTV coverage. Is that not correct?

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — No, that is not correct.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** — Well, then would the Attorney General give his position as to whether or not he endorses or supports in Meadow Lake the application for a CKSA Lloydminster feed into Meadow Lake so that they can get both major networks.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the provincial government is not involved in this matter. This is an application before the CRTC, and as such, is a federal CRTC responsibility. To the best of my knowledge the provincial government never has, in the past, intervened. I am not even sure if there is a mechanism for intervention, and has no intention of intervention one way or the other on either this application or any other similar kind of an application.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** — On supplementary, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding what you have said, I have a copy of a letter from the Minister of Co-operation, formerly responsible for Corporate Affairs of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and it is dated March 14, 1977, signed by Ned Shillington. The letter indicates quite clearly that it is this government's position that we would ask that the Corporation co-operate with CKSA to allow a Lloydminster, rather than a Saskatoon feed to ACP transmitters north of Meadow Lake, basically to give better service to the people of Meadow Lake. Now, in fact, of course, that contravenes your present position, and I suggest, my question to the minister is you have not intervened, notwithstanding what you said, and your pushing of the CBC outlet only (inaudible) to Meadow Lake or your CPN getting into Meadow Lake . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order!

### **Poplar River Power Project**

April 28, 1978

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

On Monday, April 17, in this Assembly, the minister stated that the government had a licenser permit to proceed with Coronach No. 2 plant at Poplar River. On a recent radio program the minister stated that the government had no intention of spending enough money to reclaim the coal land in that area where it would be suitable to grow grain.

Can the minister tell us why he is spending the people's money and time in holding the Bergstrom Report that is to decide these two issue? The hearings have not concluded; the minister has pre-judged the situation and actually says that he has made up his mind on these. Is this not a completed farce . . .

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Minister, I have not made up my mind, the government has not announced a Poplar River No. 2 plant and we have not in any way, decided what level of reclamation may take place at the Coronach site. I would suggest that the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg undertake to acquire facts that are closer to being accurate before he asks such ridiculous questions.

I announced that we have authorization to buy Poplar River, generating installation of No. 1. I have made statements in regard to land reclamation in that they could cost anywhere from something, I believe, Mr. Minister of Environment, \$600 an acre, upwards of \$1,600 an acre and even higher if it was to be returned to farm land. In fact, reports and studies would indicate that there would be reclamation costs in excess of \$1 million per quarter section (160 acres) in order to return it to a farming state.

I have said that it would seem somewhat impractical to spend that kind of money on the reclamation of a quarter section and it may therefore be more reasonable to reclaim it to a state which would provide some sort of park facility rather than agriculture production. But those decisions are not yet made. I think that we should convey to the people of Saskatchewan what the costs are or could be when we talk about reclamation because they ultimately as the consumers of power, will be the people who will have to pay for that.

**MR. NELSON:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

The minister apparently has two different viewpoints. He expresses them both, one on radio and one in this House, but in this House on the 17th of April, 1978 on page 1509 of Hansard, the minister stated:

In doing so we have given a licenser permit to establish Coronach No. 2.

Mr. Minister, are you denying that you said that? It's in print.

**MR. MESSER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not have the Hansard in front of me but if it does state No. 2, it was not intended to be that, Mr. Speaker . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, do I have the opportunity to answer or not? I have never . . .

(inaudible interjection)

**MR. MESSER:** — Well, O.K. The member says that everybody misquotes. I have never undertaken to convince this Legislature or to convey to this Legislature or anyone else that we have a licence for No. 2. We have authorization to build Coronach No. 1. We have now an understanding with the International Joint Commission and others who are involved in the process of acquiring authorization for No. 2. But under no circumstances have I, or will I, undertake to convey to anyone in this province that we have authority to go ahead with Popular River No. 2 at this particular point in time.

**MR. NELSON (As-Gr):** — Last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then the minister is saying that he gave me a wrong answer to my question on the 17th day of April, 1978 in Hansard? That he gave me wrong information; that he made a false statement in this particular question?

**MR. MESSER:** — No, I will not say that I gave him wrong information, Mr. Speaker. He may have something in front of him that may allude to that. If it says Popular River No. 2 it was said in error. I have not on any occasion undertaken to deliberately mislead the member or the members of this Legislative Assembly. If the record says it that it is Popular River No. 2 (and the page just brought it over to me), and it does, and I say it is an error. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the first time that recorded remarks may have been recorded differently than what the member has stated them, or meant them to be. In this instance, and I convey to you, Mr. Speaker, that it says No. 2 and that was in error and it should, in fact, then say No. 1. I would like the records to be corrected to so say.

### **Bill 43 Redundant**

**MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** — I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board. In view of the announcement, Mr. Minister, that manufacturers of Lysol and other materials or commodities that are on the market today, that they have made it known to you and in general to the public that they are quite prepared to produce a product with a very low alcoholic content because of the difficulties that we are experiencing in the province at the present time, would the minister, with the assurance from the manufacturers and distributors of such commodities, would you not feel that in view of that statement made by them that perhaps Bill 54 or a part thereof would be somewhat redundant if it proceeds before this Legislature?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this problem with some of the manufacturers, there have been discussions with them and with people in other branches of the government. They are aware of the problem. They are not happy with the present situation or the situation as it has existed up to at least this point. One of the suppliers has voluntarily withdrawn his product from the market in the area of Saskatchewan that has been affected. I have not had any correspondence from any of the manufacturers that they are prepared to put an alternative product on the market but that is an interesting observation. I have not received any direct communications from them in that regard and I think that with the amendments that are proposed to cope with this very, very serious problem I think that is the proper way to deal with the problem so that it does give us the power to ban the sale of that particular product and we can then regulate it thereafter. I think the approach we are taking is the sensible approach. We wish this problem did not exist but we are not in control of that and we think the action we are taking here is the most appropriate.

**MR. BAILEY:** – Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister not agree that the action taken by the business community and the manufacturers to quickly respond to the problem is not commendable on their part? Secondly, would you not agree that to proceed at this particular time particularly as the bill relates to the onus placed upon the independent businessman that it would be somewhat redundant and at the same time it could be detrimental in his relationships in his business community in which he has to live?

**MR. BYERS:** – Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be clear that in no way are we regarding the manufacturers and distributors as pushers, if I might use that term. They are marketers, they are manufacturers and distributors and, of course, they are interested in sales. However, they are not primarily interested in sales as I understand it, for the purpose for which the commodity has been used. I think the hon. member perhaps doesn't have a proper interpretation of how this will apply to the individual businessman and I was hoping to have a chance to respond to that when that debate resumes in the Legislature.

### **Special Programs for Level III Care**

**MR. MERCHANT:** – A question to the Minister in charge of Social Services who a few days ago announced a \$1.5 million special program to assist level III care. I ask the minister whether this is the beginning of the recognition of the Liberal policy that you should in fact be making level III care an insured service? This move of sort of insuring level III and one-half level as opposed to IV, does this mean that you are on the brink of moving into insuring all of level III?

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** – Mr. Speaker, first of all I think he should direct that Liberal policy question to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, he's an expert in that area. First of all, let me deny it is not – it's simply not the implementation of the Liberal program since we are against deterrent fees of any kind, Mr. Speaker. I want to indicate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you want me to answer it or do you have a further supplementary question? Mr. Speaker, if he has a further supplementary I'll take the supplementary.

**MR. MERCHANT:** – Would the minister agree that by now implementing a sort of a level III and one-half care that you will do nothing more than make worse the problem that exists where doctors in nursing care home and so on try to get people into level IV in an effort to get them insured coverage while in fact the relatively arbitrary distinction between III and IV is just the age confusion in the nursing homes and in the nursing home care area.

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker there is no doubt that there is some confusion with the levels of care. I think everybody recognizes that. The study we have undertaken of extended care indicated that to us and the Special Care Homes Association has indicated that to us. We are certainly going to undertake this year a particular study as to how we can simplify the levels of care. I think they are arbitrary and I have to agree with the member that there is some confusion which exists there. But I want to make it very clear to the member that many of the Special Care Homes Association's individual homes have requested over the last two years that we implement some mechanism whereby they could keep their residents in their own homes



because they recognize that moving the residents from a Level III facility to a Level IV facility, even in the same city, could be a very traumatic experience. They asked us to do that for special care homes. We, I think, are accommodating them at this particular time in doing that. The Minister of Health I think will be announcing very shortly additional level IV beds so that those people who become too big a problem in the nursing homes, or too much of a problem for them to take care of, can then be moved to a level IV facility. But I do think we are accommodating the special care homes in this situation and we will be carrying on further studies in the home area of levels of care.

## SECOND READINGS

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)** moved second reading of Bill NO. 59 – **An Act respecting the Provincial-Municipal Revenue Sharing.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 59 lays the foundation of a major new system of provincial-municipal finance. Revenue sharing itself is not a new idea, Mr. Speaker. The provincial government has been sharing its revenue with local governments for many years.

What is new is the method of setting the amount to be shared and the way it is distributed. In these two areas the Saskatchewan Revenue Sharing Program is the first of its kind in Canada. Over two years of work has been devoted to the preparation of this program in the preparation of this bill. Much of the preparatory work was done in consultant with representatives of the urban and rural municipalities.

Here, again, Saskatchewan is the only province to have engaged, in detailed discussion, with municipal organizations prior to introducing this program. Because of the consultation, because of the regional meetings, because of the board involvement of dozens of individual municipal councillors, the development of revenue sharing has strengthened, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, both the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities.

Giving the matter credibility with their members and a conferring on them a new real view in the conduct of municipal affairs in this province.

The new stature of the two municipal organizations is but one benefit from revenue sharing yet to be fully recognized, although I think the appearance of the stature is already there.

The new program of revenue sharing permitted by this bill will be the most comprehensive in this country. In fact, considering the backward-looking policies of most provincial governments now in office across this country, this revenue sharing plan may very well be the only real program of its kind for many years to come. It is another instance of Saskatchewan leading the way for all of Canada.

Revenue sharing, Mr. Speaker, is a watershed in provincial municipal relations. The concept of unconditional funding and the independent escalator open up broad, new horizons for municipalities by offering a new source of revenue geared to economic growth. Revenue sharing is a giant step away from the restrictiveness of reliance on the property tax for general municipal purposes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the early discussions, three goals were identified for revenue sharing, to consolidate a number of existing grants into a single new revenue source, to

offer flexibility and autonomy by making this block of money unconditional and to protect against inflation by gearing increases in the fund to the growth of our provincial economy.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, revenue sharing is designed to provide a major new source of unconditional revenue that grows along with the Saskatchewan economy.

There are several different ways these three goals could have been achieved. The simplest would have been to allow municipal governments to levy taxes on some of the province's tax bases. For example, legislation could permit a municipality to say for example, charge a sales tax or perhaps to charge a surtax on income. This would be simple. It would give the maximum of local autonomy. But it was rejected, both by the municipal organizations and by the government and the reason that it was rejected is that municipalities do not want to get into these tax fields, because if they do, the result would be a tax jungle yielding minimum revenue at a very high cost.

Another option, Mr. Speaker, is a dedicated tax where part or all of the revenue from a single tax is dedicated to municipal use and I think basically, that that is the Manitoba scheme. Of course this has some attractions but it offers only a narrow base for true revenue sharing program and it would interfere with the flexibility a provincial government must have to manage its economic affairs.

These and other options were reviewed and in discussions with municipal representatives the choice was reduced to two methods, a pool fund indexed to three or four major tax bases or a flat percentage of that provincial revenue.

Among the municipal organizations, some difference of opinion exists over which method is to be preferred. The rural representatives favor a pool tied to four tax bases. The urban group, although I don't think it is unanimous, supported a percentage of total revenue. As a government, our choice is the pool indexed to tax bases and our choice is for several reasons. First, the pooling of conditional grants is what urban representatives called for at their SUMA conventions. The request was to remove the conditions and pay the money with no strings attached. Revenue sharing is for operating costs so it is logical to start by pooling the three largest operating grants into a single fund.

Second, the goal of autonomy and independence from the province can best be met if increases are tied to the tax base instead of to revenue from that tax base. If the total provincial revenue was used, the money available each year would depend on the rate of tax set by the government. In 1978 with the reduction in income tax, that much less money would have been available for sharing with municipalities. Any reductions in tax would directly affect the amount going into the municipal coffers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Liberal Opposition, some of their spokesmen say that it should relate to total revenue. Some of the spokesmen say that it is such a good program that they want to take credit for it. Now I don't mind that, Mr. Speaker, because I think the people in Saskatchewan will know the record of the Liberal Party with respect to both urban and municipal grants because they had a change to deliver when they were in office not so long ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the loudest advocates of using provincial revenues, are the Conservative Opposition. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, The Conservative Opposition is the most vocal in calling for cutbacks in government spending. Now

those contradictory results have never stood in the way of a Tory looking for votes. But the question is, Mr. Speaker, what would happen to municipal revenue if the Conservative Opposition ever get elected? Total provincial revenue is unsuitable because it includes all sorts of income that has little or no relation to real economic growth. It includes borrowing from Crown corporations invested in capital facilities; it includes federal transfer payments such as the equalization grants which go up when the economy goes down; it includes federal money for provincial services, medicare, education, social services. Total revenue includes payments from Crown corporations which can vary, not according to the economy but to the capital needs of the corporations or to the operating needs of the province.

Total revenue, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is simply too clumsy and too crude to work within shaping municipal grants. The use of selected tax bases as proposed in this bill is much more accurate in reflecting real economic growth. A tax base grows or shrinks in direct relation to the economic future of the province. Only at the margins does provincial policy touch the four tax bases proposed for revenue sharing. The discretionary powers in this bill allow adjustments in the scope of the tax bases to be compensated. For instance, retail sales are one of the four bases. The rate of increase in retail purchases depends on how much money is around in the province, direct reflection of our economic health.

Not all sales are subject to tax, of course, but any changes in the base of the tax can be taken into account between now and 1980, when the index takes effect and after that by regulation. The tax bases of retail sales, personal income, corporate income and fuel produce a broad accurate indicator of what is happening in Saskatchewan and at the same time they offer a measure of stability that certain other tax bases do not.

Mr. Speaker, revenue sharing funds support operating expenses. They are not intended as an important source of capital funding. The community capital fund expires in 1979 and the government will be looking at a replacement for it. The introduction of revenue sharing will not be accompanied by any transfer of provincial programs onto provincial government. We will pay no attention to those in this House and outside of this House who propose to shift provincial services, like welfare, or health, onto municipal administration. No municipality, since I have been around, has asked to take on this responsibility, or any other, that those people want to impose on them. Revenue sharing should not be a backhanded way of dumping provincial problems on the municipal doorstep.

So long as this government is in office, revenue-sharing dollars will be the provincial contribution to any and all local expenditures and the choice of which ones and how much will remain in the hands of elected municipal governments will remain there.

In future years additional program options, which the provincial government agrees to foster and support, may be funded through revenue sharing. This year three such programs are on the drawing board – ambulance, fire protection and support for operating costs of recreational facilities.

Whenever such programs are made available an accompanying sum of money will be added to the revenue sharing pool. Municipalities that choose to participate in these program may receive grant money to support the cause. As each program develops the possibility exists for the funding eventually to be made, totally unconditional.

This new program option offers advantages to both the provincial and the municipal

April 28, 1978

sponsors. Provincially, the government is free to respond to needs for services it can support; municipally, councils may decide whether or not they wish to be included in the optional services.

In the long term should such an optional service prove popular at the municipal level, support for it can be built into the total block of funds available and distributed unconditionally.

Mr. Speaker, revenue sharing is a municipal program for municipal service. It is not a general program of local government finance. It will not include other forms of local governments such as, school or hospital board, or recreation committees. Only municipal councils are concerned.

Because revenue sharing focuses itself on municipal government it offers a new opportunity for municipalities to strength their position and work toward broader responsibility for program delivery. Yet each form of local government retains its own distinct source of funds.

The amount of provincial input to local expenditure is often not recognized, though it is very, very substantial — \$760 million in 1978, or just one half of the total provincial Budget. With this volume of money flowing into local coffers, the question can be asked, where is the new money for revenue sharing to come from?

Well, the answer is that revenue sharing would not be possible at any significant level, in Saskatchewan, without our greatly increased income from resources.

In 1971, provincial grants to municipalities, in total, came to less than \$1 million to urban municipalities. Total municipal grants exceed, now, \$61 million and that does not include capital grants, or housing, water and sewer, or urban road assistance, or land assembly or any other special purpose programs.

What makes this large and unprecedented increase in municipal funding is the policy of increasing resource revenues. In 1971 resource revenue produced only \$33 million for Saskatchewan or about 7 per cent of the Budget. In 1978 resource revenues have been raised to over \$460 million or about 25 per cent of the budget.

Municipal grants under our NDP government have risen even faster than resource revenue, faster than municipal spending and far faster than local taxes or personal income. The 45 per cent increase in 1978 puts Saskatchewan municipalities at the top of the list of Canadian municipal governments in provincial assistance. Mr. Minister, this is a fact of which we can be proud, for once again Saskatchewan is showing leadership to other provinces, even those other provinces with greater resources like oil rich Alberta or industry rich Ontario.

Saskatchewan I say, Mr. Speaker, is very likely to remain in the lead in the foreseeable future as Alberta's Conservative government rejects any consideration of our revenue-sharing plan and because here in Saskatchewan a second major increase in the pool of funds is scheduled for 1979, they are likely to be well behind. The 45 per cent increase this year and the second increase next year are necessary to boost the base level of revenue sharing before the indexing formula takes effecting 1980.

The two-year phase-in period allows time for the pools to be built up and for the new

program to be tested. Revenue sharing introduces a new system for both generating grant money and distributing it. In each respect we believe it will be useful to allow a couple of years to fine tune the program in consultation with our municipalities. A four-part pay out structure, Mr. Speaker, as proposed in this legislation for the urban communities.

Every community from village to cities receives the same basic grant in 1978, \$1,000. Now that basic grant obviously means more to the villages than it does to the cities of Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw or Regina. It is intended to channel money to smaller centres to give them enough in total to have a real impact.

The second pay out is a per capita allowance – a set amount to each community for its population. For 1978 the per capita allowance in the basic grant distributed a total of 60 per cent of the revenue-sharing pool, which effectively channels more money to towns and villages by reducing the amount available for distribution through the foundation grant.

Part three is the foundation formula which distribute funds in accordance with the needs of each community as measured against the average for all centres of similar size.

The foundation grant is comparable in principle to the school grants formula introduced in 1972. The school grants formula replaced the pupil-teacher ration in distributing education dollars.

In municipal affairs, the foundation program, in combination with other pay outs, replaces grants previously paid separately, such as the conditional grant for police services.

In both education and municipal affairs, the total of all grants calculated by these formulas is lumped into one amount and paid out to the local government to be spent according to its own priorities.

A further pay out is available on the conditional basis to municipalities that are interested in offering the services for which the money is intended. For 1978, \$3 million out of the \$61 million pool covers the cost of this fourth pay out. The services are municipal road ambulance, co-operative fire protection and assistance with the cost of operating recreational facilities.

Each of these three special grant programs will be brought on stream separately over the next four to six months.

The first program to reach implementation is the municipal road ambulance. We are within a week to ten days of finalizing the program with the Saskatchewan Road Ambulance Association, with SUMA and with SARM. Once meetings have been held to review outstanding details a program outline will be sent to all municipalities and work will begin on organizing road ambulance districts. A total of \$2.2 million is allotted from the 1978 revenue-sharing pool for ambulance. Two thirds of this, or \$15. million, is available to urban centres and \$700,000 is available for the rural municipalities.

Let me report to this Assembly where discussions are at so far. The municipal road ambulance program offers a graduated per capita grant with a higher allowance per

person or for districts of smaller more standard population. A population flow of 2,500 is proposed for new ambulance operations. Existing services based on smaller populations may be recognized outside of this minimum but for new ambulance services 2,500 is the smallest number for a viable operation in the long term according to the discussions so far.

The size of each municipal ambulance district beyond 2,500 level depends on the choices of the municipal people who form the associations. We expect associations will form at all levels of the grant schedule according to the type of service the local people decide to offer, the geographic location and the way the association chooses to arrange for ambulance service.

The grant proposed is \$3 per capita on the first 15,000 population, \$2 per capita on the next 15,000, and \$1.50 per capita on any population in excess of 30,000. For example, an association with a population of 20,000 people would raw a grant of \$55,000; an association with 34,000 population would receive \$81,000. The bulk of municipal road ambulance associations are likely to qualify at the \$3 per capita rate as most will have fewer than 15,000 people to serve within the boundaries of their member municipalities.

Municipal Road Ambulance is a local option program – those that are interested may enter; those that are not interested need to do nothing.

Grants will be available to associations of one or more municipal governments whose ambulance service meets minimum standards. Among the standards are regulations on the equipment that must be carried, the training of attendants and maximum pick-up and mileage rates that may be charged.

These details remain to be finalized. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to this House, we have received good co-operation from the Saskatchewan Road Ambulance Association, and most important from both SUMA and SARM, that have nominated two representatives with whom we consult in the development of this most important program.

Work has been in progress for over one month. Discussions on the last details will take place in a week to ten days, at which time I will be able to table an outline of the ambulance program in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, details of the co-operative fire protection grant and the recreation program will follow later this spring and summer. In each case, grants are available to co-operating municipalities that offer a fire protection service or recreation service to their residents. There will be certain minimum standards each ambulance or fire protection organization must meet to qualify for the grant, and for this reason, the funds are set up as conditional grants.

Municipalities may not want to participate in one or all of these programs, and those that wish to stay out are entirely free to do so. Part four grants are optional at the discretion of each municipal council.

This bill proposes a difference structure for grants to rural municipalities, recognizing that their operating conditions vary considerably from the urban centres. All rural municipalities receive a basic operating grant. The grant is not a flat dollar amount it is a percentage of the municipality's annual service cost.

The equalization grant introduced some years ago continues under revenue sharing. With new money available this year and next, the percentage of entitlement paid out under equalization will be raised very, very substantially. Such equalization is a benefit to the municipalities with lower assessment and lower revenues; paying a higher portion of entitlement is a way of channelling more aid to those with the greatest need for it.

Revenue sharing takes in the existing grant program for roads. At the request of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities these program have not been changed in application. The effect of revenue sharing is to index the total amount of money available for the programs so that rural municipalities are guaranteed funding, both conditional and unconditional, funding that can be used toward maintenance of good roads in our rural communities.

Rural municipalities are eligible for the same grant programs for ambulance, fire protection and recreation as urban counterparts. In 1978, a total of \$700,000 is set aside for pay outs to rural municipal councils entering the ambulance program, and a further \$300,000 is available under fire protection and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, revenue sharing, the revenue-sharing program and this bill are entirely new concepts in provincial-municipal affairs in this country. Once again Saskatchewan is in the leadership role. As the first province off the mark we are breaking new ground, and there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that means we have some learning and some experimenting ahead to develop this program. I expect there will be changes as we gain experience. This bill is arranged so that the changes can be made and that the program can be flexible.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is real and tangible evidence of the benefits of our Saskatchewan policy of resource taxation. It is real and tangible evidence of the good relationship between the provincial government and the municipalities, both rural and urban. It is real evidence of our government's willingness to accept challenge and to use government, not with fear and hesitation but with positiveness and with imagination. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, just a couple of remarks. I have to say first of all, I am surprised that the minister would take a half an hour with regard to a bill that has already — or to a concept that has been discussed a number of times in the House and where positions have pretty well been taken with regard to the principle of revenue sharing. It seems to me that what the minister has indicated is that the bill that is before us if it is real evidence of anything, more likely can be said to be real evidence of the fact that the government is prepared to accept ideas that come from the Liberal caucus. We are pleased about that, that has been aptly demonstrated before. We know that it takes a while. The member for Saskatoon Buena Vista will recall our discussion the other day with a group of students, where one of the things that was mentioned was that from time to time ideas put forward by the opposition, in fact, are grabbed maybe not immediately but a year or two later. This is one idea that we feel is something that the government did well to grab. There was real evidence of the fact that municipalities, both rural and urban, were having a great of difficulty with their fiscal policies because they were so limited in the resources that were available to them.

There is no question that the matter of inflation in the last few years particularly hit

municipalities because they did not have the opportunity to have revenues that corresponded with the question of inflation. Their revenues were remaining static because they were based on property taxation and revenue sharing was required. I think those of us who have been involved in municipal government in any way, will be aware of that very real problem that existed and will recognize that this particular program can go a long way towards solving that problem.

There is no question but what there has been a great deal of consultation with the members of SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), the members of SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities). There is no question that from a philosophical point of view both organizations support the concept of revenue sharing. When we put forward the idea we felt that would likely be the case, because there has been representation to us from those organizations prior to that they felt that something along that line needed to be done. The minister says it's the most comprehensive program in Canada. I would say that it has the potential to be the most comprehensive program in Canada. We know that there are other steps that are going to be required. A good deal is going to depend upon the discussions that take place between the department and the representatives in the municipalities in the next year. There is no question that it has the potential. Particularly, if in addition to the operating aspect the capital funding is placed in a revenue sharing pool, that it is likely to be worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to support the bill.

**MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** – Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the bill and the presentation made by the minister. I think it goes to prove the value of the amount of consultation that the Department of Municipal Affairs has had with SARM and SUMA. Although there were some difficulties over the months of negotiation and discussion, I think that in general there is acceptance of the principle of this bill. For that I would so commend the minister.

Municipal bodies across the province, as the member who just spoke, have had some difficulties in view of the tremendous costs of operation. Associated with that of course is the perennial problem of inflation. The concept of revenue sharing, and I am not going to argue over semantics about the words "revenue sharing." I am pleased that the minister was able to acquire from the Department of Municipal Affairs a key man from the Department of Education. What I see here is a grant formula structure which has worked very well, in my opinion, in the Department of Education. I am pleased to see that this type of thing is being applied to the municipalities across the province.

I would hope that the minister and the government opposite would not rest now on their laurels when this bill is passed, because there is a great deal of difficulty involved, even as yet.

A lot of things have to be settled with the municipalities. A lot of the ancillary grants that went with the basic grants, all being included in one, is causing some problems in the municipal area. I can mention a number of these but I point particularly to such things as the ambulance grant. We still don't know how and the RMs still don't know how they are going to divide this thing up. I sense that the local organizations, as such volunteer fire brigade in a small town, or the voluntary ambulance association, do have some concern that once all the money goes to the RMs how are they going to negotiate, or what portion are they going to get? I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs that his department not leave the difficulties alone. Make some



suggestions to these people. Be in constant contact with them so the grant formula itself that has been devised for the RMs I think is a move in a very positive direction. I think that minister has done a good job in this idea of a grant formula which they have preferred to call revenue sharing. I am not questioning that. But please, Mr. Minister, don't leave the local bodies now to fight some of these touchy little things out on their own. Pass on to them some recommendations to get away from what you might say "in fighting" at the local level. There could be some difficulties. Like all programs that go out, all new programs, we always have to iron out the little difficulties that exist and no program is perfect. I have often said about the grant formula for the school structure in the province, it's not perfect. You can never come up with a grant formula that is perfect. Nobody has yet. But the formula that has been devised, based on the success of the school grant formula, needs to have some ironing out. There will be some difficulties and I think the minister will be the first one to admit that.

I commend you, Mr. Minister, to make your staff available to be in contact with these people, to smooth out these wrinkles before the end of this current fiscal year, because they will have some difficulties.

Mr. Minister, we will be supporting this bill, there isn't any question about that. I think the government has moved in the right direction and I commend the minister of the time that he is taking with these two large municipal bodies, both SUMA and SARM. I think we are in the right direction in putting out to local government in Saskatchewan more ability on their own to manage their own affairs at the local level.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)** moved second reading of Bill NO. 58 – **An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, members of the Assembly are aware of the work of the Urban Law Review Committee. A comprehensive review of urban legislation in Saskatchewan has been called for in successive conventions of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and had been pressed for in particular by the major cities.

The Minister's Committee to review urban law began work last fall. It is chaired by Mr. Greg Darychuk, a long-time and respected member of the Department of Municipal Affairs and the local government board. Other Committee members are: Mayor Herb Taylor of Moose Jaw; Alderman Henry Dayday, Saskatoon; Mayor Forest Pederson, Wynyard; Mayor Guy Dauphinais, Gravelbourg; Carl McLeod, Saskatoon, a former administrator; Jean Jacklin, Star City, an administrator; Mayor Bill Haussecker, Maryfield; Mayor Boxell, Unity.

The Committee is reviewing existing legislation, a complex of something over statutes. Subject areas have to be clearly defined; councils have to be consulted. The process is likely to go on for many months ahead. Meantime, Mr. Speaker, the call for minor amendments to the exiting Urban Municipality Act which has gone on for years, has continued. Councils have found that the existing act does not match current practice, time and time again, and ask for it to be changed.

The amendment to The Urban Municipality Act before the Assembly in Bill 58 are the result of these requests for immediate change. They are in response to requests to not slow down the process of urban government because of an outdated act even while the review goes on.

April 28, 1978

In all cases, Mr. Speaker, the amendments before you have been reviewed by the Urban Law Review Committee and they have recommended they be included for legislation. The amendments are for the most part of a housekeeping and administrative nature.

Two of the amendments proposed to The Urban Act you have seen before. They are the same as the amendments proposed to The Rural Municipality Act, both at the request of the councils.

Because of the working of the present legislation there has been some question in The Urban Act, as there was in The Rural Act, as to whether or not municipalities have the power to tax mobile homes as separate buildings.

In the past, mobile homes have been taxed as separate buildings if they are being used as a residence, but a judgment of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal held that a municipality does not have the authority under existing legislation to assess a trailer, a mobile home or portable shack as a separate building. The amendment before you clarified the word "building" to ensure that municipalities do have the power to apply the same assessment and taxation rules to mobile homes as they do to any other residence in their jurisdiction.

Similarly, existing legislation puts a ceiling of \$25 per day that may be paid to councillors or aldermen while on council business. Aldermen feel that this is an unrealistic amount today and have asked that the ceiling be removed to allow them to set the per diem rate at their own discretion. The amendment provides for that removal.

The remaining amendments are also administrative in nature but did not arise in the changes of The Rural Municipalities Act.

Existing legislation carries a requirement that virtually any addition, alteration or repair to a building must have plans, drawings and specifications prepared by an architect. Many municipalities, especially the smaller ones, find this restriction prohibitive. The amendment before you removes the necessity of having architect plans for renovations as long as the supporting structure of the building is not affected. If the supporting structure is affected or if major structural changes are being made or if the building is new then architect plans are still required. But for the smaller alterations, the ones where municipalities found the requirement an unnecessary hardship, the requirement has been removed.

The amendments before you also provide councils with the power to remove a building within its boundaries that is a danger to public safety. Buildings such as ones severely damaged by fire or older buildings dilapidated to the point where they are dangerous would fall into this category.

Councils have repeatedly raised a concern with respect to their power to control stray animals. A recent court decision judged that a municipality did not, under existing legislation, have power to levy fines against the owner of a stray dog. The bill before you ensures that councils do have this power and also extends council's power to control stray animals to cats.

**MR. BAILEY:** – Cats?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Tom cats will be exempt in the regulation.

One other irritant to councils has been that there is some question of their authority to remove a junked car within urban boundaries. If the car is covered with an old tarp, it is argued that the car is part of the permanent features of the yard. Hence it is not a junked vehicle and hence cannot be removed by council at the owner's expense. This provision ensures that councils do have the right to remove a junked vehicle, unless it is inside a building and hence protected by the owner.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides councils with specific authority to attempt new approaches to some of the old problems of main street, of downtown. Concern has been expressed, by many, many towns and villages and cities, particularly by the larger cities, who see their downtown core deteriorating as urban shopping centres grow. This amendment provides that a council may, with the approval of the downtown burgesses, delegate authority to a Board of Management to take action with respect to the downtown core or to the main street. The Board of Management can be made up of local businessmen as well as council members. The Board of Management can be delegated funds from the council. The Board of Management can acquire property and can maintain and beautify it to improve the main street or to improve the downtown. The areas would be known as Business Improvement Districts. The legislation remains permissive but councils have expressed an interest in this type of co-operative approach to the main street development or to a downtown development and the amendment merely provides them with the authority.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 58.

**MR. BAILEY:** – I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if all of this is housekeeping as the minister would like us to believe when we see the crows come back and the signs of crocuses, we are about to see another disappearance of a sure sign of spring with the perennial tom cat running around but it may disappear altogether.

Mr. Minister, there are a couple of items that I would like to mention and I want to just zero in first of all, on the per diem grant and the ceiling being lifted in relation to this particular bill.

I want to say, Mr. Minister, that it is long overdue. We expect people who devote so much item to the municipal governments to do so in charity. Many, many of the people,

as the minister is aware, give up a job, a good-paying job for that particular day for which they receive no remuneration and they are serving their community and indeed, serving this province with a much lower per diem rate than they should be and for a number of years now, one of the problems of municipal government has been that people can give of their talents to that government for a period of time and then after that it becomes too much of a loss of income to themselves. I am very pleased to see that the local government is able now to set their own per diem rate. I think that is long overdue and I think that is very good.

The other thing I want to say about some of the difficulties, particularly the ones that the small areas have had with this piece of legislation is with regard to the architects. Now I'm not knocking that particular profession as such but all one has to do is to go and take a look at the blunders which you see across the province which were created in the 1950s in relation to the structural design of some of our schools to see that even this profession is not without flaws. I agree that in these lower areas, these smaller areas, that to burden the local government with some of the severe regulations regard to the architectural plans, is again, long overdue.

All of the bill, Mr. Minister, that I can see, has come forward from the municipal groups. Every suggestion that you have made in relation to Bill 58, I think it is, has come directly from the two municipal bodies in the province. I find no fault with it and I will be supporting the bill.

**MR. PENNER:** – Mr. Speaker, we too will be supporting the bill. Those of us who have been involved with municipal government will realize that some of these areas have been problems that local governments have been able to deal with, and while we make light of the particular problem of the tom cat, large centres particularly, have been frustrated by problems, nuisances that have been created and have found that they haven't had the power to do anything about it. The fact that that section with regard to cats and dogs is being clarified – I guess from that point of view, has to be considered to be worthwhile. The matter of trailer and junk vehicles has also been a bit of a problem. This is an attempt to clear it up. I recognize the point made by the minister earlier that a comprehensive review of the act, as was the case with education, is something that is going to take a long time and it is well that where there are things that are identified as we go through that review or as that committee goes through the review, that they are picked up and dealt with rather than awaiting until the end to do it.

We will be supporting the bill, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. N. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services)** moved second reading of Bill No. 61 – **An Act to provide for the Celebration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Establishment of the Province of Saskatchewan.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce for second reading, an Act to provide for the Celebration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary.

It is an act that I think will have a significant influence and effect on this province, at least I hope it does. It might be worthwhile for the members of the House, if I were to describe some of the philosophy and some of the thinking behind the seventy-fifth anniversary celebrations.

We are trying to avoid – I might describe what we are trying to do by telling you what we are trying to avoid. We are trying to avoid making the seventy-fifth anniversary

celebration a mere tourist promotion. I think it may fairly be said that "Homecoming '71" was a mere tourist celebration. My estimation of it was that it was something less than a success and it has been my observation, Mr. Speaker, that celebrations which are nothing more than tourist celebrations and nothing more than tourist promotions are almost designed to fail.

It is also, Mr. Speaker, something more than an opportunity for the government to grandstand and be expressed about what a great country we live in and what a great province we live in.

I see, Mr. Speaker, in some ways Canada Day developing in to that kind of a day. We hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary celebration will be a community celebration and the impetus and the inspiration for it will come from the communities. That is very appropriate, Mr. Speaker. In this province, the people in this province have probably the strongest sense of identity with their communities, the strongest sense of community spirit of any province in Canada.

Previous to becoming Minister of Culture and Youth I would have thought that I would have said such a suggestion was kind or corny, but my experience in seeing other provinces operate has suggested to me that the people of this province do have a strong sense of community, much so than elsewhere. I might give you a couple of illustrations. I am going to refer to our Saskatchewan Games.

Our Budget, Mr. Speaker, is a fraction of what the budget of other provinces is for Summer Games. Why? Because the Saskatchewan volunteers do the vast majority of the work and, accordingly, we spent a lot less. I might also refer to our recreation program, Mr. Speaker.

Our recreation program has been based on the communities and our recreation program in this province has become a model for other provinces who are trying to set up similar successful recreation programs. None of the provinces, I might add, have duplicated it with complete success because the people of those other provinces don't have that sense of identity with their community.

We are trying to turn this celebration into a true community celebration. It will obviously be a time to encourage tourists to come back. It will obviously also as well be a time to celebrate some very real achievements over the last 75 years, but as well, Mr. Speaker, we hope that the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary will be an opportunity for communities to reflect on where they have come from and where they are going in the next few years. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we hope that these Seventy-Fifth Anniversary celebrations will have a serious side to them.

I spend some time discussing the philosophy of the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary celebration because that philosophy is reflected in this act. We could have, I suppose, run the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary celebrations through a department of government. The Department of Culture and Youth might have been one department which might have operated and had the responsibility for the program. As members of the Legislature will see from the act, that is not what we chose to do. We set up a Crown

corporation to be styled to the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary. (Let me get the bill out and make sure I have it right) – the Saskatchewan Diamond Jubilee Corporation. We set up a corporation for a number of reasons, Mr. Speaker, the primary one though is that we wanted the celebrations to have a little distance from the government. We didn't want people feeling that this was a government celebration. We wanted them to feel that it was theirs with advice and direction and assistance from the provincial government, but it was to be their celebration. This is one of the primary reasons we chose to set up a corporation.

With this act the corporation will be established with a board of directions who will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The name, as is apparent on the first page, will be the Diamond Jubilee Corporation. It has, we believe, all the necessary powers to act and to carry out the observation of our province's entry into confederation. It is proposed to the day to day business of the Diamond Jubilee Corporation will be conducted by the manager with the general policy being set down by a board of directors, who will be not less than three and not more than nine.

We also have in mind, Mr. Speaker, I might add that in addition to a board of directors, we plan to have a citizens advisory committee composed of various people from throughout the province, representing the various groups whom we hope will become actively involved in the celebrations. The structure is patterned after the 1955 celebrations. They had a corporation as distinct from running it through the department, a board of directors which was small and a working board which will meet often, as often as twice a month or once a week. Then they and the citizen advisory committee as well.

In reviewing the various celebrations that we have had in this province, the Golden Jubilee, the Diamond Jubilee in 1965, the 1967 Centennial celebration and so on, the most successful was the 1965 celebration and one of the reasons for that, we thought, was that particular celebration was based in the community and it was the communities which provided the inspiration and impetus for it.

It is proposed that the Diamond Jubilee Corporation will co-operate with other bodies to assist them with liaison of committees, offices and employees, to plan and carry out a most suitable and exciting confederation celebration of our seventy-fifth birthday as a province. Virtually all of the money the corporation will spend will come from the Consolidated Revenue. Another of the advantages of a corporation is, it is easy to buy and sell programs and flags and so on and so forth. There will be some of this done. We don't anticipate this will be a highly significant source of revenue. We don't plan to do it with an eye to covering the cost of the corporation. This corporation is not by any means going to pay its own way and it was never intended to.

The corporation's fiscal year will be from April 1 to the end of March, in the succeeding calendar year, with all the accounts, statements and reports properly audited and presented to the Assembly in the normal fashion.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, we are eager to proceed with the observance of this celebration in 1980. We have a number of ideas and activities which we have thought of but I am not going to list them exhaustively now. Members may have questions in the Committee of the Whole and we would be glad to answer them and give you such details as we have.

Mr. Speaker, a prairie tradition has been the gathering together of people in sport and cultural performances. So, in 1980 our citizens and travellers can come together, to have the opportunity and to participate in community events and activities and to understand their province better.

1980, Saskatchewan's year and the year of our 75 anniversary as a great province. I am sure all members of the House will want to join with me in voting for the bill and join with me, more importantly, in an effort to make our Seventy-Fifth Anniversary celebrations meaningful for the people of this province. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not at this time going to say very much but there are several members of our caucus — I think even though this is a very minor piece of legislation in regard to the length and breadth of it, I think this Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the province of Saskatchewan is rather an important and historic occasion and, therefore, I think that perhaps the members on our side of the House who are unable to speak at this time this morning would like the opportunity to address a few remarks to this bill, to this occasion more so than to the bill itself. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the hon. Mr. Shillington that Bill No. 49 — **An Act to amend The Theatres and Cinematographs Act, 1968** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

### **Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Industry Incentives Act, 1970**

1:1970:Chapter 33

Agreed.

**Item 2:** New section 5

Agreed

**Item 3:** 9 amended

**MR. WIPF:** — Mr. Chairman, just one question on this and that is what criteria is used for the forgiveness of these loans?

**MR. VICKAR:** – My people are around the back someplace, but they are sending us some regulations on the type of businesses that are involved and every business will have its own set of criteria in order for a loan to be forgiven. The loans themselves will be made by a different set of regulations. I'll be able to give them to you. I don't know where my people are this morning. I'll get them for you.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** – Will the minister undertake to supply the regulations and criteria to us?

**MR. VICKAR:** – Yes, no problem.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** – And will you also give us the assurance that this will not be retroactive, loans that are already made, it will not apply to.

**MR. VICKAR:** – Yes, that is quite true.

**MR. WIPF:** – Mr. Minister, in this (d) would you table an example of these terms and conditions that you have under 3 (d)? It says in 3 here, prescribing the terms and conditions under which the loans may be made and under which loans may be forgiven? Would you also table and give us an example of those, of the regulations on that?

**MR. VICKAR:** – Yes, I will supply the whole thing for you.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

### **BILL NO. 39 – An Act to amend The Coroners Act**

Section 1 agreed.

#### **Section 2**

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** – Can the Attorney General advise as to the qualifications of the individual that he is looking for as the coroner and whether it would be a salaried employee or whether it's going to be a contract employee or a contracted service?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, our hope would be to attract a fully qualified medical practitioner, who has some interest and/or experience in this area. Our present thinking is that we would have him as a salaried official of the government to conduct and be responsible for the entire administration of The Coroners Act. We don't have any individual in mind yet. Whether we will be able to attract one on this kind of a basis or not, it will be difficult to tell.

Section 2 to 6 agreed.

#### **Section 7**

**MR. WIPF:** – Mr. Chairman, on Section 7, this means that you can summons anyone to come as a juror, is that right, to sit as a juror at the inquest, and if you summons somebody to come in and they can't say, stomach that sort of thing, is there room for them to beg out?



**MR. ROMANOW:** — I am advised that there is a method out and that is basically it is up to the coroner. The juror comes and says to the coroner I have a particular problem and he decides.

Section 7 and 8 agreed.

9, new section 18 agreed.

10, Section 22 amended agreed.

11, Section 24 repealed agreed.

12, Section 25 repealed agreed.

13, Section 28 repealed agreed.

14, Section 29 repealed agreed.

15, Section 30 repealed agreed.

16, Section 31 repealed agreed.

17, Section 32 repealed agreed.

18, Section 33 amended agreed.

19, New schedule agreed.

20, coming into force – strike out.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

### **BILL NO. 42 – An Act to amend The Small Claims Enforcement Act**

1 and 2 agreed.

### **Section 3**

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** – Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, it is becoming a perennial criticism or the ignoring of the criticism is becoming a perennial matter. I think the Attorney General is as the one responsible for the administration of justice should take cognizance of a couple of facts. First of all, there are great number of small local businessmen who are incorporating for tax purposes, not because they have any designs of becoming a big, bad multinational corporation or doing damage to the little person on the street, it is just a nice way for them to take advantage of tax situations and to save themselves some money. They don't have evil in their blood and they are not out to get people. Secondly, there are an awful lot of small corporations now that are individuals who will be incorporating to take advantage of the recent tax changes.

Now what you do in this bill is you discriminate against them; you do it deliberately and you do it continuously. I say to you that you are in fact penalizing people. There are number of situations . . . I have one that comes to mind . . . they've got a small business;

there are five of them operating; they have accounts receivable, \$600 or whatever it is and, of course, they can't take advantage of The Small Claims Enforcement Act because the jurisdiction is cut in half for them. I just think it is unfair and it would simplify the operation of the act if you allowed the small limited company to take advantage of the provisions. It would encourage them to use The Small Claims Enforcement Act.

The reverse is also true, that in many cases it's the large multinational corporation that you want to discriminate against, that don't bother with the act on the smaller claims. It's really a petty discrimination that you are embarking upon and I think it ill-behooves you to even consider it there and I don't now why you don't just make the jurisdiction the same for everybody.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the member raised certainly an arguable point and one that is worthy of consideration. I think the simple situation is the standard complaint that he raises and I suppose now my standard response. The basic situation is the philosophy of the act.

The philosophy of the act as it was set out years ago was in effect to make this, in a sense a small man's consumer court. The member argues well, that there are some companies who are really the category of consumers. That may be so. But keeping in mind that Small Claims is designed where the person can come to the judge and get assistance for the filling out of the forms and informal hearing system and a quick easy resolution to the issue on that kind of a philosophy. The general fact of the matter is that by incorporation, I agree, here is the arguable point, not in all cases but by generally the active incorporation puts in a different kind of philosophical base for it, something which we don't think the original Small Claims enforcement jurisdiction was set out to do.

I can't satisfactorily resolve this. I don't think the arguments is 100 per cent in my mind in the way that I articulate it. Perhaps we should eliminate the difference at some future point but at the present time my department and myself view the philosophy of the bill to be an individual's bill, a person's bill, as opposed to a corporate entity's bill on the arguments that I have advanced. All I can tell the member is that I will again consider his arguments. Undoubtedly this act is going to be looked at again. In fact I have made a commitment in second reading to the member for Regina south (Mr. Cameron) that we would look at the Consumer's Association brief and review that in detail and I fully expect that next year around we are going to be coming with a detailed bill and perhaps there will be some change at that particular stage in the game. I will have to consider it then.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** — Well, except that your argument is found further wanting for two other reasons.

First of all the philosophy of discrimination didn't evolve until the amendment of 1973 and it was not in the original intent of the act. Secondly the government is inconsistent because on the one hand it makes changes to The Business Corporations' Act, making fundamental changes in the corporate law of Saskatchewan, which designed to ease incorporation and cut out the façade that went on for years of being more complex. You simplified it and you in fact made it open for one man companies, single individuals, to incorporate which refutes, I think, total your position. Again, I just don't think that it is really proper for the Attorney General to stand up and say that we just plain want to discriminate and we are using amendments to an act to discriminate. No other reason is really of any validity. Your argument the other night that I would increase the workload,

well, in fact you are increasing the jurisdiction to increase the workload and if there is an increase in the workload then there is a commensurate reduction in the workload in district court, which is what you want. I just don't really know how you, as Minister of Justice, can really argue in fairness that it is right and proper to discriminate for really petty reasons.

Item 3 agreed.

#### **ITEM 4, SECTION 4**

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** — The Attorney General made some reference in his second reading speech that at the lower end there would in fact be no increase and that at the upper end there would be a slight increase so that overall there would be no great increase. Well, obviously if that is based on past statistics that with the inflationary increase there will be an increase in revenues. Would you supply the Assembly with the revenues you expect next year from this particular source; secondly, the revenues you received in the past completed year?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I think I can provide those. At least have my people provide it during the consideration of the Attorney General's Estimates. Mr. Ketcheson will make a little note and we will have it ready for you then, we hope.

Item 4 agreed.

Items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, as amended agreed.

Item 14 deleted.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE – DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR VOTE 20**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order please! We are dealing with the Estimates of Labour, page 65. I will ask the minister to introduce his staff please.

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Chairman, I want to introduce the Deputy Minister, Bob Mitchell, to my left, who will be known to most of you. The Associate Deputy Minister and Director of Occupational Health and Safety has not yet arrived but will be with us shortly. I believe he was introduced to the house a year ago. Behind the rail, Lynne Pearson, formerly the Director of the Women's Division has taken on expanded responsibilities and is now Executive Director of the Employment Services Branch, David Wartman, directly behind the Deputy Minister, the Director of Administrative Services, Mr. Don Goss behind the rail to Lynne Pearson's left, the Director of Policy, Planning and Research, Mr. Bert Sheasby, the Director of Safety Services Branch, Gerry Meier who is the Director of Apprenticeship and Standards Division, and Pat More, the Director of Administration, Occupational health and Safety and representing the Worker's Compensation Board, Mr. Alec Taylor, the Chairman Jack McLean is the Executive Secretary for the Worker's Compensation Board, and Ted Theissen, the Director of Accounting with the WCB.

#### **ITEM 1**

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** – Mr. Chairman, I suppose – well, different from other years, I don't have a series of particularly specific points that I wanted to raise. I do want to raise with the minister in a general sense, the broader question that troubles me greatly. I think in '75 and '76, to a lesser extent in '77 but clearly in those times when the Canadian economy was vibrant and doing well and the Saskatchewan economy was vibrant and doing well, I thought that the appropriate course of action for the Department of Labour to take was the course of action that basically it was taking, a course of action that was concerned specifically about the progress of organized labor and to a lesser extent, the worker, progress in the narrow sense of the worker as opposed to the economy as a whole. So that in a time of a strong economy, I thought that it was appropriate that the energies of the Department of Labour and (I would have been apt to describe them as the biases) the biases of the Department of Labour worked as they did to assist the working man against the other side of the coin, which would have been profitability, production, the capacity of the economy to perform well. The side of me that is concerned about the working man would then have said, look the economy is strong. Because the economy is strong, this is the time when average working men and women can make some progress within the economy, get a bigger bite, a bigger piece of the action. I might well have said then that the actions of the Department of Labour were right, in the sense of that the Department of Labour has, and I believe the whole NDP government has, a bias towards the working man, a bias that I think causes particular problems for the business community and causes particular problems for investment in this province.

I would have said that then because I always think that what we have to do in the economy is trade off the good times and when there are good times, I am always looking to try to broaden that return to people so that the poorer segments of the economy have more. Certainly that's the final aim, always the final aim, but I would have said that was an appropriate time for the poorer segments of the economy to make progress. I said of course that when that is a happening, when a government and when your department are concerned about greater worker participation, which I think is a good aim, a good aim in the final analysis, safety for workers, protection for workers, protection for workers, in the sense of safety but also protection in terms of the hours that they work and the requirements that are made upon them and all of the things that go into protecting the workers, all of those things, which I consider good, long term aims, are also things that cut into productivity and cut into profitability.

All right, now in 1978, we have a very troubled Saskatchewan economy, the highest rate of unemployment that we have had since the depression and really no sign from the provincial government that you intend to do anything about it, particularly we have signs of very real problems in the Canadian economy. The manufacturing section, our cost of production, the labor input is running about 12 per cent to 14 per cent behind the cost of production in the United States. Yet, you continue the 1975 thinking, the 1976 thinking, which was probably appropriate as well in 1973 and 1974, but I was not here with an opportunity to say that to you. You continue the thinking that seeks progress for the poorer end of the economy, I recognize that, at the expense, I suggest, of profitability and production. The result of that, I suggest again, is that we are seeing an outflow of capital from this nation and we are not seeing an inflow of investment into Saskatchewan, not seeing an inflow in the past year or so, at a time when there were all the natural things to bring in income, uranium coming on stream, things of that nature.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the whole direction of the Department of Labour now may be a good direction because I think that progress along the lines of worker participation and safety and protection of the worker, those things are always good. But

there is only so much that you can do to the economy at a particular time without the business community backing away, saying, no you are pushing us too hard, you are pushing us at a time when we are in trouble on other fronts. And I suggest to you that it would now be appropriate for the Department of Labour to be easing up on that final long term aim but what you should be doing now is trying to change emphasis to make it possible for Saskatchewan businessmen to do better so that there would be a greater investment here. You should be changing your emphasis, particularly changing your emphasis on the problem that Canada faces as a nation, low productivity. The support that the government very obviously gives to organized labor demanding sort of their full pound of flesh, the minister, Mr. Chairman, comes from the labor movement, his biases are clear. The group, Mr. Chairman, in government have a number of people directly out of the labor movement and I suggest that your biases in that direction are keeping you from looking at the broader question. The broader question now is, is Saskatchewan productivity high enough to continue to attract investment? Is Canadian productivity high enough? Should you go on giving the encouragement that this government gives to the trade union movement's taking always the hard line? Should the Minister of Labour, for instance have given implied support in the recent milk strike, implied support to the side of organized labor?

**MR. SNYDER:** – I didn't . . .

**MR. MERCHANT:** – Well I'm saying you did. I'm saying you did, plug in your earphone and you'll hear me say that. I say, Mr. Chairman, you gave implied support, the rhetoric of your language then gave implied support and I say it's all part of the piece.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat again, those aims are worthwhile aims in the long term. I ask the minister whether this is not a time when you should be looking at the broader questions of productivity, profitability, at a time when the Canadian economy and the Saskatchewan economy are as troubled perhaps as they have been for decades.

**MR. SNYDER:** – Mr. Chairman, I think it's obvious that the member's remarks require a few observations on my part. I think the member very skilfully took positions which stake out his position in no particular area. It strikes me that he did a very good job of saying and then, you've gone too far on occasions, giving qualified support to some of the program that have been advanced over the last number of years. I am wondering what the member is suggesting we have done over the last couple of years, that we should not have done? Is he implying, first of all, that the minimum wage is too high? Does he believe that? I wish he would say it. If he believes that there is too much emphasis on Occupational Health and Safety, which I believe is tantamount to a good, healthy satisfied labor force, then I wish he would say it. If he is saying that some of the Labor Standards' provisions, which I think have been reasonably modest over the last period of time, have been excessive, then I wish he would say it. But he has neglected to do any of those things except set out, in general terms, what he believes to be as an element of excess on the one hand while giving qualified support to the programs that we've offered on the other hand.

I don't think that is good enough in this House, Mr. Chairman, because in terms of the staggering economy certainly he shouldn't be pointing his finger at the province of Saskatchewan . Certainly, we acknowledge the fact that we have a higher unemployment rate that has been the case over these last number of years. Certainly, this can't be attributed to the province of Saskatchewan or the administration of the Department of Labour or the government generally, I think perhaps the time might be

right for a review of the Budget that was just brought down in this Legislature a short time ago which takes some major and some very positive steps that have received accolades all over this country. If Liberal provinces and if this federal government had observed what was going on in Saskatchewan and done something more positive at an earlier point in time we might have been freed from some of the problems we face at this point. We know, for example, that we are receiving from the other provinces, which have a much higher unemployment rate, immigrant workers who are searching for work, looking upon us and Alberta as a place where it is more possible to receive employment. I think the member is being grossly unfair when he suggests in general terms that we have done too much without observing what his political counterparts in other provinces have failed to do. Had some of these actions taken place that we have manifested in our last Budget I think a great many of the problems might not be upon us. A great many of them are not of the making of Saskatchewan people, the government of Saskatchewan, or industry or labor here.

He is suggesting that there should be somehow a trade off of good time against bad time. I wonder at that point in time whether the member is really saying that you suspend the collective bargaining agreement at a point in time when things become difficult. I think in large measure the trade union movement has assumed a more temperate position over the last number of months in particular and particularly since the wage and price controls have been lifted. Once again, I wish the member if he has objection he would stand in his place and say that he objects to some of the collective agreements that have been established and indicate to this House that he believes they are too rich. If he thinks the government of Saskatchewan is overly generous in a 7 1/2 and a 6 per cent agreement over a two-year period, I wish he would say it. If he believes that we were too generous when we negotiated almost an identical contract with the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers vis-a-vis the contract that we have with them and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, then I wish he would say it. If he believes that we were too generous with the Dairy Workers then I think he should stand in his place and indicate that we should somehow have been devoting our efforts to something less than the agreement that the two parties agreed upon without any coercion by myself.

I want to say at this point in time that when the parties were called together I gave a clear indication to them that my part was going to be an obscure one, that I expected them to get together and resolve the problem and this was my major imposition on the two parties to that collective bargaining agreement and for him to imply that I imposed myself on that collective bargaining agreement and showed a bias on behalf of the Dairy Workers is completely and totally erroneous and I think in fairness he should admit that this is the case.

The suggestion somehow that biases are clear with respect to my position in Cabinet, my position in this House, I want to make it clear to him that as Minister of Labour I feel a responsibility particularly for that group that he draws attention to, the people in the low income categories, particularly the unorganised. I think I have a particular obligation to that group or otherwise I think that my existence here falls far short if I don't devote myself to the causes of some of the people who find themselves having a desperate time keeping pace with the inflationary spiral that he has been with us over the last couple of years or three years in particular.

I think in general terms, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that the member waves his arms frantically in attempting to indicate some suggestion that somehow this government

has been too generous to working people and at the same time he wants to be placed on the record as favoring some of the things that we have done in order that he can go out and greet his constituents and indicate his unqualified support for all the good things the Department of Labour has done. Obviously we haven't done enough when you are talking to that group. When you are talking to your industrial friends and people in the private sector you are in a position to say that you also have taken a position on their behalf and indicated to the government that they should be showing a greater degree of - well, modify their position with respect to the other side of the coin. I don't think you can have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. In spite of the agility, in spite of the fancy footwork of the member for Regina Wascana, I just don't think you can have it both ways.

**MR. MERCHANT:** – Mr. Chairman, let me tell members of the House that my support for some of your programs has never, ever, ever, ever got me as far as I know in the political worlds any support from anybody. Indeed, if anything, my support for some of your programs has hurt me within the support that usually flows to the Liberal Party and probably hurt me with the electorate. My support for some of your programs has been because I have thought that some of your programs were appropriate and well handled. Nonetheless, I say to the minister that he knows full well that a province and an area acquires a reputation with the business community. Your reputation is a bad reputation. It is a reputation of being, if I can use the word, overzealous. You may say, what does that mean, what does overzealous mean? Does it mean following the law and ensuring that the law, as we have written it, is in fact enforced? Yes, that is what overzealous means. That is the way the business community views it. The minister well knows that when companies decide where they will establish they look at a number of things. They look at markets, they look at the kind of influence that governments have through programs like DREE and provincial industrial incentives or state industrial incentives if they are in the United States, they look in the United States at the form of bond functions that are there, in the United States they look at the question of whether it is a right to work state or not a right to work state. They look in Canada at the atmosphere that exists towards organized labor. They look at the atmosphere that exists in the Labour Relations Board; they look at the atmosphere that exists in Safety Standards. In all of those areas here you take a very specific bias towards organized labor and that hurts you. It hurts this province in terms of getting investment, it hurts the province that the investing community knows full well that the Labour Relations Board is not particular wrong in the way they interpret your laws, but your laws are designed to give the advantage to organized labor. People know that, the minister knows that. The minister would probably be apt to say, if he were candid about it, look on all labor matters you have got to have a bias, it is a natural thing you will have a bias one way or another. The minister may well say that the under the Liberal government there was bias in this province towards big business. Well, that may be true but the result was some investment came of a big business orientation.

All I say, Mr. Chairman, to the members of the committee is that, when the economy is in difficulty, that is the time to change the emphasis. The emphasis you have always had is for what I would describe as progress for the worker and I think that is a good, long range aim. But there may be a time when you have to suspend that good long range aim, go more slowly on it. You can only do so much at any particular time. This is the time to sort of, let up. Now the minister says, made some comments about labor settlements in this province. I congratulate the trade union movement on the moderation that they have shown, with the exception of one trade union in this province. I think that all the rest are showing moderation and are doing what I have always through the trade union movement did, a pretty fair job of handling

themselves than various small businessmen, who are not sort of the specialists in the field, but good labor negotiators are, the people negotiating on behalf of the trade unions.

That is not to say that your department has eased up as the trade union movement has eased up. You are just as zealous, just as rigorous. The department goes on leaving the very clear impression with business, the very clear impression through your health and safety standards, through all of the things that the department does that influences the business community, goes on leaving the very clear impression that this is as tough place on management; that you take a tough view and that is one of the things that management considers when they decide whether to expand or whether to develop here. I think that in a troubled economic time for this province, you should be easing up.

**MR. SNYDER:** – Mr. Chairman, I shan't prolong the debate on the item for an extended period of time but I think particularly when industry is attempting to make a judgment about where they will establish, they have a look first of all at the wages paid in that particular region, the amenities that are offered, the opportunity to consult and receive assistance from the Department of Industry and Commerce or SEDCO or wherever but they look particularly, I suppose, at the industrial composite of wages that are being offered in that particular jurisdiction and a few comparisons, I think, are probably apt at this time.

The industrial composite October 1977, average weekly wage in the province of Saskatchewan, \$242.62, which I don't imagine the member could regard as being particularly generous at this point in time. I look upon the others where I see the average for Canada is \$257 compared to our \$242; I see British Columbia with an average weekly wage of \$292.28; I see Alberta, our neighbor to the west, with \$268.88 compared to Saskatchewan's \$242.62 and I don't see industry fleeing the province of Alberta because of onerous wages in that province. New Brunswick, I suppose, if the member believes that this is the formula for an economy that will boom, then should be taken into consideration. New Brunswick has an average weekly wage of \$226 which is below that of the province of Saskatchewan; Prince Edward Island with \$192.82; Nova Scotia with \$216.06. With the exception of Manitoba, Saskatchewan actually falls behind those other provinces that I have drawn attention to. I don't know whether the member believes that the answer to bringing about a prosperous economy is keeping industrial wages down. It would seem to me that that is what he is saying in a rather obscure fashion. He is also saying that our emphasis on occupational health has somehow been a deterrent to industrial development in the province of Saskatchewan. I frankly don't believe that to be the case, and if it is the case, I think he can rest assured that with the current set of circumstances and the moves that are obviously being made in all of the other jurisdictions that can regard themselves as being moderately progressive, they are looking at the Saskatchewan scheme and they are patterning their scheme on the basis of what we have done in this province since 1972. I take considerable amount of pride in that. I think most employers take a considerable amount of pride in providing safe and healthy working conditions for their employees.

This is a system that is going to be duplicated across Canada before we are very far into the 1980s, with the exception perhaps of some of the Tory provinces who are travelling in the opposite direction. With a Conservative province to the east of us, the province of Manitoba, cutting and hacking away at almost every conceivable program, and with the Occupational Health and Safety Program which was devised and on the planning board and well on its way prior to the coming into office of the Hon. Sterling Lyon, then we see some backward steps being taken in the province of Manitoba and elsewhere where



there is a Conservative administration.

I don't think the member can raise any particular objection to the fact that we do indeed enforce the law. We have been criticized in the past for not being rigid enough. I think the member opposite has been one of those that has raised some objections with respect to job evaluation, some of the things which haven't progressed quite as quickly as he had suggested we should be doing. This of course, has a cost factor attached to it and you can't escape the inevitable results that if you enforce good legislation that has some financial features involved that there are some costs that will inevitably be part of the settlement. I don't know whether he is objecting to the fact that our enforcement program under The Labor Standards Act picked up something like \$500,000 owing to workers in the Saskatchewan work force, provided for by investigation and enforcement by the Labour Standards Branch of the Department of Labour. If he is saying that, once again, I wish he would stand in his place and make it clear that we should not be rigid in our enforcement and that \$500,000 that we collected on behalf of workers in this province who had not been paid in accordance with holiday provisions, annual vacation and minimum wage should not be enforced . . . overtime provisions also. If he is saying that, I wish he would be more specific rather than dealing in broad generalities.

**MR. MERCHANT:** – Mr. Chairman, first the minister says that the employers are proud of the Occupational Health and Safety program. The employers that have spoke to me and they are many, almost unanimously – I don't agree with them and I tell them that – view occupational health and safety as a means of an NDP government for which they have a great deal of suspicion, an NDP government trying to get in and unionize them. That's the basic view of the small businessman in Saskatchewan of the occupational health and safety group.

Now on the other hand, there are different kinds of employers like the schools and so on and the white collar areas which just laugh at occupational health and safety. They think it is ridiculous that they are asked to have occupational health and safety committees in areas where they don't think they have any risk. Some of them have had one meeting in five years or four years. They don't think it is very appropriate. I just mention that in passing. Obviously we are talking to different employers.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to say was the minister knows that when he talks about weekly wage costs, that is an apples and oranges comparison because it depends on how much organized labor there is. A large company coming into Saskatchewan, thinking of making an investment, even a medium sized company of 25 or 30 employee, the sort of investment that I am concerned about, the sort of investment that I think we should be trying to encourage in this province. Those people know they will be unionized; they know they will pay a comparable rate to the rates paid all across the country. Indeed they know they will be probably be unionised by an across-Canada union that deals in that field. The reason that Saskatchewan has a lower weekly wage package is because we have a lower rate of unionization than most jurisdictions in this country. That's why in part I agree with the minister when he said that a big part of his function is to protect the unorganized, because the organized they will protect themselves. It's the unorganised that the Department of Labour should be trying to protect and I think recognizes responsibility to do so.

**MR. CAMERON:** – Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister about a specific area. I am talking here about people who are subpoenaed as witnesses to appear in criminal prosecutions and very often they are required to go back to court two or three times and

give up as many as four or five days of work. Most employers will continue to pay the employee the regular wage the employee would be earning, but some, however, refuse to do that. I think the employee gets about a \$10 witness fee that is all the employee is entitled to from the court process.

Can you tell me whether there is provision in the law at the moment for an employee to force an employer to pay the regular salary while the employee is that situation? I don't think there is but I am not certain of it. That is question number one.

Secondly would you undertake to take a look at that? I can give you some examples in private of where the employer is, in fact, saying, no, I am not prepared to pay you the regular wage. You took the day off. It is a criminal matter, not a civil matter. So it is not the employee's business, it is the business of the Crown and it is the civic duty of the employee and, indeed, the employee and, indeed, the employee has to go under compulsion and yet he can't get paid for those days of work. Would you take a look, if the provision isn't currently there, at amending The Labour Standards Act to be certain that employee in those situation are entitled to their full pay?

**MR. SNYDER:** – I have to admit to the hon. member that there is no provision in The Labour Standards Act for appearance when you are a subpoenaed witness if I am using the right expression. That is something that has troubled me for a period of time and there have been some discussions within the department concerning this matter. Also I have had some discussion directly with the Attorney General with respect to what I hope will be a revised jury act, which will be coming forward, perhaps, during the next session of the Legislature. I am not announcing any legislation by the Attorney General but I have made my concerns known to him when worker is obliged to appear for jury duty. The same set of circumstances, I understand, applies at that point in time where he will receive, I believe, a \$10 fee or a very minimal fee for appearing as a subpoenaed witness or appearing on jury duty. It seems wholly inappropriate that when he is called other than of his own volition or even if he was required or permitted to appear, that he should lose pay because of something that was not of his making.

We will have a look at it. I think it is a good point and deserves some consideration by both my department and the Attorney General's.

**MR. CAMERON:** – O.K. It has to go beyond jury duty. I am sure you understand that. For example, there may be a charge of theft laid against an individual, an employee may be the complainant in this situation or alternatively may be a witness and appear in court on several occasions. Now, it seems to me that either the employer has to continue to pay the full wage, or alternatively, it is up to the state to make up the difference to the employee because the employee is not there appearing on his own business. He is, as I say, doing his civic duty and we should recognize, not only the sort of duty that a person has, but we ought to be encouraging those people to do it. There are enough deterrents along the way for people to become involved in the process as it is and we ought not to put another one on it.

So I would hope that within, at least, the next 12 months that we would have some provision in addition to whatever amendments may come to The Jury Act, a provision in The Labour Standards Act, either to require the employer to continue to pay, or alternatively, for the Crown to reimburse the employee for loss of wages.

**MR. WIPF:** – Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, in one segment of our population there is a

high rate of unemployment and that is within the Indian and Metis population. I am just wondering if the government has done any studies lately or is doing any studies to see how many of these people would go into apprenticeship programs and go into the trade field? Are there any studies going on at this time or are there programs going on to have this happen?

**MR. SNYDER:** – I should tell the member first of all, I am sure that he appreciates the fact, that in order to gain entrance to one of our vocational training schools, certain academic requirements are a must. Accordingly, we put in place, a number of pre-employment programs in order to allow some people who general fall in this category, not necessarily categorizes as a result of racial origin or anything of that nature, but people who have not attained a certain academic level. We have put into place a number of upgrading courses and pre-employment course in order to provide for this. In addition to that, we are having some discussion with the trades, particularly respecting construction in the northern areas and I think the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan has been directly involved in this, in an attempt to give some preferential treatment, once again, not necessarily separated by racial origin but by geographic location. By necessity then, this takes into account, the fact that we do have a large number of people of Indian ancestry who are unemployed and are social welfare recipients as result of the fact that they have no particular skills and in many instances, haven't reached the necessary academic level in order for them to play a part in a large number of trades training courses that are offered in our vocational training schools.

It is an ongoing thing and we recognize the problem. It is one that isn't solved very easily because there are number of other contributing factors but it is one that we are giving particular attention to and intend to pursue vigorously in the time directly ahead.

**MR. WIPF:** – Mr. Minister, I recognize in the DNS area that this is one of the steps that they are taking. There is a large segment of that population in the south and I was glad to hear you say that your department is actively encouraging the trade union movement to bring these people into the trades.

In the upgrading program that has taken place, how many of the people who have graduated and reached the qualifications that they need – have you got a percentage of the people who have actually gone in to the trades after they have been upgraded for that type of work?

**MR. SNYDER:** – No, we don't attempt to categorize people in Saskatchewan on the basis of their racial origin. They come into the course and there is no notation made on their application or their journeyman certificate or whatever, that they are red, yellow, black or white. We don't attempt to keep records that way and I think it would probably be inappropriate for us to pursue that course of action.

Obviously, we know of a number of success stories and we know of a large number of failures in the native community. We are quite aware of the fact that some particular problems revolve around courses that are offered for native people. Oftentimes they are directly removed from their home environment which causes particular difficulties for them – the social environment that they have lived with for the first fifteen or eighteen years of their life. Accordingly, some of those problems manifest themselves and people, I suppose, through anxiety for their family back home or a number of other circumstances such as being cut off from the social contacts that they have had in their home environment sometimes causes them not to be integrated into the so-called

white community with a great deal of ease. Those are continuing problems that are within us and I suppose at some point in the future it will be looked back upon and the indication will be that we have not done as well as we should have done. I think that applies to the previous administration and to the one that at some point in time in the next twenty years may follow this government.

We will continue to pursue it vigorously. We recognize that it is one of the major problems, particularly with large number of people moving off the reserve and moving into the community, and accordingly, it is one that is going to have to receive accelerated emphasis in the years ahead.

**MR. WIPF:** – Mr. Minister, I suppose I should have been more general in my question there. What I was trying to ask you is, the people who have gone through the upgrading schools and that is a cross section of all people, the people who have gone through the upgrading schools to reach the certain qualifications, do they specifically go into a trade school or upgrading of some type to reach these qualifications? Of those, and this is a cross section of people, do you have any idea of how many pursue and go on into trades to carry on after their upgrading that they had taken to reach the necessary requirements?

**MR. SNYDER:** – It is difficult for us because Continuing Education would be the department that would have those statistics if they are available. I think the best I could do would be to offer the member the commitment that we will contact Continuing Education to see then, if we can get him the sort of horseback guess as to (or perhaps it may be more specific that that) we will try to get the figures that indicate the number of those in upgrading courses that have continued on and entered a trade training school and won a journeyman's certificate at the end of two, three or four year period.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** – I am sure the department and staff are aware of the difficulties in the United States with regard to low income or the unemployed. There unfortunately are racial overtones in the US and it became clear – the Department of Labour made some efforts in the US to minimize the educational qualification in that they found the educational qualifications required were so high that the chronically poor — there is no way they could ever apply if those were maintained. The upgrading proposals were found to be totally inadequate, an effort but not adequate to try and recognize the the hard core problems and to try and encourage them into the trade union movement. In fact, in the United States the educational qualifications were used as a bias against the chronically poor. So I put that statement to you and would like your comment whether the department has looked at whether the educational requirements for a certain segment shouldn't perhaps even be ignored if there is any way to try and encourage them into the movement and into the work force?

**MR. SNYDER:** – Well in answer to the hon. member's question, I'm not at all sure that we do a person a favor by allowing him to enter a trades training course with something less than the minimum qualifications that are required for everyone else. Obviously, if it were suggested that the person who had Grade Eight, for example, had not gained his senior matriculation could enter trade school and perform there and do all of the things necessary to gain a journeyman's certificate, then I would be inclined to agree with him. Many of these have an academic component built into them in some of the programs mathematics is a part of the operation and if they haven't received something in the way of that level of academic excellence then they find themselves hopelessly lost in a trades training course. I don't whether we do them any favor by lowering the standards, allowing them to work their way, at least partially through a course, to

find that because of their limited academic qualifications they fail the course. We are not sure that we have done them much of a favor in the process in the event that they fail because we have allowed them in with less than the minimum qualifications required. So that remains as one of the problems and I think that upgrading has gone at least a part of the distance in terms of a low crash course in mathematics or whatever in order to allow them to go to a journeyman's school, go to a trade training school and pick up a journeyman's certificate.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** – The United States Department of Labour, I am advised, took a look at the upgrading qualifications and attempted to try, rather than the objective qualification approach, an aptitude approach. In other words, those, no matter what their educational (to use your phrase) component was, if they had an aptitude for particular skill or something, they were prepared to look at that and waive or minimize the object education are requirements. Has your department considered that aspect at all?

**MR. SNYDER:** – Well some of this goes on, on a continuing basis. We oftentimes have, to get into another area perhaps but somewhat related to this, immigrants from other parts of the world who came to Saskatchewan with all of the knowledge of their trade but lack of some of the ability to communicate. In those circumstances we've done a great deal for them in terms of having someone actually write the exam for them, at least be there to convey on paper their understanding of the questions that are involved. My impression is that the examination officers have attempted to be helpful in every way when it is a matter of interpreting questions. When a person has the practical knowledge and is able to perform but has difficulty with the written examinations then the examination officers of the Apprenticeship Branch have performed that service. I suppose it is a subjective judgment as to whether a person is able to perform a certain task in spite of the fact that he is not able to convey it on paper. All of these things have to be weighed very carefully because I think we have an obligation to protect the consumer and ensure that when a person is issued a journeyman's certificate that he is competent in that trade.

For me to judge whether a person is a good mechanic and could give my automobile a ring and a valve job on the basis of the fact that someone tells me that he is able to do a very adequate job, perhaps isn't good enough in terms of consumer protection. I think we have to cognizant of that fact also.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** – I would like to shift topics if I could, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister There was a movement afoot in the trade union movement call tripartism which met with some reaction I believe in Saskatchewan. Certainly one that in my opinion looked like an attempt to retrench or maintain the coalesced economic power to eastern Canada. Did the Department of Labour get involved in the consideration of that proposal and, if so, what was the department's position and did it make its position clear to the trade union movement with regard to the general problem?

**MR. SNYDER:** – I think the expressions of concern that you just brought forward were perhaps recognized in the province of Saskatchewan by our Department of Labour and by the trade union movement and I think by industry generally. In order for any kind of tripartism to work, I think it has to be fair; it has to be seen to be fair. It has to have the active support of the participants or obviously it is going to fail. We didn't become actively involved in the discussion because I don't think they reached the stage where

it required any major judgment on our part and there seemed to be a great deal of apprehension from a number of quarters about the make up of the body that would represent tripartism on a national level and accordingly we played no particular part in any of the decision-making process that took place. There were, I guess, some informal discussions but nothing of a formal nature that the Department of Labour was involved in.

**MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):** – Mr. Minister you mentioned the question before about immigrants coming into Saskatchewan. I am just wondering if any departmental people from your department have taken any trips overseas. Do they travel outside of Canada or America and if they did where did they go, what were the reasons for their trips?

**MR. SNYDER:** – Well, over the last number of years there have been a number of occasions where I believe the Deputy Minister and I attended the ILO convention in Geneva and I believe the Director of Occupational Health and Safety, the Associate Deputy Minister was at a symposium in 1974. He attended an ILO symposium in Bucharest where he offered a paper on behalf of the Department of Labour, Province of Saskatchewan. There may have been others. I attended an ILO symposium on worker participation in Oslo in 1974.

**MR. WIPF:** – O.K. Mr. Minister maybe we could get a copy of some of the other trips if those are the ones you remember, if there are some others we could get a copy of them. Has the Department of Labour done any recruiting, gone over to do any recruiting?

**MR. SNYDER:** – Yes, if you wish we can provide you with a list of the out of the country trips or out of the province trips – out of the country trips. My Deputy Minister reminds me that he just returned from Australia to an ILO symposium in Australia and that slipped my mind because it was so recent.

**MR. BAILEY:** – Mr. Chairman. I just have a few comments that I would like to direct to the Minister of Labour in item 1 in reviewing the Estimates.

Mr. Minister, I have some sympathy for your position as you probably have the worst position in the government when it comes to advertising or the promotion in itself of the Department of Labour. You go to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources and he has the opportunity to put out maps and brochures and so on, or the Department of Health can advertise a particular program, but the Minister of Labour is somehow caught with, the only time you see your name is on a regulation some place. If you go into an elevator it is there, you go to the steam boiler it is there; you go to the statutory holidays and it is there. No matter where you go, the Minister of Labour, in any province I suppose, has a very, very bad position as far as the public feel because his signature goes on all the regulations that pertain to the working day world of people in all different aspects of our working public. I, therefore, do have some sympathy for you because it is your department, correctly sometimes and too often incorrectly, that receives the adverse effects of the general public.

I think the minister would agree with that. It is a difficult thing to educate and, perhaps enhance the position of the overall Department of Labour as viewed by the general public. I have some concern about that, Mr. Minister, without going into a history

lesson to see how the labor movement has evolved.

In general, the one thing that I would like to comment upon is that the image that you and your department has among the people. I suggested it many times and I am talking about the populace, in general, is an unfair image. Other times of course I think that because of certain built-in bias and because of a lack of proper educational program by your department, we find our citizens within the province, often at cross purposes, often with unneeded friction between groups because of the lack of information and basically, because of lack of education. I think the minister will have to agree with that as well.

Too many people out there, you, you mention the word labor, they associate the word you and . . . (inaudible) . . . and they envisage some of the horrendous stories that come out of the United States and parts of Canada as well, about the atrocities of the Mafia and big labor governments and it has been an unfair picture, because when it does come to you, I mean, who are these people. Well it is a cousin or it's an uncle or a daughter or a son, who happens to be part of the labor movement. Unfortunately the whole picture that develops once the print is made, is developed differently in different people's minds and it is too often at the disadvantage of society, in general.

Mr. Minister, I think we have to be very careful. You know the member for Indian Head read into this Assembly what is a Canadian yesterday. I don't know whether you heard it or not, but I thought it was rather amusing. A fellow goes to an Italian movie, comes out and gets into a German car and goes to a Chinese restaurant and washes it all down with French brandy or something, goes home and takes off his shirt made in Korea and his shoes made in Czechoslovakia and so on. But you know I know that was put in the paper and whoever put it in there had a bit of humor, but there is an element of truth to it and it is a great element of truth. I think that in the position that Canada is in today, it is time that management and labor, you know, quit playing games with the public and I put as much blame on management as I do on labor. I feel that the fact we have in Canada now moved from something like, way up on the scale, that at times last year we were tied as having the worst record and the lowest productivity and I am sure that you have read the statistics. I am close enough to a city to know what happened in the city of Swift Current, when the two forces opposed one another and we got a very undesirable situation in a plant where everybody in the city would have given their back teeth to go work for (inaudible). They said that is enough of that; they simply said, you know, that's it, we are going. No one won in that case. There are so many cases where nobody wins, in that particular case; it lost something like 37 families just like that, unemployed.

Now, I believe as you do, that a person has a right to be in the labor movement, in a union and so on. But you also have to admit on the other hand that surely we have matured enough in the development of this country that there are also some other rights on the other side. Some of the things which happen need not happen if it wasn't for some intrinsic political bias, put that together with the uneducated people not knowing – it's not their fault by any means – and we get some very undesirable situations. I took quarrel with you yesterday, Mr. Minister, in using some terms like, you know, the civilized way. I didn't do it in a derogative manner at all because I believe there are civilized ways when it comes to wastage and food rotting and I was referring to that. I want to say this that too often this doesn't have to apply to your department. I don't care whether it's with the Department of Health or Education no matter what it may be. We've gone, in my opinion, we've gone to great lengths and maybe it's unavoidable in the protection somehow hidden back into the incompetency. We should not protect the incompetent in any way. There should be no way in any department that a person

who is incompetent can hide behind some particular organization or some particular federation. That's part of the problem in Canada today and I say that to you, as I say to any minister in any province, it's just an observation that we Canadians are going to have to face. We're going to have to face it sooner or later and because you have one small section of this it has a tendency to tarnish all the books. Now, Mr. Minister, I watched with great interest, and I have not brought this topic to the House before – it's something which is going on in the province – I have approximately as many people working who are non-union people. They are not organized union. That's their business, as I have those who belong to an organization and they have that right, I think I really believe that in a free society they have the right not to belong to a union as I agree that they have the right to belong to a union. But when we come to matters which affect the local autonomy of governing bills, I am going away from management at this particular time in the business sense, and, of course, I have to refer to the Medstead School dispute at the present time. I have followed this, Mr. Minister, with a great deal of interest and I have had a great deal of communication and a great deal of understanding of this situation and indeed it is unfortunate that the people of this province view the Labour Relations Board as nothing but a political wing of the NDP. I tell you as long as that view is there and you may well deny it, you may have grounds upon which you can deny it but one thing you can't do is take away that suspicion that is there and to these people it's deeply grounded. In that particular case to give to a quasi-judicial body, whether it's in Saskatchewan or Manitoba or Ontario, no matter where it is – you remember that that was part of the quarrel that I had with Bill 22, and our people said in that case that all these superintendents and school boards, they are not gods onto themselves. Their decisions aren't foolproof, and I will agree to that. On the other hand, if we agree to that, we conversely have to agree that a three man board of reference, it's not foolproof either, and to give quasi-judicial powers, limiting citizens the right to appeal to the courts seems to me a very dangerous thing. In some ways it actually disfranchises citizenship. That is what it does. We look at situations. I know a number of smaller towns, I'm not going to mention them, come back to the next best dispute. Here we have a Bully Burns (?) situation and to my mind it is the first time that local government board has stood up and they have virtually said okay, if you are going to give that decision to the quasi-judicial group, then we have, as elective representatives, we have no right to appeal, we have no right to a hearing and that is what it is, that is what it is.

Then, of course, they have taken the stand and you know how far they have gone with the statements they have made. What I'm getting at, Mr. Minister, back to my preface, my first remarks. It seems to me it is time, the time is right in this confrontation that exists. This is the thing that developed with a number of bills in this house in this session. Here we have, in the people's mind you have the labor here, the management here, that claims never meet. I know that you have a good record, then you are two together. I think it is time that you developed some sort of an educational program, some sort of becoming the ambassador if you wish to destroy once and for all the concept of political bias in this field and it will be better, not only for those who are the working class, but it will be better for those of the management class and indeed it will be much better for all the people of Saskatchewan. Somehow, we get that the innocent people are the people who always suffer in these disputes. I vote that sooner or later Mr. Minister that the silent majority is going to stand up on this issue in the years ahead.

Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:03 p.m.