

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 2, 1978

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

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — I take great pleasure today in introducing 38 grade eight students from Westmount School in the constituency of Saskatoon Westmount. They are located in the Speaker's Gallery and they are accompanied by Mr. Corey and Mr. Toles. I hope all members will join with me in making these students from Saskatoon feel welcome in the Legislative Assembly. I hope that they have an interesting day and safe journey back to Saskatoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce a group of students from my constituency. They are 10 in number; they are an adult upgrading class from the Poundmaker and Little Pine Reserve. They arrived here yesterday. I have already met with them this morning and I would like to mention they are grade eleven and grade twelve students, Mr. Speaker. They have already completed grade eleven and are now in grade twelve. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery, the top row. I would like you to welcome these students from Little Pine Poundmaker and wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. B.M. Dyck (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce to you and to this legislature, 44 students from the McNab Park School in the Saskatoon Mayfair constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Schellenberg and Mr. Riechert. I had the opportunity a few months ago of visiting McNab Park School and I was very impressed with the integrated program they run there where handicapped children are taught in the mainstream of the school. I want to congratulate the staff for their dedication at McNab Park School and certainly the foresight of the Saskatoon Board of Education in running this integrated program which I think has been very successful at McNab Park. I hope the students at McNab Park School have an informative and worthwhile afternoon and I look forward to visiting with them for a short time in the rotunda area as soon as they leave the gallery.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join with my colleagues in introducing a group of students to the House today. I have, as guests of the House, students of grade six, grade seven and grade eight. I think there are about 40 in number from St. Dominic and St. Mark Schools in Saskatoon in the west gallery. They are accompanied by Mr. Exner and Miss Butz of St. Dominic - I hope I pronounced that correctly. I probably did not - and Miss Henderson of St. Mark. I know they have had an enjoyable tour of many of the highlights of Regina to date. I am sure they will enjoy the question period and their stay in the House and I wish them a safe journey back home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Tax Rates Under Bill No. 47

Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question either to the Minister of Mineral Resources or the Attorney General. The Leader Post, in the last few days, has indicated that the government is applying to the Supreme Court of Canada to set the interest rate on the judgment that CIGOL obtained in the recent decision in that court. The minister was quoted as saying that it not only affected the CIGOL case but the appeal would also affect tax rates to be set under the regulations for Bill No. 47. Am I to assume by these statements of yours, Mr. Minister, or Mr. Attorney General, as the case may be, that the tax rates that will be set under Bill No. 47 will be approximately the same, and I stress the word approximately, as the tax rates that were set under Bill No. 42, and as well will have a factor built in to cover interest costs if any of those companies should decide to take the government to court under the CIGOL decision?

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bit too early to be precise about that. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the matter is subject to a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. We are also currently carrying on discussions with the industry. We have had several meetings with them in regard to the regulations that will be required by Bill No. 47. Until, I think, those discussions have been concluded and/or the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, it is a bit difficult to be positive in relation to the question the member asks. However, I can say, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intention of the government to undertake to approximate, under Bill No. 47, the revenues that were collected under Bill No. 42 and it would not be acceptable to the government of Saskatchewan to have moneys claimed in interest for any moneys that companies may feel were owing to them. There would be some measure then undertaken to assure the people of Saskatchewan that they would not lose that potential revenue which may be claimed in interest.

Mr. Malone: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, will the minister confirm that the tax rates will not be set until the Supreme Court comes down with its decision on the recent appeal which I assume will be the case, but would you not agree that if you build in a factor under the regulations to Bill 47 to cover interest, then what you are in effect doing is asking those companies that paid taxes under Bill 42 to pay not only the same amount of taxes under Bill 47 that they paid under Bill 42 but a certain percentage more depending on whatever rate the Supreme Court sets, that is they could be paying 5 per cent, 8 per cent, 10 per cent more in taxes to the government under Bill 47 than they paid under Bill 42.

Mr. Messer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I do not want the Leader of the Opposition or the members of the Legislative Assembly to assume that we will not be making any decisions in relation to regulations until the Supreme Court has concluded its deliberations in regard to the interest question. That may or may not be the case but I do not want our position to be one or the other at this particular point in time. That is something that we are still considering.

In regard to the rest of the inquiry of the Leader of the Liberal Party, as I noted earlier we are still undergoing discussions with the oil companies in relation to the regulations that will be required by Bill 47 and it would be improper to conclude that we will undertake to establish a rate which will, in effect, bring about the additional charge of 10 per cent or whatever it is that the member makes recognition or note of. There may be, at the conclusion of these discussions, some other means of resolving that problem. I recognize that it is a problem. I think it was a problem that was recognized, a

potential problem, when we introduced Bill 47. It is one that we have not come to a final decision on at this point in time. I think that we will have a decision which will be agreeable to most parties, if not all, when we conclude our discussions with the oil companies.

Mr. Malone: — Final supplementary. Would the minister not conceive by building in this interest fact in Bill 47 that what you are doing, in effect, by so doing is you are penalizing those oil companies that did not challenge you in the courts and that those companies that were prepared to accept the rates under Bill 42 and to pay their taxes when they became due, and now going to be penalized because they didn't follow the leader, CIGOL, and sue in the courts and collect the interest that they may have been entitled to?

Mr. Messer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that may well be the case if one was to undertake to build in the interest factor. I think that is obviously one of the means of resolving the problem. It is not at this particular point in time the decision of the government in fact to pursue that. There are other alternatives and I think that one will simply have to wait until we conclude our discussions with the industry to see which alternative it is we choose to introduce.

Mr. R.A. Larter (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister who just sat down, would you comment, is there any further action pending - has any other oil company taken action because of the CIGOL decision? Is there any action being taken against the government right now?

Mr. Messer: — Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker . . . but that was conveyed to the House during the course of the last session in the fall of 1977, but I know of no other since that time.

Mr. W.C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, this morning in Crown Corporation an exchange took place between one of the members of the Crown Corporations Committee on the government's side, the member for Kinistino. Granted that no records are kept in Crown corporations but as fate would have it, we happened to have a steno who happened to be taking notes and the words were something to the effect that the member for Kinistino directed to the members of the press who were in attendance, which went precisely, 'I wonder who bought those people.' Mr. Attorney General, the people of the press who were there were one Mr. Lowrey of the Star Phoenix, Mr. Robbins of CKCK Radio, Mr. Cheshire of the Leader Post, Mr. Rolko of Broadcast News. Would the Attorney General tell this Assembly whether the member for Kinistino was reflecting an official government attitude or was it merely reflecting a position of his party towards the press?

Hon. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I was not in Crown Corporations, I have not talked to the member for Kinistino about what has or hasn't transpired in Crown Corporations. Frankly, I just can't answer that question. I think that is something which the hon. member for Kinistino will have an opportunity to explain at some later date as he chooses and as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I'll take a new question, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Poplar River Power Project

Mr. R.E. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister in charge of SPC. On Friday last the minister made it clear that his statement had misled this Assembly in answering a question on Monday, April 17, when he said SPC had permission to proceed with Number 2 generator at Coronach. Unfortunately the media also carried the misleading story and I have heard concerns from citizens at Coronach, as well as from a person in the Department of Environment in Ottawa. I am wondering, will the minister immediately send a letter to the Government of Canada, the Government of the United States, the Government of Montana, as well as the chairman of the International Joint Commission and the chairman of the Bergstrom hearings, making clear his misstatement so that problems won't arise from this misleading story.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, let me first say that it is inappropriate, I think, and in itself misleading to suggest that I undertook to mislead this legislature. I conveyed to the member as I did to the Legislative Assembly last Friday, that even though the records did refer to Coronach Number 2, that it was in error. I had in error said Coronach Number 2 for Coronach Number 1, that I wanted the records corrected to show what in fact my intentions were. I have undertaken to do that in this Legislative Assembly so that the records are, in fact, correct. Mr. Speaker, if that is the single largest mistake that a member of this Legislative Assembly makes, then I think that he should be forgiven for it. Let me further say, Mr. Speaker, that I also, because I felt that there might be some of those who may undertake to use that to mislead the people of Saskatchewan or other people, released a statement last Friday afternoon correcting any misleading statements that may be made relating to the utterances that were made within this Legislative Assembly. I believe that I have done virtually everything within my power to convey to the general public, to those parties that the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg relates to, so that if there was some misunderstanding it should now be cleared up.

Mr. Nelson (As-Gr): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I did say his statement mislead this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, but I am wondering now, I have had concerns from rural municipal council of the municipality of Hart Butte that expressed concerns over statements made by the minister on a CBC Insight program. I am wondering if the minister shouldn't straighten these statements out and make clear his meaning when he said they have no intention of spending the money necessary to reclaim the land in that area to a state as good as it was before.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I think that the RM of Hart Butte can undertake to convey their concerns to either Saskatchewan Power Corporation or myself as chairman responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I think that there is a very significant record of dialogue, both written and verbal in relation to the Coronach project. I am sure that if they are somewhat concerned about statements that may or may not have emanated from myself on the CBC radio program Insight, that they would communicate them to me. I said on that program as I have said in this legislature and at public meetings throughout Saskatchewan, that there are costs projected at this particular point in time to reach something as high as \$1.5 million per quarter section if it was to be reclaimed to farm land and that it would seem somewhat inappropriate to now, before the total studies in regard to reclamation have been concluded, to commit ourselves to a reclamation cost of something which could approach \$1.5 million per quarter section. I have not said that we would not undertake to expend significant sums of money to reclaim the land that was stripped for coal mining but that we should be aware of the fact that it may not, because of economic reasons, be reclaimed to the

status of farming again.

Mr. Nelson (As-Gr): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering if the minister is presently saying that the people of Coronach or the people of the Hart Butte municipality have not the right to bring their concerns to this Assembly through their elected representative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I think the record of the elected representatives speaks for itself . . . (inaudible interjection and noise) . . . We would have, we would have, Mr. Speaker, I think if the member with good conscience had represented those concerns as I think a conscientious member should have, resolved a lot of the problems that were outstanding . . . some months ago . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Farm Workers - Shortage

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — A question for the Minister of Social Services. A news report today indicated that, from the Canada Department of Manpower, that there was a severe shortage of farm workers in the province of Saskatchewan. I note your latest statistical bulletin, or the one for January, indicates that there are approximately 4,500 fully employable or partially employable Saskatchewan Assistance Plan recipients. What specific actions is your department taking to direct those eligible or those employable assistance plan recipients to take such training as is necessary to assist the farmers with the shortage of farm workers?

Hon. H.H. Rolfes (Minister of Social Service): — Mr. Speaker, let me first of all indicate to the member that I am aware of the fact that the staff enrolments are up. I indicated in the House before that we had anticipated this because of the action taken by the federal government in restricting the eligibility for people on the . . .

Mr. Malone: — What about . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, if the member from, if the Leader of the Liberal Party had the answers to the employment situation, I wish he would convey that to his national leader, Mr. Trudeau, who has to face this responsibility, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . This province, Mr. Speaker, employment rate is very good compared to what you have in Quebec or what you have in Prince Edward Island or what you have in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the employment record in Nova Scotia, where we have a Liberal government, I'll compare our record any day, any day! And, Mr. Speaker, it will be a sad day in Saskatchewan when these people, when the Saskatchewan people would ever elect a Liberal government here again . . . (Loud noises) . . . It is true, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the record will show, the record will show, Mr. Speaker, in 1970 that the employment rate was low because 24,000 people left this province at that time and went to other provinces when they couldn't find any work.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — In answer to the member for Qu'Appelle, we have increased, Mr. Speaker, we have increased our budget for our Employment Support Program as I

indicated the other day, by \$1.6 million and there are going to be a number of people who are going to be on training programs so that they can develop the skills of either becoming partially employed or fully employed. And you can look at the record, look at the record of the Employment Support Program, you will find that about 80 per cent of those people are no longer on public assistance. I think we can continue that record. But, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier indicated the other day, there is no way we can supply the work for all those people who are coming in from the other provinces, where there is no work available and ask us to take care of them here.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — I wonder if I could get back to my original question.

Can the minister explain, after his long answer, why his department refuses to make it a priority of his employment programs that the employment training programs be designed specifically to meet the needs of the farmers of Saskatchewan, who are faced with a shortage of farm workers? Now, would you not admit that your policy should have been directed to that end in the first place?

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, we are certainly not opposed to that and the ESP (Economic Support Program) is certainly adaptable to that. There is absolutely no reason why potential social service recipients cannot work for a farmer and receive assistance through the ESP, nothing at all to present that. In fact the program is so worked that that can happen and it is happening right now. We have many of our potential social recipients who are working for individual business people and if they get training, if they can prove to us that they are getting training so that their skills are improved and they then have the potential of being either partially employable or fully employable, the ESP Program will. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfair for the member to expect the Department of Social Services, solely, to take care of that problem. As the Minister of Finance has indicated we have approximately \$400 million or \$450 million of capital works programs which will, Mr. Speaker, to a large extent take care of the problem that the member for Qu'Appelle is referring to. I think over the next two months this will be proven.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister has very pointedly referred to business and has very pointedly ignored answering the question with regard to farm workers.

Would you not admit that in fact it should have been a first priority of your department that employable assistant recipients should have been directed to those training programs so that they could, in fact, be trained and be sent to the farms to give the farmers the needed support assistance that they are crying for?

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, certainly I can't disagree with what the member is saying and there is absolutely nothing that this department has not done to allow that. We are, right now, the director of the ESP Program is doing exactly that and there is no stone left unturned in order to provide employment for the potential social recipient, Mr. Speaker. I think our record shows that we have done a good job in that particular aspect. As I indicated before the ESP Program has been very successful. That is why I asked for an additional \$1.6 million. This government made it available and I think the program will prove itself again in keeping hundreds, hundreds of people off of public assistance payrolls which otherwise would have been there.

Gas Rebate - Distance from Customer or Dealer

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — A question to the Minister of Revenue. In your gas statement last week I believe it was clear when it came to retail outlets but as far as the bulk dealers were concerned in Saskatchewan it has left many of them concerned as to how it applies. My question is, when there is going to be a rebate of 10 cents is the rebate going to apply by the distance that the bulk dealers are from the Alberta competition or is it going to apply by the distance that the customer is from the Alberta competition? There is quite a difference between the two.

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Minister of Revenue): — I am not absolutely certain but I believe it is from the distance of the bulk location of the plant.

Mr. Stodalka: — The distance then is from the bulk dealer. How are you going to in a situation where you have one person the dealer who is living in an area where there is a 10 cent rebate and then the next area two, three or four miles down the town on the other side of the dividing line where there is a 5 cent rebate, how agree you going to take care of the competition between the two dealers and prevent the fellow with the 10 cent rebate having a price advantage over the fellow with the 5 cent rebate?

Mr. Robbins: — Obviously what you do is put your finger on one of the problems. It is apparent no matter what you do they are going to have that problem.

Mr. Stodalka: — Supplementary then. It would seem then that the minister indeed has no solution. I would like to indicate to the minister that in the instance an example is the Maple Creek area where you have the two service stations on the Trans-Canada Highway which are eligible for the 5 cent reduction and just five miles down the road you have all the service stations in town which are just two miles out of the area. It would seem to me that possibly you should have used more of a trading area rather than such figures as an arbitrary distance and you wouldn't have run into some of the difficulties that you have if you used the trading area. Would the minister not take it into consideration the fact that you might change your program so that you will deal with the trading area rather than just the arbitrary distances?

Mr. Robbins: — I don't know, Mr. Speaker, what is bothering the member. If he thinks Maple Creek is not included in the . . . it is included . . . well, it is. The distance from the town of Maple Creek to Walsh via grid roads is 46.6 kilometres and it is within the 48 kilometre range.

Three Axle Trucks

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, this question has come before this Assembly before and it seems to be a growing problem in rural Saskatchewan, one which I have received a number of letters of which you have a copy with even some support from the Ag reps and that is the growing trend in rural Saskatchewan for the purchase of the three axle trucks. The reason why as you know they are going for the three axle trucks or being encouraged to do so is because they are causing less damage to the roads than those overweighted two axle trucks. A number of petitions came before you this spring and again last fall about including the three axle truck in the way of the farm licence rather than the . . . (inaudible) . . . licence. Is your department and have you presented to the Department of Revenue your case to prevent this type of discrimination among the owners of farm trucks?

Hon. E. Kaeding (Minister of Agriculture): — That is a question which comes up fairly

frequently and one which has been under some consideration by the government but it is not one which we have been prepared to move on at the present time. There are all of the arguments which are still there about the fact that three axle trucks, which has not been proven by anyone that three axle trucks create less damage, in fact that is very questionable whether they create less damage. We also have a problem of three axle trucks being in competition with our commercial trucks and that still continues to be a problem and one which we have not resolved. At this point in time we have not prepared any recommendations.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have you, Mr. Minister, as Minister of Agriculture made your own personal representation in cabinet to prevent this discrimination and secondly, Mr. Minister, would you not agree at this particular time that the amount of revenue to be lost as far as the Minister of Revenue is concerned is very small indeed compared to the discriminatory element. Have you done a study as to what the revenue loss would be for three axle farm trucks?

Mr. Kaeding: — No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't made that study. I think that's within the purview of the Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Bailey: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, we have, and let me repeat it, and I ask again this question. As Minister of Agriculture, a farmer yourself, would you not agree that when the recommendations are coming from the farm organizations and, indeed, the Ag reps within the province of Saskatchewan, where farm trucks where they are larger trucks, three axle trucks, that it is your responsibility to take this to cabinet and argue on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, I know that it continues to be a continuing problem. It continues to be something which is being related to me by the agriculture community and I will be discussing it with my colleagues.

Tax Rates under Bill 47

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, the minister said earlier that it is a bit too early to be precise about the regulations. I ask the minister when you will be bringing down the regulations to Bill 47? It is five months since the CIGOL case, three months since the legislation came in and five months since the Premier told us that it would be possible to bring in the regulations before the legislation was passed when he thought the legislation would be passed in December. I ask the minister how long he will hold up the development of the industry and continue creating problems in the industry by this delays?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the member that there are problems with the industry and that there is hold up as far as development is concerned. The member need only look at the records of activity within the province of Saskatchewan for the first quarter to show that there is an increasing level of activity in Saskatchewan vis-à-vis last year. Last year's activity was an increase of something in excess of 100 per cent over the previous year, 1976. There is not, Mr. Speaker, one shred of evidence to show that there is any reluctance to continue to explore and develop oil in the province of Saskatchewan. In fact it is the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only appropriate for us to complete our discussions with the industry before we announce what the regulations will be and those discussions are ongoing at this particular point of time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Dyck: — Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the students from McNab School, there were two students who were not present in the Chamber at that time and I would like to introduce to this legislature and to you, Mr. Speaker, Ron Schonberger of McNab Park, who is accompanied by his mother, Mrs. Schonberger and Cheryl Utli accompanied by her foster mother, Mrs. Utli. I would like to welcome them to this legislature and I'll be meeting with them in a few minutes in the rotunda area.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Comments of the Member for Kinistino made in Crown Corporations

Mr. R.L. Collver Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to rise on a matter of personal privilege. Today in Crown Corporations Committee, a member of the legislative Chamber in referring to four members of the press corps stated and I quote: — 'I wonder who brought those people.' Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an opportunity to that member today to unqualifiedly withdraw those statements on behalf of the members of the press corps in the east gallery. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that it was an unwarranted comments, I am sure, perhaps, unintentional on behalf of the member for Kinistino and I believe he should have an opportunity to withdraw those comments, totally.

I understand the press gallery association is meeting on this matter this afternoon, that they are concerned about this matter. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the member for Kinistino speak to this issue.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I simply ask Your Honour when you are considering the privilege, to determine whether in fact it is a member's privilege. I was not in Crown corporations. My information is neither was the Leader of the PC Party. In any event even if he was there, the key issue is, is this a remark or an action which offends the privilege of any of the rights of the members of this House?

It may or may not offend the rights of the press gallery or the sensitivity of the pressmen. That is something for them to concern themselves with. It may or may not offend the member for Kinistino, his views, that is something that he has to sort out with the press.

My point with you, Sir, is that this is not a matter of personal privilege and as such cannot be considered since in no conceivable way affects any of the member's privileges.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would rule that the member's so-called point of privilege does not qualify as a point of privilege. Therefore, I am not in position where I have to rule on the matter. It happened outside of this Chamber, in a committee. I am not aware of whether it was recorded by anyone, or any of the officials of the Chamber, so, therefore, I don't feel it is a legitimate point of privilege.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 16 - Gas Tax Difference between Alberta and Saskatchewan

Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley) moved, seconded by Mr. Stodalka (Maple Creek):

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for failing to take action which would have substantially alleviated the serious financial problems faced by Saskatchewan petroleum dealers as a result of the gas tax difference between Alberta and Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate to pass some comment on the government's attempt to absolve financial difficulties created by Alberta reducing its gas tax, in view of the kinds of questions that the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) has put to the minister today. If anything was accompanied by his questions here in this legislature, it was to certainly outline to anyone who was interested in observing the procedures here that the minister, while he may be somewhat unsure of himself at this very minute, two hours ago his department was completely unsure about what they were doing with their own regulations in an attempt to absolve the problems with respect to the Fuel Rebate Program, to eliminate the discrepancy in price between Alberta and Saskatchewan.

The government was faced with a difficult situation indeed, as a result of Alberta's action. They do, however, have the responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan to try to take action which would provide the best possible solution to the difficulties faced by the people of Saskatchewan, in this case those dealers bulk or retail that live along the Alberta border, whose livelihood depends on their sale of gasoline to their customers, along the central Saskatchewan or the western part of the province. The government had that responsibility to resolve those problems and what have they done with it? Well, there is little doubt that the minister's own staff is unsure of, in fact, what application of regulation will be done in Saskatchewan. The member for Maple Creek contacted the minister's department several hours ago, to ask them if in fact, the community of Maple Creek and service stations that lay within the town limits of Maple Creek qualified under the grant program. The response of the minister's department was that, no they never. The member for Maple Creek said, why not? Your employees told him that the reason was that the distances were measured along the highway and that Maple Creek was 52.17 kilometres from Walsh, Alberta, it's nearest competitor. Therefore the town of Maple Creek would not qualify, although two service stations lying on the Trans-Canada Highway, five miles north of Maple Creek, would qualify.

The minister now stands up in this legislature in question period and says and points out with a sarcastic note in his voice, that of course the community of Maple Creek qualifies, because when one takes the grid road it is only 46.7 kilometres from Walsh, Alberta. In fact, the suggestion that the member for Maple Creek made to your employees earlier today that they try to consider that access to the Walsh retailer rather than going on the highway. So the minister is lurching from one hour to the next and the employees of his department are lurching one hour to the next.

I was interested as well to hear the minister say that he was not sure, but he thought perhaps that the application of the grant with respect to bulk dealers would be to apply it to where that bulk dealer was located rather than where the farmers were located, or those people that he served. The minister wasn't sure though. A crucial situation with respect to the grant program and the minister isn't sure and I'll tell you why it is crucial, because if you are going to apply the grant to where the bulk dealer is located, you can scratch about 25 or 30 bulk dealers along the western boundary of Alberta and Saskatchewan, with their application of the grant system. I will tell you why, because a dealer living in Richmond in Saskatchewan, living 13 miles from the dealer in Fox Valley, would have a five cent a gallon advantage over his competition 13 miles away.

They serve exactly the same area. Where are the farmers going to buy their gas? Richmond - I got that one myself!

The minister should be paying attention to this because these are problems which he certainly hasn't resolved in his own mind and which apparently many of the members of his staff, that are required to deal with this, may not have resolved in their own minds . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The minister's staff pointed out to the member for Maple Creek that the grant rebate would not be applied where the dealer was located but rather where the farmer was located. Again, a rather serious rift in communication before the minister and his own employees. The minister who, supposedly, had to go to cabinet and sell this program to his cabinet members, it's no wonder you had so much difficulty in doing that. If you didn't understand it yourself, how are you supposed to convince your own cabinet colleagues that you had a worthwhile workable program to bring in?

We have some other serious problems, just as serious as the question of whether or not bulk dealers are assigned the grant program according to their location or according to their customers' locations. Firstly, this program does in no way take into account those sales that dealers, retail gas dealers and bulk dealers along the Alberta border, lost from April 1 to the time this program was brought in. The minister made an attempt to have the program retroactive; the grant will be retroactive and payable on each gallon of gas, taxable gasoline sold. But what does that do for these fellows who had a 60 per cent drop in the volume of their gasoline business from April 1? They get no retroactive grant on the business they lost. So there has been no attempt by your government to deal with that. You had the example of Tisdale's Esso Service in Kindersley that lost money every day it was open from April 1 on. You've done nothing to deal with that and I know that you are not particularly interested in any suggestions that members on this side of the House may have. That may be the particular problem with your grant program. You weren't prepared to go out and ask anybody what you might do about it. You never contacted those dealers living in Kindersley to find out if they had any suggestions about things you might have done to alleviate this problem.

Local farmers in Saskatchewan will be in a position, apparently, of being able to buy their bronze gas cheaper than their neighbours depending either on where the bulk dealer is located or where they are located. Once that's done, what happens? There is nothing to prevent any member of the community living along the Alberta border to go to one of his farmers and say, I'd like to buy 250 gallons of bronze gas from you. I live 60 miles east of your Alberta competition, you can buy the gas 10 cents a gallon cheaper than I can, will you buy it and I'll purchase it from you. The minister had better be aware that that problem is going to exist in Saskatchewan. Not only that, every gallon of gas that these farmers buy they can claim as an income tax deduction, bronze gas. Two-thirds of it, if it's for use in their automobiles and all of it if it's for use in a four ton tandem grain truck or a gasoline operated tractor that they decide to burn bronze gas in. The minister had better be aware that that problem exists. I doubt it in view of the record that he has at this time in this legislature of informing us about his program. I would assume he hardly knows how to get to his office these days.

What about the dealers in Saskatchewan that are badly hurt by the reduction in gas sales? Does your program even attempt to help all of them? No, it doesn't. What did the minister do? He established an arbitrary border, 48 miles from your nearest Alberta competition, pardon me, 48 kilometres, as an outside limit. Did he bother to check with all those dealers in Saskatchewan who might lie outside that boundary who are badly hurt? Not at all. I can only assume that the minister was either unaware that the problem

existed, in which case he should be condemned for not paying enough attention to what's going on, or he didn't care. One or the other. Take again Tisdale's in Kindersley, lying about 40 or 50 miles away from its nearest Alberta competition, badly devastated financially by the reduction in the Alberta tax. The minister knew that because I brought it to his attention before he ever announced his program in this House. What did he do about it? Not a thing. He has ignored the problem in Kindersley. The fact that there are 14 employees working for that one dealer alone, that saves possible lay-offs, apparently doesn't concern the minister. He's not too interested at this particular moment. He wasn't too interested about them when he was drawing his program up. His only defence is to say, oh, well, it's such a difficult problem. We've done what we can and we should be thanked for that. The fact that we haven't done all we can, that's no fault of ours because it's so difficult.

You have taken a half-hearted stab at this problem, not because you had any serious compassion for people who were in trouble as a result of the Alberta tax reduction but because you are in the government and you obviously felt you had some responsibility to keep these people in business. But you weren't serious about it. I'll guarantee that. You never considered the difference between travelling on an interprovincial highway, like No. 7, and the distance on that highway from your nearest Alberta competition or travelling on a grid road. Mr. Speaker, 48 kilometres on a grid road for some farmer who doesn't live in Alberta nor does he want to travel to Alberta. Not the least little bit of concern about the people in that situation.

I would have liked to have heard that the minister or some of his staff would have phoned the dealers in Kindersley and said, has this problem affected you? These dealers are Saskatchewan citizens, they don't live in Alberta. They didn't come here from the United States to set up business. They are Saskatchewan people trying to run a business and provide a service for Saskatchewan people. What did their government do for them? It ignored them, either out of stupidity or lack of compassion, one or the other. I say you should be faulted for that. Maybe there is no easy solution. Obviously not, but I'll tell you one thing, that if the Liberal Party were in power today we would have done a darn sight better at tackling this problem than you did and you had better believe that that's a fact. The fact that you didn't have the incentive to go out and find out how serious the problem is, is a clear indication of your own incompetence, either in spirit or in ability. I say you had better be prepared to bring in some amendments to this program. You better be darned prepared because you haven't done a job here. If you think your answer is to apply a rebate system, then make it available for all people who are legitimately harmed by the reduction in the sale of gas, not just those that live within a 48 kilometre range. Why the discrimination? I would like to hear the minister explain that to me. Why does someone in Alsask qualify and someone in Kindersley not, when the Kindersley service station is hurt just as badly as the Alsask service station? Answer me that. Did you not apply your mind to that? Did you not ask your people in your office to tell you how serious the problem was? You completely ignored that service station in Kindersley. As a result of your ignorance they are faced with laying off many of their employees that were formerly employed there fulltime to pump gas - gas business that they have lost.

Mr. Kramer: — Horse feathers!

Mr. McMillan: — That's the absolute truth. If the Minister for Highways would ever undertake to check the highway situation out there, he might have to buy gas in Kindersley and he would find that out.

Now I say to you, you have an opportunity to make some improvements in your program here, I am suggesting one of your improvements would be to go back out and find out just how many dealers were seriously hurt, because you haven't gotten them all. You might have fixed up most of the dealers in your NDP constituency of Cutknife-Lloydminster, you might have fixed up those dealers that had the advantage a few years ago, or a year ago, of having a 10 cent gallon differential, or 9 cent differential. But you didn't fix those dealers that were hurt after April 1, that had good businesses before. You should be again faulted for that. I hope you are man enough to consider making some changes to that program. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move this motion to condemn the government. It would give me just as much pleasure to stand up here a month later and congratulate that minister for bringing in amendments which would make this a more equitable application of a program to dealers in Saskatchewan - just as much pleasure to get up and congratulate you if you would do that. I hope you are prepared to stand up here and say, no we're not done with the program. We have introduced a basic program, we know there will be faults in it and we are prepared to look at it and bring in new changes if they are necessary. You have some obvious areas where they are necessary. As I say again, I hope you are man enough in your cabinet post to bring them in. I so move.

Mr. W.H. Stodalka Maple Creek): — Just a few comments that I would like to make. First of all, I would like to thank the minister's department for the quick work that they did after my phone call this morning in checking out the distances that are in the Maple Creek area, recognizing the fact that Maple Creek was to be included. To me it seems that really, I suppose, one of the basic problems is that this is one of the prices that we have to pay for the fact that politicians on the other side of the House are able to go around the province and say that we don't have a medicare tax in the province of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that it would be possible for the two levels of government, both the Alberta and the Saskatchewan government to get together and choose the same tax basis. Here we have in Alberta a situation in which we have no sales tax and we have no provincial gas tax and we have a medical tax of some \$300 per family. Really it isn't. I suppose always \$300 per family because often the company will pay a portion of the medical care premium that the individual has.

On the other hand in Saskatchewan what have we got over here? In Saskatchewan we have decided that we shouldn't have any medical care premiums. It is very attractive politically at election time to go around and tell the people of Saskatchewan that we haven't any medical premiums and other provinces have \$300, \$400 or \$500. But on the other hand then we have to have revenue coming from other sources. Where do we get it from then? We have to get it from provincial gas taxes. We have to get it from such things as the sales tax of 5 per cent, a differential in income tax. I am the first to realize probably that we cannot compare with Alberta with some of the revenues that they have that we don't have. But certainly it would be much more appropriate I feel, if you could get together at the provincial level and choose the same tax basis, at least your differentials wouldn't be nearly as sharp as they are at the present time.

You might say, and I suppose when you try to take this thing through your cabinet some of the problems that you had was that consumers in the western portion of the province are really getting some advantages. We all know that the 5 per cent sales tax isn't applicable in Medicine Hat when one makes purchases in that area. Now of course, we are going to be purchasing gas with less than the 109 cent provincial sales tax. The real people that are hurt and this is a short-term advantage I might say because the real people that are hurt are the businessmen who are trying to compete in the small

villages and towns along the Alberta border. It is just another one of these disadvantages that they will have to compete against. They, of course, as I say it is a short-term advantage because of the fact that we don't know how long these businesses will be able to survive and if the businesses are eliminated in the end and have to go to Medicine Hat or some Alberta centre for all of your purchases then, of course, any advantage that we have at the present time is lost. The other comments I would like to make are in regard to the pricing system. I did contact a person in your department and asked him whether or not at the bulk dealer level there was going to be a rebate at the station level or at the customer level. There are problems really I suppose whether you use either way. If you could develop some sort of combination it may help.

I would just like to outline a couple of problems that the member for Kindersley touched on. If you take and move the - I will speak as if I am a bulk dealer in the town of Maple Creek. If you did it by the location of the customer then that dealer would have to keep track of people who were 15 miles from the Alberta outlet, 30 miles from the Alberta outlet and beyond 30 miles from the Alberta outlet. When he delivered his sales into the country he would then have to adjust his price accordingly. So if you live beyond 15 miles west of the Maple Creek area you would get a 10 cent rebate, if you were between Maple Creek and the 15 to 30 miles range you would get the nickel rebate and if you were just east of the Maple Creek area you would get no rebate. Now, there are contractors who work in the area. There are farmers whose areas spread throughout both of the areas. You are going to have problems in that rebate system no matter how it applies. That is why I suggested in the question period that possibly one of the better ways would have been if you could have done it somehow through a trading area rather than through the staggered area. I don't know how you would administratively keep track of delivering it to customers. It would be rather difficult. You would have to put a lot of onus on the individual who is the dealer to keep track of it and then you couldn't prevent people from getting somebody in the 10 cent area from purchasing taxed gas for them, particularly people who weren't interested in keeping track of costs for income tax. You might say there would be a 10 cent advantage in getting somebody in that area to purchase for you. On the other hand by going into the pricing by the station then you run into the situation where you have a price differential between two centres that are rather closely located. The one fellow then would get the price advantage over the other. Speaking of that area which I am very familiar with, it's Fox Valley and Richmound. In the Richmound area the dealer will get a 10 cent rebate and in the Fox Valley area he is going to get a 5 cent rebate and the area between is 13 miles apart and they service the same area. So naturally you are going to have somebody with a 5 cent differential in the case of taxed car gas or this gas having to be used in trucks that are larger than four tons. So it is really going to create some problems and that is why I don't know how if you move along the entire area, I suppose along the boundary you will run into more problems as you move in the area. But in our area, the great sand hills, you know sort of form an almost natural division. There are no outlets on the east side; most of them are on the west side. Probably if the rebate could have been standardized on that side, some of the difficulties in that area might have been eliminated. Again, that is only one area and I am not completely familiar with some of the other areas.

I realize it is a very complex problem and was very difficult to deal with. I just would hope that the minister if he find that some of the things in the next few weeks are not working out the way they should will make considerable changes.

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, at least the last speaker admitted that there were very severe problems in relation to attempting to do anything. Therefore, he is a much more fair-haired boy than the fellow who sits behind him. The fact of the matter is that we are

not the only province that has very severe problems in this respect. We have had contacts with the British Columbia government with respect to the problems they have in relation to gasoline taxes and they have done nothing about it so far. I don't know whether they will do anything about it. But they also have very severe problems. They also have severe problems in relation to cigarette taxes, taxes on tobacco and they have just as severe problems as we have, in fact, more severe problems than we have in relation to our sales tax because their sales tax is 2 per cent higher.

The problem is a significant one when there is a substantial differential between the tax bases of two provinces. Now, I think one of the members suggested that we should have consultation with them. Obviously we would also have to be in consultation with British Columbia at the same time because there would be a differential there. We have differentials between Manitoba and Saskatchewan in terms of cigarette taxes for example. Should we be in consultation with them? The fact of the matter is, that what we did so was return the 9 cent differential to those people most closely affected by the change in the past. Now it is true that you can levy criticism all you like in relation to main highways and those other arteries. The members over there were the people who were telling us to hurry up and get on with the job. One member said that we were not out consulting with anybody. We did consult with people in Macklin and places like that, reasonably close to the border. It is true that we did some checking in Kindersley as well. The fact of the matter is that although we hear the distress stories with respect to the situation in Kindersley, I can find distress stories with respect to station operators in the city of Saskatoon. I can show you a 6 cent differential one block apart, on Broadway Avenue. The station that had a 94.9 cent gasoline price on it last Saturday has a sign up on it since Monday morning saying 'Permanently Closed.' Now, should we be rebating something to those people simply because they are caught in the difficult situation as well?

We know the vendors have problems. We know they have problems but I think the member for Kindersley has accentuated them and exaggerated them a good deal. We have also had members within the zones where we were going to apply some rebate to say that we should not have bothered at all. We have had some of those members say we should not have bothered at all, even though some of them are within the 10 cent zone.

Actually \$82 million of revenue from gasoline taxes is vitally important to this province. In our direct taxes, we collect or estimate that we will collect about \$204 million in E&H tax, \$82 million in gasoline tax and about \$21,600,000 in tobacco tax. Those are the direct taxes that we can list. There are some others but they are minor ones. They total about \$344 million. If we are going to continually erode the tax base - I have even had members say you should abolish the gasoline tax altogether. Well, that would be very nice would it not? \$82 million gone. We spend about \$154 million a year on highways. Where are we going to get the money to spend on highways? If we did not have that \$82 million, the members over there would be the first to be yelling about the fact that we were cutting back drastically on the highway program.

We do not say it is perfect. We have never suggested it was perfect. We said that we would help the people who had been hurt the worst and we think that is true. Now, the member was critical of the fact that I was not completely aware of all the rules and regulations and the mechanics of the thing. I do not think that is a fair criticism either. It is true that we are feeling our way to some extent with respect to those regulations. We have to, I think it is fair to say that we are going to do the very best we can in relation to, I think it is 33 points that are now covered under those clauses, and it is going to cost

about \$1 million a year in terms of revenue back to about 112 or 115 operators. We are going to use the best possible means we can get to assure that those people get the results from the program.

It does not matter where you go. If we had come to Kindersley, there would have been people in Netherhill saying they should have had it too, or in Fiske or D'Arcy or Rosetown or Saskatoon, right down the line. It is a fact of life that we had to cut it off within reasonable proximity of the border. I think the member is well aware of that fact and he knows, despite his criticism, that we did not say the program was perfect by any means but it is at least an attempt to ameliorate it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to propose an amendment, moved by myself and seconded by my seatmate, Mr. MacMurchy:

That all the words after 'Assembly' in Resolution No. 16 be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

congratulates the Government of Saskatchewan for taking some action to reduce the impact of the elimination of the Alberta gas tax by providing assistance to fuel vendors who face competition from Alberta fuel outlets.

Debate continues concurrently on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. R.H. Bailey Rosetown Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I believe that I was one of the first ones to raise this problem in question period and I raised a number of questions. Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out that during the month of April and now we are into May, I must admit that I, personally, had no remedy for the situation. To be quite honest with you, I didn't hear any remedy for the problem facing the government from anyone on the opposition side, including this caucus.

We have a very difficult situation here as the Minister of Revenue has admitted. I suppose there is some criticism in the time that the minister took to finally come up with the problem. I know that he was having difficulties in the caucus. It is one of these things, Mr. Minister, something like the school starting age where you set yourself off a mileage limit and it varies from place to place and yet a line has to be drawn some place. I know this is obviously going to cause some problems.

Just speaking as a Saskatchewan citizen I have some very nasty thoughts about the removal of the 12 cents sales tax in the province of Alberta, because being a native of Saskatchewan I could condemn them very strongly for doing this and make some recommendations to that government where they could have done some other cutting back. But it is very difficult, of course, for this Legislative Assembly. We are not here to try to tell any other province what they should have done. I suppose there are three things that come to mind.

The first thing I would do, as a Saskatchewan citizen, is say, look why don't you keep the 12 cents on there and get your No. 1 Highway built up so we can drive on it. That would be a logical thing to say as a Saskatchewan citizen. We could also make the point about the fact that maybe it would have been more beneficial, totally, socially, to take a look at their hospitalization premiums or something else. But be that as it may, I personally feel that for Saskatchewan we have been somewhat hurt by this. I don't think the government can remove the gasoline tax in the province. I don't think we have the revenue; I don't think we can continue to operate without having the gasoline tax. I have

not heard a solution to the problem.

I read with interest and studied further the proposal made by the government opposite. The minister admits that it is not perfect. Two of my colleagues in the Liberal Party have mentioned some of the difficulties with it. I suspect that in the year that lies ahead there may be some modifications necessary to it. I regret that we find ourselves as a province, in a very difficult situation and I want to say that I appreciate the effort that our Minister of Revenue has put in to try to save, at least, some of the potential business on the Saskatchewan side of the border. Until I hear of a better plan, until I hear of a more logical approach to this situation, I will have to say that I appreciate what the Minister of Revenue has done.

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I want only to make a couple of brief remarks about the matter and I, Mr. Speaker, will be begging leave to adjourn debate.

First, Mr. Speaker, I think it must be apparent to everybody in the province that from the level of expenditure - a little over \$1 million - that this is sort of a niggling attempt by the government to avoid a very major problem, not a problem of their creation but a very major problem for a large number of people. And the level of expenditure itself demonstrates how little the government is prepared to do. Oh, the government is prepared to make a good stab at protecting their own constituency, a constituency that has been NDP for decades but they are prepared to do very little to protect other dealers and other people in the service station industry up and down the border.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, that I think the minister will find is a tremendous problem as time goes on, is that it will be possible, under this legislation as the minister describes it - if the minister was correct in question period when he said that the question for a bulk dealer is not where the purchaser is, but where the bulk dealer is located - it would be possible for a farmer to deal, say, with a bulk dealer in Lloydminster, get an 18 cent reduction and then have his gas, not his farm fuel, but his ordinary gas truck, perhaps 500 gallon lots. A 500 gallon tank, Mr. Speaker, is not unusual, a 1,000 gallon tank is not unusual, to buy in Lloydminster, to buy in Lloydminster, even though that person might live, for instance, in North Battleford or perhaps even in Saskatoon and get that 18 cent benefit. The other possibility and I suspect this will, indeed, be happening, is that people will be buying in Burstall to supply themselves in Swift Current. So what you will have now, is the tendency of people from some distance away from the border, to go to the border for the benefit that is available. We had assumed, Mr. Speaker, as a result of certain questions to the minister's officials, that, in fact, the bulk dealer would have to react and base the entitlement to the benefit based on the location of the buyer. Now in question period the minister says that, no, that is not the intention. It may well be then, Mr. Speaker, that the minister was wrong in question period when he speculated and I suppose I shouldn't criticize the minister for speculating. I appreciate him at least trying to answer the question. That's a very major area. If it is the way the minister thinks it was, when he mentioned it in question period, you are going to have some extremely large problems to overcome in the way that bulk dealerships operate. If, on the other hand, the program operates the way your officials have described it to some of us, particularly the member for Maple Creek you are inundating the dealers with more paper work, more problems, more difficulty. Typical, Mr. Speaker, the way the government treats business, frankly, that they don't seem to mind how many papers and how many forms and how much difficulty you have to deal with. Mr. Speaker, either way, it is going to create some very real problems. I said earlier, I don't visit upon this government the creation of the problem and as the

member that just spoke indicated, he doesn't particularly have any solutions to the problem but I suggest to the minister that what has been advanced is not a solution, not a good solution to the problem and I don't know what happened in the cabinet room, I don't know whether the ideas which the minister and his officials had were repeatedly shot down in the cabinet or not. I know that I watched the minister say in the electronic media that he'd have a solution, that he had the solution then and he was sure it would be passed the next day in cabinet. Well, the next day came, that was Tuesday, three weeks ago, then another Tuesday came and obviously the suggestions of the minister were again rejected by cabinet and then some days after that the hodgepodge solution that is now presented was presented in this House. Mr. Speaker, as I said I have further remarks that I would like to address to the matter and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 19

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Merchant that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return 19 showing:

(1) The recidivist rate of former inmates of the provincial correctional system on a yearly basis commencing with 1970 to the present. (2) The recidivist rate of inmates of the various racial origins of the provincial correctional system for each of the years on an annual basis starting in 1970 until the present. (3) The names of studies of possible integration of the provincial correctional systems and the federal penitentiaries system now in the possession of the department. (4) The studies reported in answer to (3) above. (5) The dates and nature of discussions or negotiations regarding integration of the Saskatchewan correctional system and the federal penitentiaries system proceeding with the federal government.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments before I move an amendment to the motion before us. Mr. Speaker, it is not that I don't want to make the information available to the member but my understanding is that information simply isn't available that he is asking for. Information that I received from our officials is that this government approved in 1976 to establish an automated information system which has allowed the ongoing recording of each offender as he comes in the correctional system. This ongoing record permits the assessment of the recidivism to be made for 1976 and 1977. However, prior to 1976 each incarceration of an offender was recorded as a separate case in the manual filing system. To determine the recidivism for 1970 to 1975 it would be necessary to leaf all the cases by hand and the information I received from our officials is that this would require an exhaustive review of about 40,000 case cards and this would be a momentous task and really a great expense, so that portion simply cannot be answered and I will move an amendment to that effect.

Secondly, when the member asks for a comparison of this recidivism rate, I think it must be remembered that recidivism is not, is simply not measured the same by any of the provinces or by the provinces and the federal government. So any statistics for example, that I would give him, simply would be like comparing apples and oranges. In

the federal government, I am told, after five years simply the case becomes inactive, or the file becomes inactive and it no longer exists, which is not the case in many of the provinces. I am told, however, that the recidivism rate for the federal government is around 70 per cent to 80 per cent, which would mean it is about 10 per cent to 20 per cent greater than that of the Saskatchewan correctional system. Now that is not surprising since they deal with real hard core criminals and in many instances, we do not. So that I think is quite understandable.

Mr. Speaker, there are some other questions that the member has asked. He asked also, I believe, for the ethnic origins of some of the inmates. I believe that this information is available. The minister in 1972 agreed with the FSI that we should keep of record of the ethnic origin. I think that information is available and will be forthcoming.

The member asked us to give the names of the studies that are going on right now on integration of the provincial correctional system with the federal penitentiary system. Mr. Speaker, I simply am not at liberty to give him the names of those studies. That would have to be an agreement between the provinces and the federal government and the territories and I think that this simply is not forthcoming at this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that short explanation I would move, seconded by the member for Saltcoats, Mr. Kaeding, that the motion made by Mr. Merchant for Return No. 19 be amended:

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

(1) The rate of recidivism for inmates of the provincial correctional centres on the yearly basis commencing with 1976 to the present. (2) The rate of recidivism of inmates of native ancestry versus others in correctional centres on a yearly basis commencing with 1976 to the present. (3) The names of studies of possible integration of provincial correctional systems and the federal penitentiaries system now in possession of the department. (4) The dates and nature of discussions or negotiations regarding integration of Saskatchewan correctional system and the federal penitentiaries system proceeding with the federal government.

Mr. Merchant: — Would he answer a question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I take it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I take it that it is intentional not to incorporate (4) of the original motion which reads: — 'The studies reported in answer to (3) above.' The minister knows the way the current motion is worded, a return would follow by which you would automatically be tabling with the House, the various studies that are in your possession. I take it, it is intentional that you not release and make public those documents.

Debate continues concurrently on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, prior to the closing of debate by the hon. member for Wascana, I attempted some time ago to have the Legislative Library get from the Department of Social Services the recidivist rate for the province of Saskatchewan, in the correctional centres, and no such rate was available and this was within the last two months.

My comment is that I will acknowledge that the use of the recidivist rate is not a highly

accurate indication of the success for the correctional system, that in fact it can mean an indication of better police enforcement, for example. I acknowledge that, but I think the lack of one indicates that the Department of Social Services corrections branch really has no way to monitor or to judge the effectiveness of its programs. I think that is one of the failures. I think that that is one of the failures of the federal penitentiary system. I would hope that the minister would undertake to supply to the Conservative caucus, as well, his answers to the particular matter so that we can start to judge the effectiveness of the department.

Mr. Merchant: — I am very disappointed to hear from the minister a reluctance to provide the studies of the proposition of bringing together the national and provincial correctional systems to some extent.

I believe that it would be very useful for us to change the date of division, that the date of division of two years that was appropriate in 1867 is not appropriate now. I think that it would be appropriate for the public and members of this House to start to judge the likelihood of some change of that date of division, a date of division that was set by the BNA Act and may have been appropriate then, but I don't think is appropriate now.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am disappointed that the minister has decided not to release the studies that have been requested.

I, secondly, Mr. Speaker, just want to make a brief mention of the rate of recidivism, which I am sure will emerge. As the minister says it is going to be about 60 or 70 per cent. That is for everybody. I think my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that it is going to be about 85 or 90 per cent for native people, that the recidivist rate is far higher for native people than it is for whites. It, again, demonstrates that we are just not doing the job for the Metis and Indian people in this province. We are not doing the job in a number of ways and I don't visit that in a particularly political sense upon the government. That is something about which we have to do something and it is something that requires far more attention than it is receiving now by this government. I believe, perhaps there is too little attention by the national government although at the Metis level the national government has not previously, at least, been considered to take some part in that area.

Mr. Speaker, other than that I suppose that the amendments are satisfactory. I am sorry that we are not going to get information that goes back to the early '70s, sorry for this reason, not because I think this information that will be forthcoming will assist me to score any political points. That is not really the purpose of it. Sorry because I think that members and the public would be surprised to find that the recidivist rate is going up. That is my belief. That what is happening is we are recirculating the same criminals more often, rather than developing new criminals. Perhaps that is a positive way to say we are not developing anybody new, but we seem to be recirculating the old over and over again. When the minister says that his recidivist rate is going to be in the 50 per cent to 70 per cent range and the federal is 70 to 80 per cent, that, of course, is because a large number of the people from the provincial system get graduated to the federal system. After flunking grade five and grade six four or five times they finally get graduated to high school.

The whole thing, Mr. Speaker, the numbers that I believe are going to be forthcoming and regretfully probably won't be forthcoming for six or eight months. I would have said I may not be here, but I may be. I think, Mr. Speaker, the public will find those figures to be very surprising and very disappointing.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Minister of Social Services): — Have I spoken on this before or could I speak on - I can't speak on it now after the amendment has been disposed of?

Mr. Speaker: — You're right.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Resolution No. 2 - Compensation for Injured Workers

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution as amended, moved by Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly commends the government and the Workers' Compensation Board for the fair and just manner in which compensation is provided to injured workers, and for the efficient mechanisms which have been developed to ensure that Workers' Compensation Fund payments are more equitable and more flexible than compensation awarded in the courts.

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, it is rather typical of the government across the way in their arrogance to change a motion that was put in with good faith in what the people of Saskatchewan really believed which is the government should be condemned not complimented for their actions re the Workers' Compensation Board. I realize the individuals and as we discussed it last night, are trying to do a job but unfortunately the only thing that the Minister of Labour said yesterday is we're not in debt. We don't have a fund that's short of money to pay out. That's the big thing he was arguing last evening. Yet by doing that he's giving people inadequate pensions for the accidents that they received and they are unable to work. People that were receiving a good income on good jobs, working hard, are now being denied the right to live even anywhere near their former standard or even in an adequate standard. In one case I remember a person being told, go on welfare if you can" live on what we pay you. What kind of attitude is that? Workers' Compensation should be paying fair and adequate compensation to those who are hurt on the job. They are there giving their service. It's not their fault that they have been injured. I think this motion and it is unfortunate the government has changed, where it says that this Assembly commends, it should be condemns and this government's fair treatment of injured workers should be unfair treatment of injured workers. The government is playing a game with this. It is unfortunate that they can't be told when they are wrong and accept the hand slapping and try to improve the situation. No, they have got to use that big majority over there to pat themselves on the back when they are totally wrong. Therefore, I think you should be condemned and I will not vote for this motion.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 22

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 22 showing:

(1) The requirement imposed on hospitals, penal institutions, nursing homes and special care homes, within the province of Saskatchewan, regarding the use of fire resistant bedding materials. (2) The funding being considered to assist in the transition in hospitals, penal institutions, nursing homes and special care homes, to facilitate the replacement of current bedding materials with appropriate fire resistant bedding materials in those establishments.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, again on this particular motion I have a few comments on it before I move an amendment to it.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the requirement imposed on hospitals and penal institutions, nursing homes, etc., I just want to make a slight amendment to state a legal requirement in this particular aspect. I think that it is also important even though much of this has been done by regulation and through policy and it may not be any particular law that's required to do anything specifically, the government has taken many actions in order to do exactly what the member opposite is asking us to do. For example, Mr. Speaker, in the area of the sprinkler systems for nursing homes, we have I think over the past three or four years spent in the neighbourhood of \$500,000 to \$600,000 to assist nursing homes in providing sprinkler systems in their institutions. In fact, the government pays up to 90 per cent of the total costs involved. There is nothing, as I said before, that requires us by law to do so, but the government thought it was imperative that we do so.

Some of the homes, Mr. Speaker, that have received sprinkler systems are such as St. Anthony in Moose Jaw, St. Joseph's in Prince Albert, Pioneer Village in Regina, Santa Maria in Regina, Salvation Army in Saskatoon, CNIB, St. Mary's in Weyburn, CNIB in Regina, and so on. As I indicated, the cost to the government is about \$600,000.

Mr. Speaker, also in the correctional centres, the Department of Social Services took upon itself to replace 700 mattresses in the correctional centre which would be fire resistant to the tune of about \$30,000. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that this would satisfy the member for Wascana but we are attempting to do the best we can to give him the type of information that he is requiring. Therefore I move, seconded again by Mr. Kaeding for Saltcoats:

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

(1) The legal requirement imposed on hospitals, penal institutions, nursing homes and special care homes within the province of Saskatchewan regarding the use of fire resistant bedding materials. (2) The current operational practices of hospitals, penal institutions, and special care homes administered by the province of Saskatchewan, which may assist in the replacement of present bedding materials with appropriate fire resistant materials in those establishments. (3) Other protective measures, for devices being utilized to provide fire protection for these institutions.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this basically supplies the member with the information that he desires.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Resolution No. 14 - Federal Crown Corporations

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Mr. Nelson (Yorkton):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to establish a Crown Corporations Committee similar to the Saskatchewan committee so that the business of all federal Crown corporations may be effectively examined and controlled.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — The motion moved by the member for Yorkton, urging the Government of Canada to establish a Crown Corporations Committee similar to the Saskatchewan Crown Corporations Committee so that the business of all federal Crown corporations may be effectively examined and controlled indicates a complete lack of awareness in the operations of the Crown Corporations Committee by the member for Yorkton. Perhaps it is his inexperience, the fact that he is a new member that he has not seen fit to watch his own government's activities on the Crown Corporations Committee. Why the hon. member for Yorkton would want to compound a felony, so to speak, by having the same type of operation in Ottawa as they have here in Saskatchewan, is far beyond the comprehension of any rational member of this Assembly. For the stonewalling that goes on in this Crown Corporations Committee and the ability of the present Crown Corporations Committee structure in Saskatchewan to effectively stop the opposition from getting information or, in fact, getting to the to the financial operations of the Crown corporations, I think it indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is in fact just plain ignorant of the Crown corporations operations and for that, I suppose, being a new member we can somewhat forgive him.

I would have hoped that, in fact, the hon. member would have taken a more positive approach, keeping in mind that it is fundamental for the operation of Parliament that Parliament should have the capability as well as the right to review public expenditures.

I would be prepared to suggest to the hon. member that perhaps with the great growth of Crown corporations that Crown corporations should be brought under a similar in operation to the Public Accounts Committee. I think that this could be done by having the committee meetings in-camera; that the cabinet minister not attend; that the general manger of the Crown corporation be subject to the operations of the committee.

Well, the hon. member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) he laughs at that proposal and I can see why he would laugh at that proposal because he has so much to hide over there, with potash and every other thing that is going on, that he should be laughing at the operation. I think, Mr. Speaker, the very fact that that member is laughing at the proposal indicates the fact, the realities of the situation in Saskatchewan. That in fact the present Crown corporation is totally inadequate when it comes to having financial responsibility and public review of government expenditures. It is totally inadequate and I think all members if they were sincere would recognize that fact.

Now I have given to the hon. member, what I think would be a workable proposal and that is that the Crown Corporations Committee be similar in structure to the Public Accounts Committee. Let it be in-camera. I agree, reluctantly, but I think if we are going to get into in-depth studies of Crown corporations and if it is to be with the general manager as opposed to just being a political arena, that, in fact, it has to be in-camera.

I think that in fairness to the government that it would not function in other way, shape

or form. But due to the great growth in Crown corporations the idea of having just a political forum open to the public. Crown Corporations Committee, where it is the opposition asking questions; the minister saying it is not in the public interest, a motion coming up and it then being defeated by the government majority, serves none of us any good whatsoever. I don't think we do ourselves proud with the operations of the Crown Corporations Committee. I don't think that opposition members if they have to criticize the government in open form, and the government for obvious political reasons having to defend itself, serves the institution of Parliament in any way, shape or form. I think the growth of the Crown corporations necessitates a whole new format for a review of public expenditures. And to suggest that we propose the same system to Ottawa, I think avoids, or fails to recognize the complete change and fails to recognize the growth of Crown corporations in Canada.

I think what we should return to is what Parliament was established or grew to in the first place, and that was for public review of government expenditures. If that is our goal, and I suggest to you that that is what it should be, then surely we have no choice but to look at a committee similar to the Public Accounts Committee or perhaps a new structure altogether, but to merely have a political forum or a political arena as we have, as I say I think it serves no one any good. I think, really, it is the public that suffers as a result of it. I think we have seen the great growth of Crown corporations in Saskatchewan. I think we have seen the inability of oppositions to get information on the government's investment in the Potash Corporation. I think the failure of the previous government when it was in operation to try to get information on SEDCO loans with regard to the PA pulp mill, I think emphasizes my point. I think, that again, Crown corporations are becoming the norm instead of the exception and I think that the present political forum has proven totally inadequate to deal with public review of government expenditures through the Crown corporations. I suggest a new structure perhaps, the hon. member on reconsidering has a better suggestion. I'm certainly prepared to hear what he has to say in conclusion, but to perpetrate the present system in Ottawa, you as an opposition party in Ottawa would be so hamstrung and so unable to get to the expenditures of the Crown corporations in Ottawa that you would find very quickly that the present system doesn't work and would serve you no good as a federal opposition party. I suggest that I'm going to vote against the proposal because I think it fails to recognize the great growth in Crown corporations. I think as I say it just compounds a felony, I think it perpetrates a bad system in Ottawa and I think for that reason that in fact the member should withdraw his motion and really come back with a new proposal that recognizes the realities of the great growth of Crown corporations in Canada and Saskatchewan.

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 15 - Building and Mounting of School Bus Bodies

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Mr. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan, through the Department of Industry and Commerce, to conduct a feasibility study into establishing an industry in Saskatchewan for the purpose of building and mounting of school bus bodies.

Hon. N. Vickar (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond this afternoon to Resolution No. 15, moved in this House by the member for Rosetown-Elrose. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, urges the Department of Industry and Commerce to conduct a feasibility study into establishing an industry in Saskatchewan for the purpose of building and mounting of school bus bodies.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is not without merit. I appreciate the interest of the member for Rosetown-Elrose in seeing industry develop and expand in Saskatchewan. Throughout the term of this government, economic diversification has been described as the key to future economic stability and prosperity in this province. I'm delighted that this message has not been completely lost on the members of the opposition. As I am sure that the member for Rosetown-Elrose recognizes successful industries such as the one manufacturing school buses do not just happen. A combination of the ingredients are necessary. Capital, the right decision, the right equipment, the right location, a suitable market, experienced management and so on. The Department of Industry and Commerce as this House is aware recently introduced five new programs for the purpose of which to encourage the development of new businesses and the expansion of existing businesses in Saskatchewan. Some of these new programs such as the small business interest development programs, the product development program and the management development program have the potential to assist in the development of an industry in Saskatchewan to produce buses.

Mr. Speaker, my department first examined a similar proposal six to eight years ago. Information on the usage and replacement of school buses was not difficult to obtain at that time and I'm sure that this could be given a current review. At one point some years ago, a local entrepreneur sold and leased buses, was interested in manufacturing such vehicles, but his interests changed and the project faded. An existing Saskatoon manufacturing company may currently be the most logical firm to be considered for such a project.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, some studies would have to be carried out before any entrepreneur could be expected to make a commitment to such a project. A similar industry in Manitoba has had perennial difficulties and has required financial support from the Manitoba government. Fairly stringent requirements are necessary to ensure safety and durability in school buses. Clearly good design and competent construction would be essential at the outset to achieve market acceptance.

Mr. Speaker, given a reasonable proposal such as this one, the Department of Industry and Commerce now is able to assist an interested entrepreneur from the start to the finish of a project. Initially we can cost-share feasibility and market studies. If these studies prove positive then the department can share the cost of the necessary research and development to prepare a suitable design. The department can arrange capital financing. Finally, the department can provide ongoing services to assist with manpower training, marketing and financial management, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan cannot afford to be indifferent to such proposals. Any serious proposal should be carefully considered. I want the member for Rosetown-Elrose to know that I agree with his resolution, as far as the resolution goes. I intend to see that the Department of Industry and Commerce approaches the various Saskatchewan manufacturing companies to pursue this question further. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that any serious proposals made by any other member of this House would also be welcome. With the introduction of the five new programs I mentioned earlier, the Department of Industry and Commerce is directing its efforts to a

substantial degree to the identification, the analysis, promotion and implementation of new Saskatchewan industrial projects. I hope all members will encourage their constituents to participate in the new Industry and Commerce programs.

Manufacturing enterprises in Saskatchewan since the early '70s has been growing at a rapid pace, much ahead of the national rate, and has contributed significantly to the province's economic prosperity in recent years. We must do everything we can to foster further manufacturing growth. Mr. Speaker, I believe that with a small change in Resolution No. 15, it will be perfectly acceptable to the members of this House. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by my seatmate, the member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) that Resolution No. 15 be amended as follows:

That all of the words after the word 'Assembly' be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for its initiative in introducing five new programs to support and encourage the development of Saskatchewan businesses and that this Assembly urge the government through the Department of Industry and Commerce to investigate the possibility of an industry being established in Saskatchewan which would be for the purpose of manufacturing school bus bodies.

Debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 6 - Delay Legislation on Legalizing Marijuana

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to delay any legislation that would legalize the sale of marijuana until broader research has been conducted.

Hon. D.L. Faris (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, this resolution was on the order paper during the last session. I was surprised at the form which it took at that point. I was pleased to see on that occasion the Attorney General rise to change the resolution into one of opposition, to the legalization of marijuana and at the conclusion of my remarks I intend once again to do that. I am surprised to see the question raised in this form because while the question of decriminalization of marijuana is under

discussion in the country, I would hope there is not very wide support in the country or certainly not wide support in this legislature for the legalization of marijuana which is a different matter. There has been a great deal of research done in regard to the harmful effects of marijuana and I want to read into the record a recent press report from Vancouver which is entitled: — 'Tests Support Doctors in Marijuana Warnings'. This is from the Leader Post of April 29:

Doctors who had warned of the dangers of marijuana use now are being supported by results of recent scientific tests, the head of City Hospital's Psychiatric Department said Wednesday. Dr. Conrad Swartz of St. Paul's hospital told the annual meeting of the Alcohol, Drug Education Service that mounting scientific evidence backs up longstanding medical warnings against the use of the drug. Marijuana is quite clearly a drug that develops tolerance, he told the group, a voluntary organization combatting alcohol and drug abuse. He said that in early stages of use, people might need progressively less marijuana to get the same effect but as usage continues, more and more is required to produce the same sensation. Until 1970 only about 340 tests had been performed, said Dr. Swartz, but now there are so many studies that a special conference on the subject will be held in France this summer. Dr. Swartz said tests showed that in pregnancies, marijuana's active ingredient passes through the placenta to the fetus. He said it also passed through breast milk and rats and rabbits produced fatal abnormalities when tested with the plant from which marijuana is harvested.

Other conclusions, he said, showed chromosomal breakage in test subjects which had not used other drugs, decreased formation of DNA, the essential ingredient for cell growth and memory and lung damage, moodiness and reduced sperm count. Dr. Swartz said if dosage problems could be solved, marijuana may aid in immunization of cancer and eliminate rejection of transplanted organs. Although some glaucoma sufferers have claimed relief through the use of marijuana, Dr. Swartz said there are alternatives available which do not induce redness of the eyes. He said United States soldiers stationed in Germany smoked up to 50 grams of hashish a month over a six month period suffered the same lung damage as people who smoked tobacco for twenty or thirty years.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to read that into the record because it is quite clear that there is growing evidence of the medical problems associated with increased marijuana use. It should be clear to all members present that if we were to legalize marijuana, we would find increasing social problems much along the same lines as we now have in our society with widespread use of the legal drugs, alcohol and tobacco. I think it is quite clear that if most citizens in our society were to face the question of whether alcohol and tobacco should be newly introduced into our society or our culture at this point, that is if they weren't already deeply in our cultural society, most people who would look at that question intelligently and with concern about the effects on humanity, would say that those drugs should not be legalized and introduced into our society.

We face a particular problem because they are legally available in our society and our culture and deeply embedded in them and we face special problems because of that. But I think it would be a very serious mistake for our society to introduce another drug, marijuana, which as this article indicates is increasingly showing signs of having a lot of the very same sort of medical problems as alcohol and tobacco into our society and so, Mr. Speaker, without any further comment I want to move, seconded by the member

for Saltcoats, that in Resolution No. 6 the word, 'delay' be deleted and replaced by the word, 'oppose', and that all the words after 'marijuana' be deleted.

Debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — I have been in this Assembly long enough to know that no member in the opposition can propose a motion without an amendment to it, regardless of how good that motion is. I was questioned as to why I put this motion in the same this year as last year, knowing full well that no matter what way I redrafted that motion, it would be changed opposite anyway. I am in complete agreement with the Minister of Education as to what he said. I think he recognizes this as well. I think he recognizes as well my sentiments in regard to this drug are exactly as his. It is however somewhat frustrating that I happen to have two motions here, one which the Minister of Industry and Commerce replied to, but even that motion couldn't be left alone, we have to get into this, we commend the government. I don't buy that but it does get a little bit disappointing after a while when a person is very sincere and really wants to contribute something in the way of what I think, is good debate, good healthy debate and good recommendations for the government, that we have got to change this thing around. I want to tell the Minister of Education that is exactly why the original motion that appeared last year . . . I will take full credit by saying it was badly worded. When I was asked even by my own people, what did you do this for, to show them that no matter how you word a resolution, they are going to reword it anyway and I am glad you reworded it because that is exactly the way I wanted it to be worded. But if I had worded it that way, you would have changed it anyway, just like the Minister of Industry and Commerce as well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hope that everyone, I hope that everyone will support this particular motion. Thank you.

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to this motion I think I find it very interesting. In attending several conferences, one of the problems in the question of hard drugs is when they are taken in combination. Some parts of the world are plagued with it. It is very difficult for a police officer to identify without taking the person to a doctor and the combination of both alcohol and drugs is the most devastating. I think that in some of these problems pertaining, especially to marijuana, they say, well, people are using it anyway. People are committing murder too and we are not going to legalize it, either. Now, in the schools that I have attended, the conferences I have attended, the stand is very definite, no. I hope that this legislature will take this stand.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — And I hope this legislature will appoint a few members from every side of the House to study the question of hard drugs before they move. So you can have a few people in here who know what the hell they are talking about. And I don't think that we should be led by high pressure salesmen to legalize a thing because they are using it anyway . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well . . . (laughter) . . . we'll leave them alone for a little while. That is enough for one day . . . (laughter) . . . Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt you see, there is no doubt in my mind that I am going to support this motion. I want to congratulate the member for Rosetown for introducing the subject in the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 13 - Equality for Saskatchewan Women

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

That this Assembly go on record as supporting the principle of equality for women in Saskatchewan, and further commits itself to continue taking positive action, in the future, in furtherance of this principle.

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution introduced by my hon. colleague for Rosemont, I must say that it is a tremendously worded resolution with a lot of weight to it, a lot of thought behind it and something that this party has stood for, ever since its inception. I might also say that I think it is only fair that we remind this House at this particular time, of some of the accomplishments that this party has brought forth in this legislature and legislatures in bygone years.

Going back a few short years ago to 1972, we see there that the government of the day, the New Democratic Party, brought in legislation that provided for equal pay amendment to The Labour Standards Act. This enabled the Department of Labour to refer an equal pay dispute to the Human Rights Commission for a formal investigation and appropriate penalties for non-compliance where necessary. The Fair Employment Practices Act and The Fair Accommodation Practices Act were amended to prohibit sex discrimination. This government here in Saskatchewan was one of the first governments to bring that type of legislation before the people of this province.

In 1973, under the equal pay amendment provision, it provided that an employer could not discriminate between male and female employees by paying either a lesser rate of pay for similar work performed in the same establishment, requiring similar skill, effort and responsibility performed under similar conditions. The exception occurs where seniority or a merit system is in effect.

In a second provision there was an attempt to clarify previous equal pay provisions which defined equal work as work of comparable character and a difficult one to assess and manage. Now we agree that that is a difficult one to police at this particular time.

In 1973 a further amendment, under the maternity leave amendment provision, provided that maternity leave of 18 weeks was established and generally taken as 12 weeks preceding the birth and six weeks immediately following that birth.

A further one provided that reinstatement in a comparable job with no loss of benefits was guaranteed under the provisions of the act.

Another one was that the suspension or dismissal of an employee for the sole reason of her pregnancy was prohibited. I must say, that has been a benefit to the people of this country, the people of this province, and other provinces have followed suit since that time.

In 1974, a day care program was initiated. It was developed by the Department of Social Services, which makes available subsidies for parents who require them.

Another one provided that a Family Planning Committee was established in 1974.

A further one, the Advisory Council on the Status of Women was appointed to identify concerns related to the status of women for which the Government of Saskatchewan has responsibility and to make recommendations to the government with regard to these concerns.

At that time in 1974, and since then, funds for the operations of the Advisory Council have been administered through the Department of Labour and liaison has been maintained between the government and the council by means of the women's division. Anyone who questions the capability of the women's division I am sure is out of touch today with the society in Saskatchewan.

In 1976, under the establishment of the women's division, a new full fledged division was established, inheriting and expanding the responsibilities of the former women's bureau of the previous years ahead of that 1976 date.

The new division was created to consolidate and expand efforts of this government to achieve equal opportunities for women and eliminate discriminatory practices and attitudes towards women in the labour force. The new public education programs were developed, using workshops, speaking engagements and special publications. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that at this particular time the women's division and the establishment of the women's division into a full fledged division has been well used in the province and there has been that type of debate and understanding throughout Saskatchewan which was not evident before.

In 1977, a new Labour Standards Act and flexible leave provision was established. It provides that a woman may take all or part of her 18 weeks leave after the date of the birth of her child.

An equal pay section was strengthened when an amendment was made which would disallow an employer who had been in violation of the equal pay legislation, from reducing the rates of pay of employees on the grounds that subsequent work was being done only by members of one sex.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague for Rosemont has suggested that more has to be done in the future and I am sure that, as we read the resolution before us at this particular time, all of us will agree that there has to be further work done in so far as supporting the principle of equality for women in Saskatchewan and their rights. I am sure that this government stands committed for that purpose and to that purpose in such a way that that type of achievement will be brought about. I highly urge this Assembly at this time to adopt the resolution supported by my colleague.

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to both the mover and now the next speaker on this motion. I think that there is a common saying that goes, the government speaks with a forked tongue. They seem to indicate that they are just 'dirt right', what they say is what they do but it seems strange that in the labour situation - an example I will use is a hospital job evaluation study where it was proven that it was a fact that women were being paid less than men. It's the government again that's responsible for that one, therefore I want to get that information and bring it in the House as soon as I can so I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 12 - Freight Assistance for Livestock Exhibits

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Mr. Katzman (Rosthern):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to establish freight assistance for livestock exhibits to Canadian Western Agribition on the same basis as for the Toronto Winter Fair - i.e. 75 per cent of the total cost of shipping.

And the proposed amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Kaeding:

That all the words after the word 'Assembly' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for undertaking negotiations with the Government of Canada to establish freight assistance for livestock exhibits to Canadian Western Agribition on the same basis as for the Toronto Royal Winter Fair - i.e. 75 per cent of the total cost of shipping.

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment, it's interesting to note that the government again does their usual thing and says how great they are and how they are perfect and do everything, yet it's interesting that the government itself is now removing its support for organizations that go to other fairs. For example, let's use the Toronto Royal which is part of this motion. The motion seems now to compliment the Government of Saskatchewan for taking a part in negotiations to arrange for the 75 per cent funding to Western Agribition the same as the Toronto Royal Fair. But it's interesting to note that the Government of Saskatchewan is now refusing to pay any portion of the costs to go to the Toronto Royal Fair. It says, we want you to pay but we are not willing to assist our people to go anywhere else. So, it's once again the old problem, we are going to pat our back and everybody else is going to pay the bills; we are going to take the credit, but when it comes time to pay the bills they are pulling their support away.

Let's for an example take this year 1977 and the Toronto Royal shipment again, and look what the federal government be it Liberal it's been there for many years as a subsidy. I doubt that, Mr. Member for Lakeview. Another example, Prince Edward Island in 1977 received \$7,000 from the federal government to send to the Toronto Royal and assuming that they would then ship to Saskatchewan, they would require additional funds. Nova Scotia which never comes to this show because it's just too expensive, it receives funds of \$2,320 in 1977. New Brunswick never comes to Western Agribition but it would be nice to see them here, received in 1977, \$1,568. Quebec, I haven't seen Quebec people at the Agribition, they have been at Toronto for years and I hope I see them start coming west. This is a country, a nation of all provinces and therefore we would like to see their livestock display here for the international markets. Quebec \$10,621. Manitoba which we see a few of them here in the Saskatchewan Western Agribition, \$26,474 of subsidy re the Toronto Royal.

This gives you some kind of indication what kind of subsidy we are asking for, for the people coming to Western Agribition. Saskatchewan got \$19,985, and I believe the subsidy from Saskatchewan towards that was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$15,000.

Saskatchewan now is saying, no more subsidy to send our livestock to the east, and yet we are going hat in hand and saying we want the east to assist people to come here. And this you think is good and fair? Alberta, \$15,478, we see Alberta cattle at Western Agribition, maybe the shipment will be larger. BC, they have the mountains to come across, it's a little more expensive. But, they receive \$6,467 from the federal

government to assist them to the Toronto Royal. In other words, the federal government gave \$89,934 in the year 1977 to assist livestock exhibits on freight subsidy to the Toronto Royal. That's just I think, an indication of approximately the cost, what it cost the federal government to assist those coming from the east and the west to Western Agribition. And I think that's important that we get these displays from all parts of Canada to exhibit their livestock. And it's an unfortunate situation when a government will suggest that it's pulling back its support in one area, two shipments and yet asking for payments for shipments identical to this province. It is unfortunate when the livestock people and Western Agribition take up a case and suggest to the federal government, we would like assistance like the Toronto Royal. But then who stands up in the House to take credit? The NDP. Give the credit where credit is due - Western Agribition, they are the people who started the negotiations. They are the people working for it, not the Government of Saskatchewan. So why always try to take the credit for things that you don't deserve credit, yet when there is some blame to come on you you don't want to accept it. It belongs to somebody else.

All that I am suggesting, Mr. Minister, may be that we should amend the motion to condemn your government for the suggestion that it may be removing its assistance to go to other fairs in Canada and I would suggest the Toronto Royal. May I suggest that the minister and the government reconsider its amendment and maybe defeat it, which is not a normal practice to defeat their own amendments and to approve the original resolution, which says that we try to negotiate and to get this arrangement, rather than to pat yourself on the back because one of these days you are going to break your arm trying to reach your back and I would hate to see the minister do that.

Mr. Snyder: — . . . circus.

Mr. Katzman: — Oh, we heard the man about the circus again. I think that is the same member that is getting a new zoo and I understand that he is going to be the prime exhibit in that zoo in the Moose Jaw area.

Mr. Speaker, this motion, I think, deserves one comment. The government is once again patting its own back and taking the credit away from the organization that did the hard work and deserves the credit, the Canadian Western Agribition and I will not support this amendment.

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

Mr. W.J.G. Allen (Regina Rosemont) moved second reading of Bill 34 - **An Act to amend The Industrial Accountants Act.**

He said Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 34 be now read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition) moved second reading of Bill 62 - **An Act to prohibit Saskatchewan Telecommunications from interfering with the Delivery of Programming by a Cablecaster.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words about this bill before moving second reading and I can appreciate why the Attorney General would like this bill to be dropped and for it to go away, but unfortunately that is not about to happen.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset that this bill does not in any way deal with the controversy between community programming network and the CRTC licensees. What this bill tries to deal with is something in our view of more significant nature.

What this bill tries to do is to, firstly, illustrate to the people of Saskatchewan in a very real way that the Government of Saskatchewan, through its Crown corporation Sask Tel, is in our view breaking the law.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it was necessary to put this bill on the order paper so that we could debate the issue of what Sask Tel is doing and whether it is appropriate or not.

As you know the members opposite, during question period, have refused to answer the questions about Sask Tel's activities on the excuse that this matter was before the courts. I understand, after reading Beauchesne and hearing Mr. Speaker's rulings, that by putting a bill on the order paper it opens the matter up and allows us to debate it when the bill comes before the Assembly.

Let me make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that we view with suspicion the actions of this government. We say that the government and in particular the Attorney General, and I will come to him later, is defying the law in two ways. Firstly, they are defying the laws of Canada. There is no doubt in anybody's mind in Canada and in Saskatchewan that the CRTC is the duly licensed agency to control broadcasting. Now members opposite may take exception to that law and, indeed, many people across Canada are debating the issue as to whether or not the CRTC should be in charge of broadcasting across Canada but that is the law at this time, whether members across like it or not, whether other people in Canada, particularly in Quebec, like it or not. Indeed, I can't help but reflect, Mr. Speaker, that the only two governments that have really seriously challenged the CRTC's mandate in Canada are the Party Quebecois of Mr. Levesque and the New Democratic Party of Mr. Blakeney. So we say by the actions of Sask Tel whereby they are actively jamming the signal that has been put forth by the private licensees, Cable Regina in Regina, Saskatoon Telecommunications in Saskatoon and the private licensee in Moose Jaw, that Sask Tel with the government's approval, with the government's direction is defying the laws of Canada in not allowing those duly licensed licensees by the CRTC to provide the message which they are authorized to provide to people in Saskatchewan.

We are saying, as well, Mr. Speaker, that they are breaking the law in another way. They are breaking the law by now complying with the contractual agreement that was entered into between the duly licensed CRTC's with Sask Telecommunications. Once again I want to put on record, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was sent, in this particular case, to Mr. C.C. Forester of Saskatoon Telecable Ltd. This letter was dated February 24, 1978, signed by the general manager of Saskatchewan Telecommunications.

Dear Mr. Forester: — This is to confirm our recent telephone conversation. Sask Tel guarantees on or before April 7, 1978 at noon, signals originated by the Saskatoon CPN will be removed from channels 2 to 13 inclusive on the

local cable distribution system. Between now and the time of the CPN signal move, Sask Tel will not connect any new CPN subscribers to the distribution system. Following April 7, Sask Tel will stop CPN subscribers from receiving Saskatoon Telecable signals within a reasonable and practical length of time. Between now and April 7, Saskatoon Telecable will not take action to interfere with Saskatoon CPN signal. I trust this is your understanding of our agreement. Yours truly.

Mr. Chairman, that's old news. Everybody in Saskatchewan knows of that agreement. Everybody in Saskatchewan also knows that after April 7 at noon Sask Tel did not take CPN off the airways and perhaps more important than what this bill that is before the House now seeks to deal with, Sask Tel deliberately went out and attempted to jam the signals that were being presented by the CRTC licensees. Let me just reflect upon that for a moment, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General is a man who is experienced in radio. He spent many years, I'm told, in Saskatoon acting as a disc jockey or a news reporter or whatever and, indeed, in June of 1979 he'll have an opportunity to return to that profession if he chooses to do so. But was when the Attorney General on the radio in Saskatoon I think he would have been appalled if the opposition in Saskatoon, another private radio station, had tried to jam the signal that his particular station was putting across the airways. I think the people of Canada would be appalled as well if CTV tried to jam the signal of CBC or vice versa, although that may be desirable from time to time as perhaps the member for Rosetown is pointing out.

People in Canada realize that there are laws for the conduct of broadcasting and that those laws, if they are not obeyed will create chaos in the whole broadcasting system of this country. I only know of one person, a body corporate, that has attempted to get around those laws and that, unfortunately, is Saskatchewan Telecommunications. A company that is not a private company, a company that is not just a bunch of individuals getting together to try to make a dollar because of a service they can offer but a company that is controlled on a daily basis by the Government of Saskatchewan. I say that the government, Mr. Speaker, should be hanging its head in shame for its actions. I don't think that there has been a government anywhere in the country that has directed a Crown corporation or a government agency or a government department to break the law, to break contracts, to every way possible defy the federal government and the powers that they have under the British North America Act and under statute. That's why it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to bring this act before the Assembly; that's why it is necessary to get something before the people of Saskatchewan, before members here, to demonstrate that Sask Tel is defying the law. Where is Sask Tel getting its instruction from? We have asked a number of questions in question period which the government has either refused to answer or which they have dodged to try to determine who is instructing the officers of Sask Tel to take the steps that they have been taking. We know from question period that the minister in charge of Sask Tel is not being allowed to answer any questions about this matter. But every time we ask a question about telecable or cable TV, the Attorney General rises to his feet and attempts to answer the questions that we put to him. We believe that we can only make one logical assumption from the government's actions, that the conduct and the actions of Sask Tel are being directed by the Attorney General and in doing so and in directing them in the way that he is, he is breaking the laws of Canada and we believe breaking the laws of Saskatchewan. We say that for any minister, Mr. Speaker, to have been acting in such a way is shameful indeed, but when it is the Attorney General, a man who takes an oath to uphold all laws, not as he would like them to be but as he finds them when he takes that office, for him to be acting in such a way is contemptible. I hope that the Attorney General will get into this debate. I hope that he will stand in his place and try to explain

his activities in this regard and indeed try to explain the activities of the Government of Saskatchewan in this regard. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that he won't because those activities and those actions are inexplicable.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is not going to go away. We know that the matter before the courts has now been adjourned until later this week and a decision is going to be rendered at that time. No matter what decision is rendered by Mr. Justice McLeod, it is still going to put the government in the position that they are going to be in breach of contract. If the learned Justice finds in favour of CPN, then Sask Tel will be in breach of contract with the private licensees. If the judge finds in favour of Cable Regina and the others, then Sask Tel is going to be put in the position of being in breach of contract with CPN. The reason the government finds itself in this position is basically from stupidity, basically because they are a bunch of little children who didn't get their own way before the CRTC so what they are saying is if we can't get our own way, we are not going to play by the rules of the game. We are going to do everything we possibly can to hinder the CRTC applicants and to make life just as miserable as we possibly can for them. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the actions of the government in this regard are contemptible, that the ministers who have directed those actions are contemptible. I say that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to an honest government, a government that will abide by rules and regulations, that all other provinces, all other companies, all other individuals, are required to be bound by. For the government to be acting in the manner that they are, they are just actually trying to act above the law, the laws that they passed. The laws that they are sworn to maintain apparently do not apply to the government when it does not suit their purpose to have them apply. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it's giving me pleasure to move second reading of Bill No. 62.

Hon. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I will want to say a few words on this bill and tell the members at the beginning of the remarks that I intend to adjourn the debate, because I will have a lot more to say about the position of the Liberal opposition and the PC opposition in this entire controversy and I will also have a lot more to say about the position of other parties related to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few preliminary remarks before I do adjourn the debate. First of all, Mr. Speaker, this is I suppose, in the category of being a lawyeristic observation or perhaps a technical observation. But I think nevertheless that it deserves being brought to the attention of the House. And that is, in my judgment this Bill No. 62 does not do what the Leader of the Liberal Party says it intends to do. In fact, it totally and incorrectly misses the base of what he says Bill 62 was intended to do.

Under paragraph 2 of this bill, the word interpretation, the word cablecaster, is said to include both the word community and the word commercial cablecasters. The latter two terms were given identical meanings under this bill to those appearing in The Community Cablecasters Act of 1977. That is the way this bill is drafted.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the meaning of community and commercial cablecasters as defined in that Community Cablecasters Act of 1977, one will see that that bill refers only to wholly closed circuit undertakings and specifically excludes licensed cable television undertakings. If I were to play lawyer, I would I suppose, get up and say, I can support this bill in toto, since what the bill does, is it protects the close circuit operations, those that are defined by The Community Cablecasters Act, from being interfered with by any kind of another operation. But, Mr. Speaker, that I think is in the category of a technical argument and I suppose it is not worth very much of a submission other than the fact that if one was looking at this in pure black and white,

the bill would be tossed out almost immediately as not achieving what the Leader of the Liberal Party says it does.

I think another observation must also be made and this, I think, I am motivated in this remark primarily from this big lecture on obeying the law. Because, Mr. Speaker, even if the Cablecasters Protection Bill which we're debating here, did apply to CRTC licensees, as the Leader of the Liberal Party says he would want to apply but does not of course, because of the totally serious error in drafting - if it did apply to CRTC licensees, one might argue, Mr. Speaker, that the bill itself was ultra vires of the province to enact, since according to the Leader of the Liberal Party, we have been doing everything within our might to interfere with a federally licensed undertaking. That is not good for us, but for him to move in with a bill called Cablecasters Protection Bill, which tries to give certain protections or other statements for those same federally licensed operations and that is good and is intra vires for him.

Mr. Speaker, I say that any act that the provincial legislature might pass trying to deal with federally licensed cable TV undertakings in as direct a manner as the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party says this bill was intended to do but does not do, might very well be argued as being ultra vires of this legislature and I think, Mr. Speaker, as a consequence, one could say that the Leader of the Liberal Party's position is, 'Do as I say but don't do as I do.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, one or two other observations. First of all, the Leader of the Liberal Party . . . and I don't think any big deal has to be made of this because the answers have been stated in question period ad infinitum but the Leader of the Liberal Party does not accept those answers. This question is who directed Sask Tel to do what it is doing? I've been asked that question on daily question period. If I have been asked it once I must have been asked it at least a half a dozen times and I think my colleagues, the minister in charge of Sask Tel has equally been asked a half a dozen times. And the answer by all of us has been that the decisions taken by Sask Tel are the exclusive decisions taken by Sask Tel and not ministerially. That doesn't carry any weight with the Leader of the Liberal Party. He is determined to make the argument that somehow there was a political direction here on Sask Tel to do whatever it is doing and the result is that this is contempt above the law. I'm not going to be bothered by the facts or the answers contrary to the fact that I don't have a shred of evidence or anything to support my point of view. I simply maintain he says that there was some political interference. And I say again, I don't think much needs to be made out of that issue at all other than the fact that it keeps on coming up and coming up again and I think it indicates that the Liberal Party and the PC Party are intent on making this as big a political issue as they can, notwithstanding the fact that the political facts don't lie to support their position.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other observation, if I can about the general thrust of the opposition's position on this whole communications cable closed circuit debate. Because this bill, and in the remarks made by the Leader of the Liberal Party speak directly to that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that as minister in charge of communications for the province of Saskatchewan that the Liberal Party in particular aided and abetted by the PC Party and certainly by Cable Regina as one of the licencees . . . I think it varies in terms of licencees exhibited an unparalleled paranoia about CPN and an unparalleled paranoia about the imagined activities of government with respect to CPN and as it relates to Sask Tel.

An example of that paranoia, Mr. Speaker, is this repeated remark that it must have been the politicians who directed Sask Tel to do what they are doing, which is now the

subject of a court case, notwithstanding the denials and the facts and notwithstanding that there is no other shred of evidence applicable whatsoever.

I think of the extreme haste with which the Liberals and the PCs have jumped in support of those who alleged that The Liquor Act amendments, the subject of another debate, are unconstitutional. They argue that we shouldn't be doing it, that we are hassling the Cable Regina and cable companies on The Liquor Act amendments. This is another example of that paranoia of which I speak. Notwithstanding that the Alcohol Commission supports what we are trying to do in The Liquor Act amendments, notwithstanding what I believe will be the support of church organizations and community people who are knowledgeable in this liquor problem; notwithstanding the fact that it is a natural and logical extension of section 114 of The Liquor Act, the paranoia, Mr. Speaker, is there.

Mr. Speaker, everybody tells me, in this House from the members opposite, that CPN is a disastrous economic mistake. It can't succeed in the market place; it will get wiped out by the conventional cable operations. When I talked privately to some of the conventional cable operators they say the same thing and yet, Mr. Speaker, the opposition and some of the conventional cable operators are afraid of letting CPN out on the market place to meet that competition which they value and hold so dearly.

They are afraid, Mr. Speaker, of allowing CPN to meet that challenge. All they argue, even supported in some way by the press, that this is a government backed organization - CPN is government backed. In every newscast the announcer gratuitously adds the last sentence, 'CPN is a government backed closed circuit co-operative.' Well, I guess that is a fact in the case of government backed, but again, every other co-operative goes through a Co-op Guaranteed Board whether there is a guarantee of that loan and, of course, there is no suggestion that those other co-ops are government backed with all of the aspects of them.

Even is that is so, the suggestion that somehow the guaranteeing of that loan has placed CPN at an unfair advantage in the market place as against the cable operators.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Government cable.

Hon. Romanow: — Government cable, the member for Qu'Appelle says. Why doesn't he, Mr. Speaker, get up and you have a chance in the course of this debate, and say the same thing about government conventional cable and Cable Regina where there is also a substantial government guarantee of that co-operative venture? Why doesn't the media of this province get up and say, Cable Regina is a government backed operation? The same Cable Regina which is issuing the press statements about the liquor ads and the same Cable Regina which is taking this matter to court the way it is. Why don't they ever do that? Why don't the media ever report that side of this government backed Cable Regina. Mr. Speaker, or this government backed North Battleford cable operation? We never hear that. Mr. Speaker, they talk competition and they introduce competition but they, in fact, say monopoly. They talk competition but they want to protect these particular areas by this proposed bill, which of course misses the entire operation. Why, Mr. Speaker, they are as much private enterprise by the Cablecasters Protection Act as I am. Mr. Speaker, this is not private enterprise or competition, this is protection.

Mr. Speaker, I say that to stand by the Liberals in promotion of liquor advertising in cable television, to stand by the Liberals and the PCs in promotion of the conventional cable operators, to stand by the Liberals and the PCs in the selective discrimination of their facts with respect to financial loans and the like in this area belies a very deep fear that, in fact, CPN can meet in the market place the conventional cable operators. And, Mr. Speaker, I find that very strange, so-called free enterprisers. I find that to be a fundamentally difficult position for them to justify.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to adjourn the debate because I want to say a lot more on this and I want to say a lot more in quite detail about the position of the PC Party, how the PC Party and the Liberals are, in effect, killing the possibility of closed circuit television to rural Saskatchewan by trying to stop CPN. I am going to try and talk in detail about the actions of that liberally dominated agency of the CRTC and what they do with respect to communications. I am going to talk about the actions of the Minister of Communications with respect to Saskatchewan Communications and the Liberal Party. I am also going to talk, Mr. Speaker, about The Liquor Act amendments which is what this is designed in great substance to do and the positions taken by the PCs and the Liberals in the promotion of liquor advertising in the province of Saskatchewan by this operation. And they, Mr. Speaker, can laugh but as the chairman of the Saskatchewan Alcohol Commission himself said today, we oppose those who oppose the amendments which are being made by The Liquor Act operation. We will see how the Leader of the Liberal Party lasts in the next two or three weeks when the debate on The Liquor Act amendments to the cable operation, which is the logical extension applied with respect to this bill, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I want to say a lot more on this bill, therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Labour - Vote 20

Mr. Snyder: — Before we left estimates the other night, the member for Regina Wascana had asked a series of questions. If it is the wish of the committee to delay my response to him until a little later, perhaps that is the best way to go. O.K., good enough, good enough. I had intended to reply to the member for Regina Wascana but I see I am talking to an empty seat which is fairly gratifying at that.

Mr. Katzman: — I think, Mr. Minister, we can assist you by making sure that we are still on item 1 until 5:00 o'clock p.m., which is in only six minutes so that you can reply to the member - sorry, 10 minutes until 5:00 o'clock p.m.

The job evaluation is becoming a very important part of labour negotiations now. Is there any work being done within your department on recommendations of types of job evaluations? Which ones are you recommending that are finding no problems? Which areas of job evaluations are giving problems? Are you working with any of the particular groups - am not saying unions. I am saying the different styles of job evaluation, be it a manual formula, be it a work formula, be it a qualification formula. Which ones are you involved with, if any?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all it will be remembered by some members of the House that in 1976, the government agreed to establish a job evaluation study which was participated in by the Health Care Association, by the Canadian Union of Public Employees, and the Service Employees National Union. The survey was done of all of the hospitals and following that, a series of negotiations took place and only recently did they consummate a collective agreement which took into account all of the

terms and conditions of the job evaluation which eliminated throughout the hospitals with one exception, the exception is the Wascana Hospital, the job evaluation study. So we can say that portion of job evaluation has been dealt with and has been completed to the general satisfaction of all those that are involved.

With respect to the whole question of job evaluation, it's a complex and a detailed arrangement which provides that evaluation be done on the basis of skilled effort, responsibility and working conditions as between two individuals in one work establishment or in one work place which I think the member will know creates a large number of problems and leaves a number of questions that are unanswered.

Accordingly, some time ago, we embarked on a route to clear in our own minds if you like, the direction in which we should be travelling with respect to job evaluation throughout the province generally and determine, I suppose, whether it had any real practical application in the province of employers that are generally, I'm saying in the main, small employers. I don't know whether job evaluation in the private sector has any real practical application. That's something we want to find out for ourselves. So the Department of Labour has been doing a good deal of background work, has prepared a slide presentation, has done a good deal of statistical work and other work prior to putting into motion the actual job evaluation study committee. In the meantime, a number of people have been contacted from the trade union groups, from the business community and elsewhere in order to see if they will act on the committee which we presume will be in motion and will be doing a detailed study of the whole question of equal pay for work of similar value by the province of Saskatchewan and at the end of their deliberations they will be reporting to us and making recommendations that the government can consider at some time in the future. I expect it will take a considerable period of time, but we are interested and concerned particularly in light of the fact that the federal government in an amendment to one of its federal statutes recently has in effect enacted a piece of legislation that provides for equal pay for work of equal value without even a glimmering of an idea or a shadow of hope of implementing it because it has no real terms of reference and no guidelines and they are actually I think, in a position to do nothing in the event that an attempt is made to put into place the concept of equal pay for work of equal value. That is where we are at this moment. We are in the process of having done a good deal of background work, some slide presentations for public presentation, we have been in the process of establishing a committee and drafting for them their terms of reference in order that we will be able to begin the job evaluation study that the committee will conduct in the not too distant future.

Mr. Katzman: — You say you're still drafting the terms, is that correct? You are still drafting the terms of reference for this committee?

Mr. Snyder: — Yes, we generally have the terms of reference together. I will give them to you if you like.

Mr. Katzman: — Well, I was just going to ask you, if in the terms of reference you have made some special recommendations re the service industry, and when I refer to the service industry I mean the non-manufacturing type of industry versus the manufacturing industry, for which the formula will be quite different I think and the evaluation will be quite different.

Mr. Snyder: — I am not at all sure that we have made any attempt and if my memory serves me correctly I am not sure if we attempted to draw any distinction between the service industry, the manufacturing industry or whatever. I think the terms of reference

as I recall them, are very broad and would . . . I'll read them if you like for your consideration. They are not terribly lengthy. The terms of reference to the committee are as follows:

To identify problem areas regarding equal pay for work of equal value which requires study.

To develop a process of public information and consultation with organized labour, business, women's organizations and the general public.

To evaluate the results of studies and public input, and,

To make recommendations to the Minister of Labour regarding whether or not the changes in legislation are appropriate and what those changes should be.

Those are basically broad terms of reference which I think give the committee an indication of, I think a good degree of latitude within which they can operate freely.

Mr. Katzman: — In my own personal opinion, I believe job evaluation will become an everyday involvement at the bargaining table in the future by the looks of the indications today. It seems to withdraw the favouritism of individuals within a job place that developed over the old system of reclassifications. As one who was involved with Local 59 job evaluation when it was first started, and I understand it presently is in the last couple of days in dispute with the city of Saskatoon, on the formula that ended up being used, it looks as if there is going to be some judgment calls being made before people get into job evaluations. The reason I say that is in the 59 study the decisions that were made at the start were with individuals getting into it for the first time and the recommendations coming from management side, a very inexperienced area, from the union side they had some experts come in to assist in the drawing of the formula to do the rating manual. The decision on how you develop a rating manual effects the end result of the whole process. My concern is, are you doing any recommendations so that down the road anybody who gets into a rating system is not locked into something that will just blow itself totally out of proportion. For an example, one of the problems that I saw in the Local 59 job evaluation that has come to light, in the over-emphasis in certain areas and the under-emphasis of mental strain, versus physical strain. It is a hard thing to relate what the responsibility of an individual, who is responsible for a \$500,000 operation of building a plant, versus the fellow that is responsible for a plant of maybe \$60,000, but more physical labour.

That, down the road, has become a real problem in making the final adjustment on a job evaluation program. My concern is that there has to be somebody - and in this case I think maybe the government will be one of those somebodies, who will make some recommendations to those that are considering going into job evaluations, in the loopholes, in the spots that you don't want to move to, the pitfalls to look out for. I am concerned, are you doing any work in making recommendations. Look, your industry is so multi complex that maybe you should have one rating manual for manual labour and one rating manual for special skills, for example, inside/outside comparison if you wish. Are you looking at these problems, because I think down the road there are really bad pitfalls.

Mr. Snyder: — Well, I think the hon. member draws attention to the complexity of the problem in attempting to reach a major judgment in the whole job evaluation study.

This committee that I drew attention to and the terms of reference that I mentioned to you, will be under the direct supervision of, chairing that particular committee, Lynn Pearson will be chairing that committee and is very much aware of the problems that you draw attention to that have been plaguing us for some time. At the same time we are very conscious of those pitfalls that you draw attention to because of the experience that we have already had with job evaluation in the hospitals system, but in addition to that, some of the difficulties that have been experienced in Saskatoon in the job evaluation that was done between the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the city of Saskatoon. So we are not going into it entirely blind and without some concept of the difficulties and the problems involved. However, it is as you say, an item that is front and centre and one I think we cannot afford to ignore. It is something that deserves a concentrated study and a recommendation by all segments of the community and that is what we are attempting to arrive at with the study that I have drawn attention to.

So all the things that you have drawn attention to in your remarks are foremost in the thoughts of those people who are currently putting the study together and drafting terms of reference for that committee.

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