

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Tuesday, April 17, 1979.

EVENING SESSION

SECOND READINGS

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved second reading of Bill No. 64 — **An Act to amend The Education Act.**

He said: You'll have to excuse me. I haven't got my glasses.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Here, I'll read for you.

MR. TAYLOR: — My concern on this bill is in two areas. As I understand The Education Act, in 1978, it was a consolidation and updating of a number of acts which I believe is a very worthwhile move (as I have said before in this House). However, if we are updating the act to 1978 standards, then I believe we should update it in all aspects. I realize that when this act was put together there were numerous acts that were encompassed into The Education Act. There was a lot of material to go through and I would imagine that much of it was taken in totality and put into this act and screened rather rapidly. My concern is sections 294 and 299 which, in this act, deal with the shares of companies. They indicate that the shares will be divided on a proportionate basis between Protestant and Roman Catholic.

I can understand that when we became a province in 1905, the founding groups of the province of Saskatchewan were mainly Protestant and Roman Catholic. Because most of the people that came here to start this province came from the province of Ontario, some from the United States. At that time in the history of Canada most of the people did belong to one or two of these religious groups, whether they would be various segments of the Protestant religion or they were Roman Catholic. However, my contention is that today in our society in Saskatchewan we have a much more cosmopolitan society. We have a much more diversified society along religious grounds. I do not think that an act that is updating an important facet of our society such as education should narrow itself if we are really going to express the nature of our province in the year 1978 when it was enacted or 1979 as I am speaking now. So, my concern is with section 294, subsection 3, where it states:

the share or portion of the property of any company assessed in a municipality for separate school purposes under this Section shall bear the same ration in proportion to the whole property or the company assessable within the municipality as the amount of proportion of the paid or partly paid up shares or stock of the company held and possessed by Protestant or Roman Catholics, as the case may be, bears to the whole amount of the paid up or partly paid up shares of the stock or company.

Now I think that is being unfair to certain religious groups in our society. I don't think they should have to be designated as Protestant or Roman Catholic. I won't go on to name all the other religious groups that are in society. I am sure the members opposite, as my colleagues here, are aware of these. In view of that, I figure that subsections 3 designating the amount of share that should go to the support of separate schools should read as follows, as I said in the amendment

April 17, 1979

Section 294(3) is amended by striking out Protestants or Roman Catholics as the case may be in the sixth and seventh lines and substituting the following:

supporters of the separate school division.

So, in that case I think we only need to say the supporters of the separate school division because that is what is being discussed in that subsection.

Now, turning to subsection 299 and 299(1) reads as follows:

A company may, by statutory declaration of the president, vice president or secretary of the company or some other person having the managements of its affairs in Saskatchewan who can testify to the facts, notify the council of the municipality of the Minister of Municipal Affairs in respect of a local improvement district on or before the first day of May in each year, or where the council has adopted the provisions of the Urban Municipalities Act (1970) by which taxes for any year are to be based upon an assessment made in the previous year, then on or before the first day of December in the year in which the assessment was made, that it is impossible owing to the numbers of shareholders and their wide distribution and kind of residence to ascertain the proportion of the share of stock of the company held by Protestants or Roman Catholics, respectively.

Now, in that situation, I feel that we should be striking out again the words Protestant and Roman Catholic, Mr. Speaker, and as follows. I would read section 299 is amended by striking out Protestant or Roman Catholic in the last line of section 1 and substituting the following:

Supporters of the public school division and supporters of the separate school division.

And then the next section that I refer to is in section 3. I won't read the whole section, but where it says, where all the shareholders of the company are either Protestant or Roman Catholic, the company may, within the period limited by subsection 1 and it goes on. In that section again, I would strike out the words Protestant and Roman Catholic, in the first and second lines of subsection 3 and substitute the following:

Supporters of the public school division or supporters of the separate school division.

Those are the amendments that I feel should be necessary to bring The Education Act, 1978 up to date and to be a true representation of the province of Saskatchewan and its religious minority groups that exist today.

I move this bill now be read a second time.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — I would like to say a few words on this at a later date and consequently I would ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, it gives me pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of his Assembly, the members of the Indian Head boy scout troop and their leader Constable Mark LeMaistre, who are seated in the gallery here. I should point out that Constable LeMaistre is working very hard to try to bring Camp Gilwell, which is the boy scout camp on the edge of Mission Lake, into service for the boy scouts in southeastern Saskatchewan, and I commend his efforts. It's a beautiful camp (they need some improvements to their bathroom facilities and he's working hard on this) and I wish him every success. I hope the boys and you, Mark, enjoy your time here tonight watching our session.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES — VOTE 39

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Does the minister have any guests to introduce?

HON. A.S. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — I'd like to introduce two new officials with me here this evening, first of all Mrs. Freda McEwen, budget officer, and Walt Bailey, director of forestry.

ITEM 1 (Con't)

MR. MATSALLA: — While I'm on my feet, I'd like to make some remarks with regard to the crop depredation program, but more particularly and specifically, provide perhaps more detail on the agreements that have been signed by me as the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources and by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). I'm going to table these so that the members opposite may have access to them.

First of all, I'd like to make reference to the prevention agreement. I think there was some question as to when I, as the minister, signed this agreement, as well as the Minister of Agriculture. I think at the time I've indicated that I signed the agreement on September 18, 1978 and the Minister of Agriculture I thought signed the agreements at the same time. I now have with me copies of the agreements, as well as covering letters. Now the first agreement that I'm referring to is the prevention agreement. Again I say it was signed on September 18, 1978. I have a copy of the letter that went to the Hon. Len Marchand along with the agreement. Then in February, 1979 I have a letter from the federal minister acknowledging my letter, as well as a receipt of the agreement, and returning the agreement to me. Now, this prevention agreement covers the prevention aspect of the program from April 1, 1978 to March 31, 1979. This is for the sum of \$365,000 to cover projects to prevent crop damage by migratory waterfowl, and program research in the amount of \$250,000.

It think it's a bit confusing because at the top of the agreement is a date shown that is different from the date I am referring to, the time that I signed, and that is February 15, 1979. Now, that is a date that has been inserted after the federal minister very likely placed his signature onto the agreement, so there was a lapse of several months before the thing was finalized. Nevertheless, we've tried to process it as quickly as possible on this end and there's nothing much we can do as to when the federal minister signs the agreement.

April 17, 1979

I want to now refer to the compensation agreement. This one too was signed on September 18, by both ministers. The Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Kaeding, also has a covering letter to the federal Minister of Agriculture, Eugene Whelan, dated September 18, 1978. I note there has been a reply acknowledging the agreement on March 13, 1979, and the date appearing at the top of the agreement is March 1, 1979. Now that too apparently was the date when the federal minister had signed the agreement, and this one is for the amount of \$675,000. I believe the hon. member has that agreement. I don't have any extra copies. Nevertheless, I'm prepared to table these so that the opposition members may have access to them.

Hopefully, Mr. Chairman, this clarifies the whole area of the crop depredation agreement and why there is some discrepancy as to the date.

MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie): — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Now, under the prevention agreement, you were stating figures of \$365,000 and \$250,000. That came to a total in my figures of \$615,000. Is that not correct? Also, is that on top of the \$675,000 under the crop compensation program?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member's question, the \$250,000 apparently refers to the federal spending, while the \$365,000 is one that is matched with the provincial funds.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I would like now to go (and we touched on it a little bit the other day) to the Wildlife Development Fund. I think you know the section of land (I don't have the figures right here) — section 5, 39-18-W3rd that you said your department had purchased. I read through Hansard and I found that you said officials had made the decision, as well as yourself. In there, I would just like it clarified for me a little more. Did you or any of your officials look at that piece of land before it was purchased?

MR. MATSALLA: — The land has been inspected and evaluated and assessed by the administrator of the Wildlife Development Fund, the late Mr. Pierre Bergren, and we in the department have followed his recommendations.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., then it was upon the gentleman's input into it that you made your decision to buy this, is that correct?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, most certainly we consider all the recommendations that are made with respect to the land and in consideration of these recommendations, we have made our decision to purchase the land.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., Mr. Minister, I would like to just go into a little more depth in this and then I will leave it. My recommendations to you on this purchase of land for the Wildlife Development Fund is, I believe an error was made, an error of judgment was made on your part, and in future, before any more of this land is purchased, I would ask you to please look this land over, either yourself or your deputy minister, more closely because it did end up by putting a young farmer out of the cattle business.

My other question to you is, who has control right now of the Wildlife Development Fund?

MR. MATSALLA: — The legislature is the body that appropriates funds to the Wildlife

Development Fund.

MR. GARNER: — Who has control?

MR. MATSALLA: — The department has control over the spending of the funds, nevertheless there is cabinet approval.

MR. GARNER: — How much land does your department then, in co-operation with the Wildlife Development Fund, plan on buying in this upcoming year and what money has been allocated aside for buying this land, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me or the department to say what lands or the amount of land we may be buying this year. It all depends on the availability of land, the quality of land, and the rest of that, so it is very difficult to say at this point in time just how much land we may be buying through the Wildlife Development Fund.

MR. GARNER: — How much money have you set aside? Have you set any money aside?

MR. MATSALLA: — At the present time there is roughly \$260,000 available in the fund.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, what procedure is used in order to obtain this land? Do you go through the papers on land that is being tendered for sale or by individuals approaching you to buy this land for the Wildlife Development Fund?

MR. MATSALLA: — I think perhaps there are a number of ways we go through in order to place a bid on the land. We have a number of requests, as a matter of fact quite a number of requests from individual landowners expressing desire that the department purchase the land or the government purchase the land for wildlife purposes. At the same time there are officers in the area who have fairly good knowledge of land that is suitable for wildlife purposes. If there is any indication that the land is offered for sale, we, let me put it this way, keep an eye on it. If the land is available it is advertised then we assess the area of suitability for wildlife purposes and determine whether or not we should place a bid on it. And then, of course, there are just the ads, watching the ads to see what lands are available. I suppose you might say there are three different ways we might be able to get our attention to the purchase of the land. One is the landowners desire to sell the land for wildlife purposes, another one is our conservation officers in the area are quite aware of the lands that are suitable for wildlife purposes and whether they may be coming up for sale. Then, of course, we focus our attention on local newspapers that may be available and at the same time, watch advertising of land that may be offered for sale. If it's suitable for wildlife purposes, then, of course, we may be interested in it.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, (and this gets back to this section of land. I would really like to get away from it) I think there's been an error made in the decision to buy this land. Two or three questions: first of all, I personally do not believe this is wildlife development land. It's a section of pasture land. What is the procedure or policy in your department regarding putting out a lease for this land or if you have other land around the province like this, because I mean, this is one example where there's been, in my estimation, an error made in buying this land? Once again, do you not think that rather than selecting land for sale from the paper, you should have your wildlife organization make the representation to you and you should stay out of the land buying business

unless they recommend it to you? Mr. Minister, in this case, we had a young farmer who had his pasture land bought out from underneath him by the Government of Saskatchewan. It put this man out of the cattle business. I has been an error. Now, I don't know how many errors there's been around the province. But I think your department should look into it very closely before you go around spending . . . you've got \$260 million, unless my figures are incorrect, to buy more land. I think this has been an error and before any more land is bought, I think you had better start getting in touch with your regional men working out there. On this pasture land that has been bought, whether it's pasture land or grain land, how about your department looking in to leasing this out for grazing permit? You can still run cattle on it, the two will run together — the wildlife and the rancher can still work hand in hand on this.

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, I thought I heard the hon. member indicate that we should follow the recommendations of the wildlife interests. I suppose he's referring to the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation. Now let me tell the hon. member that if we were to follow some of the recommendations that the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation and other wildlife interests make to us, I think we would be buying a lot of this land and there would be a lot of pressure because they're certainly interested in wildlife habitat. We are prepared to consult with the wildlife interests, but I think I can tell the hon. member that their interests would be for us to buy as much of this wildlife habitat land as may be made available. But at the same time, I might say that maybe there was an error in this case. I'm not sure, I'm just taking the hon. member's word for it. But we certainly consult. We not only consult with the people in the area, but we also consult with rural municipalities. There are rural municipal councils that have indicated interest to us that we should be purchasing some of this land for wildlife habitat purposes.

As I say, there may have been an error, but generally speaking, I think we are in fairly close consultation with the interest there might be for any of these particular wildlife lands. I think that, generally speaking, the purchases the department has made hasn't put too many farmers out of commission. Maybe in this particular case it may have caused some hardship. I'm not too sure. I'm not that well acquainted with the local situation there. Generally speaking, I think our decisions are made after full consideration of any interest there may be towards this land.

MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Minister, in this one case then I would ask you and your department to look into it and review it. I would still like the answer to my previous question regarding grazing leases on not only this section of land but other land that you have around the province. Will your department be looking into this?

MR. MATSALLA: — Yes, it certainly will.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, in some of your provincial parks, reading over your annual report, it sated that you are buying electronic gates. How many of these gates were purchased and where were they purchased and for how much money? Mr. Minister, while you are looking that up maybe you could also find something else for me. Lighting was also purchased. I would like to know who it was purchased from, where and for how much money? That ties in with my other question.

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member referred to regional parks. Is that right? It should be provincial. We don't purchase any electronic gates for regional parks. If the regional park authority wishes to purchase a gate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Did he say provincial? Sorry, I didn't hear that.

There were 15 electronic gates purchased. This went into about 10 of the provincial parks. Some of them are campgrounds. Therefore, there may be two in a park. These were purchased through the purchasing agency. Therefore, I can't tell you what the firm would be. When I said purchasing agency I meant the department of supply and services. Insofar as lighting, providing lighting in the parks, is that what the hon. member's question was regarding? It's the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I would like to know along our major highways, how many roadside campsites we have presently in the province and how many are you planning on erecting or building in the upcoming year?

MR. MATSALLA: — I am sorry. We just don't have the information to the number of campsites along the highways, but it is not our intention to build any campsites this year.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, this does startle me a little bit, with travelling throughout Canada, and that is why I wanted to know how many roadside camps we do have in Saskatchewan. We have a tourism deficit this year. We are trying to attract more tourists to the province. Do you not agree that maybe we should have more of these roadside campsites for people travelling through the province with children?

MR. MATSALLA: — My answer is, most certainly, yes. We should have more campsites. We should expand our campgrounds. We should provide additional services in our provincial parks and many other things. It is a question of funds and I think I have indicated to the House, the other day, that we are trying to make our dollars stretch as much as possible so that we can continue to provide top-notch maintenance and services in our recreational areas. I suppose, if we were to place more funds in my department . . . Of course that calls for more taxes or greater fees or we'd operate on a deficit. Nevertheless that has to be covered sooner or later. At the same time, again, I want to remind the hon. member and the members opposite that I have heard it said more than once you people are spending too much money. Go easy! So we are trying to hit a happy medium where we are still going to continue to provide adequate services without having to raise taxes to a degree that may be a hardship to many.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, the minister responsible for tourism, makes the suggestion that we are always asking them to reduce funding. Well, that is correct when we refer to spending good money after bad. What we are referring to here is spending money that might, hopefully, make money.

Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, there is quite a substantial difference. Surely if we can attract tourists to this province and get those tourist dollars here in Saskatchewan, that is what your department requires. You speak of a need for facilities which we have raised and you agree with. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you say you would go ahead with those expansions, that you would make those improvements, if it were not for a shortage of funds.

Then Mr. Minister, could you tell us and tell this committee, what kinds of funds are you looking at that would put you in a position where you could provide the proper tourism and renewable resources, supplies, if you like, necessary equipment, necessary recreation spots or campsites, if you like, in place that would attract tourists? Do you have any idea? If you can say there's a shortage, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand then on the other and conversely you should have some idea as a concerned minister with regard to your department, as to what expenditures you would feel would be more

adequate. You should know the department. You should have some idea. I'd like an answer to that question.

Secondly, you would be aware you turned down an offer by myself and some of the concerned individuals within my constituency to provide for you and in fact provide the transportation for tiger lilies that have been manufactured by Goodman Steel and Iron Works Ltd. of Rocanville for the border crossings. Mr. Minister, there are four including the Trans-Canada and the Yellowhead. We thought that would be quite an asset to this province. We have people who enter this province; they're thirty miles inside the border, and they say, when do we get to Saskatchewan? The service station attendant has to tell them well, you're already here. You need to devise ways and means of diverting traffic once it gets on those two major thoroughfares, the Yellowhead and the Trans-Canada, because they whisk across this province in no time flat at 63 miles per hour or 100 kilometres.

Mr. Minister, I suggest — not that you are totally at fault in this area, I'm just making another suggestion which I have done many times — that you could attempt to divert traffic north in particular. Those kinds of diversions would assist the northern constituencies. There are many of us here who are representing northern constituencies. Now, Mr. Minister, those are some of the observations that I make and you really can't speak of money when you are made an offer that wasn't going to cost your department, if that was your decision. We said we'd provide them if you were going to be difficult. We wanted them at those border crossing so badly, and the people want them there so badly; they want improvements at those border crossing so badly we were prepared to do it at not cost to the government. That's right. This offer was made and the minister knows it. And this minister refused at that time and has refused to this date. I suggest that surely if you refused to even accept the charity of the people of Saskatchewan who want improvements so badly they're prepared to finance those ventures themselves, then you have to answer one way or the other. Either there are substantial funds or there are not, and if there are not, then what expected expenditures do you see in the next year or two to match what you feel would be appropriate spending for this department?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is not fully aware of the budget process. There are just so many dollars to spend and this has to be sorted out and allocated to the various departments of government. Certainly every department requests the kind of program which it would like to see, but during a budget process the allocation of funds are made in such a way that appear to the government to be as fair as possible in the various areas of activity.

Now I think you will note that in our department there has been an increase of funds. Sure, we can stand more funding and again I say other departments could do as well, but in the whole process of budgeting we have to be fully aware that there are just so many dollars to spend. If we are going to attempt to try and keep a line on tax increases then we just have to be prepared to live with the kinds of funds which we have.

The hon. member makes some reference to tiger lilies. I think these refer to border entry signs. I recall the hon. member discussing this with me. But I certainly didn't have any representation from anyone who would offer these kinds of signs to us. I think perhaps he may have had some discussion with these people, but there hasn't been anything which came into my office, in a written form, to indicate that this was available to us. Furthermore, the erection of signs along the highway, and the border entry signs, are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Highways. I believe during the highway

estimates there has been some discussion on that.

For the hon. member to say that we are doing nothing in order to try to divert travellers off the main highways, like the Trans-Canada Highway, is incorrect. For the last couple of years we have established six regional tourism associations and these set to work to attempt to divert the traffic off the main thoroughfare. From the indications we had last year, from the experience we had last year, this has been proving to be a success. Not the kind of success we are looking for, but it may take some time.

The other across-Saskatchewan highway, the Yellowhead Highway, has indicated there are more people spending more time along that highway route than there are along the Trans-Canada. So I think that we are attempting to divert the traffic off the two major highways through the province.

I think one of the other things which the members opposite should be aware of is that most of our tourists are Saskatchewan tourists. Mr. Chairman, 81 per cent of our tourists are Saskatchewan tourists. Furthermore, I want to inform that there has been a reduction of the number of visitors south of the border by about 5 per cent. But there has been an increase of about 8 per cent of visitors from out-of-province, within Canada. Therefore, if we look at it in terms of the number of visitors that are tourists from outside of the province, they have increased significantly over the last year. I'm optimistic that this is going to continue.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, while I thank the minister for his remarks, it always discourages me when they don't hear me right the first time. I did not say that you were not diverting people off the main thoroughfares. I said that I felt that you should be diverting them — spending more attention in that direction. That would be a good idea. I'm glad to see that you concur with that and that you are taking that direction. I'm just encouraging you to continue to do that. You suggest and state emphatically, and as a matter of fact, that the tourists from the United States are down and that we have an increase from out-of-province. Well, that's good too that Canadians are in fact touring in their own country and not going south but I believe it to be in our interests to have the Americans coming to Saskatchewan and in particular out-of-province people coming to Saskatchewan.

I'm looking at that in terms, Mr. Chairman, of new dollars in Saskatchewan. If it's just Saskatchewan people touring within their own province, it's no more than a circulation of dollars. We want to bring new dollars to Saskatchewan. We can do that through tourists and, Mr. Chairman, I guess what I am suggesting to the minister responsible for Tourism and Renewable Resources (Mr. Matsalla) is that you look at your department as a department that could, in fact, make money instead of a department that actually loses money in the way of providing a service. Now, I believe that it could be that kind of a department, if attention was directed to it.

Surely, and one could consider . . . and I don't mind making the suggestion. I know that there will be oohs and has from that side of the House. But one would wonder, in many instances, if a lot of these parks were in private control if there would not be more of an incentive . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I knew that would come. You give a private entrepreneur the opportunity to develop a park in the way that he knows will make money. He has the incentive and it's either that or you take my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that this department should be looking at the various parks as a way not only to provide a service for those people that want to tour and enjoy our province. We don't want it to become a financial burden on them and that is the advantage of the provincial

government being in control of the parks, of which I concur with.

But you would also, Mr. Chairman, realize that the liquor vending outlets are a combination of both. You have quite often spoke of your — I know the minister responsible for Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) speaks of them — association with the multinationals in development and you could look at that as well, Mr. Minister, in terms of developing areas within our province that are suitable for recreation with the private sector. Now that's the same thing and you can't agree with it one day and disagree with it the next. It's the same philosophy that you're advocating in the development of other areas. I think the development of tourism in the province is very important as well.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those are just some of the comments that I make in that regard and I don't have to tell the minister again that there's many shortcomings in terms of people coming into the province; you know the border crossing — whether or not they're elaborate enough or not — that you already know. But in many years gone by they have not been and I think it's quite to our advantage to point out to people coming to this province that we've got something to offer, so that they don't drive right through, that they drive a little and stop to see our province. We have a lot to offer.

Another suggestion that I have made before is that in the constituency of Moosomin where we have the Kenosee Park, it surprises me that you don't even have any information made available to the many, many tourists. I understand it is the third largest populace there in the province, at its peak season. So that is a lot of people, second only to Regina and Saskatoon. Surely that would be a prime opportunity, if you want to look at it from your point of view at least, to advertise the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the potash mine at Rocanville. You could be making those many people, concentrated in one place for a month or two, aware of that potash mine as a tourist site, and have people directed and diverted from Kenosee for a day or two. When you go down to that park you see many people there and they can only swim and waterski and loaf around so much. They are looking for something to do and some other site to see in the vicinity. It is not too far for them to go to Rocanville to see the potash mine. You could organize tours there. I think that is a substantial recreation facility in itself which you have. So, Mr. Chairman, that is just another suggestion that I put before the minister.

The other thing that I take note of, Mr. Chairman, is the confusion between the Department of Highways and the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. You ask one a question and he says it is the other department and vice versa. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be fair for either minister to answer on behalf of the other in that regard, where it is a kind of intermingling, if you like, jurisdiction.

Now Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise one more concern, and that would be with regard to the movement of new fish supplies into what would hopefully be, lakes that would substantiate their growth and their actual livelihood. When you move fish from Prince Albert to Moosomin Lake, they have repeatedly died each year. That lake just doesn't sustain fish life. On the other hand, you have a very small body of water, a man-made lake at Welwyn which does sustain fish life. My suggestion, Mr. Chairman (and this may be a small matter but it is a concern to the people out there) is that since all of the people from the Moosomin area go over to Welwyn to fish, why wouldn't it be more appropriate to move fish into Welwyn than into Moosomin, where they don't live? Now that is logical and it makes sense, so I lay that before you. I know that the last time you transplanted fish from Prince Albert to Moosomin, it was said that would be the last effort made. Well, I suggest that you could make one more effort and that would be to

put them into Welwyn Lake and not Moosomin because they will live in Welwyn Lake. We know that for sure. I used to fish that area when I was a child. So, Mr. Chairman, that is just one more suggestion, and with that I leave it to the critic.

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, just a few comments. First of all, I must say that I appreciate some of the remarks that have been made by the hon. member with respect to some of the facilities that we do have for our tourists and recreation in general.

I would like to provide some information to the hon. member with respect to disseminating information at Kenosee. There are three, at least three facilities in Kenosee: there's the chalet where information is available; there's the administration office as well as the campground office. So, I think, that's pretty well sufficient in one particular area in so far as providing for information to tourists. Near Moosomin, we have a tourist information centre. That too is fairly handy for the tourists in order to obtain information that they may wish about our province and then to the south is an information centre at North Portal. So, for him to say that we are not providing enough outlets for information to tourists, I don't think is quite correct.

Again, going back to the border entry signs, we are always working very closely with the Department of Highways (that falls under their jurisdiction in so far as designing signs that are suitable at the border entry). I might inform the hon. member and the House that we are presently working with the Department of Highways in order to construct suitable signs at the border entries. Hopefully, we might be able to have them out next year so that we might be able to celebrate Saskatchewan along with the tourists that may come in and hear some of their comments with respect to our attractive entry signs. I think the hon. member is also aware that we do work with the Department of Highways very closely in the production of maps. I think you will find that the highway map that Saskatchewan produces is one of the most attractive maps that is available in Canada.

He made some reference with respect to stocking Moosomin lake with fish. Moosomin Lake apparently is in the Moosomin Regional Park and it's under the local authority. We certainly work very closely with the regional park authority when it comes to the stocking of fish, and as far as Welwyn is concerned, I think that's one lake we might be able to have our officials look into and see what the possibilities are for survival of fish in that lake.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, since the minister has stated earlier and I have brought it up many times in this House (and I'm not finished with it yet, I'll keep at it until we do get a mandatory training program for our younger people), will the minister please tell me how many indoor firearm ranges we have right now in the province of Saskatchewan?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I am not able to provide that information. These are set up by the various gun clubs and wildlife federation people and, therefore, I am not in a position to give you that information. If I had it, I would.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I know you don't set them up. I know the individual organizations set them up. First of all, what grants are eligible to individuals or organizations for starting up and building a firearms range?

April 17, 1979

MR. MATSALLA: — There are no grants available from our department for that purpose.

MR. GARNER: — This has opened up something different, Mr. Minister. First of all, was there any grant money allocated to the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation for the building and the range they have northeast of Saskatoon? I have been in the building, in the facility. The minister was there this past, I think, February to a supper and a meeting. Were there any grants allocated from the provincial government to build that building or the range?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, in so far as our department is concerned there hasn't been any financial assistance given to that range or any other range. As far as other grants that may have been available from other departments of government, I would guess there weren't any, but I can't tell you that accurately.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, this has opened up something different then. Since you stated and backed down on your word for the mandatory firearm training program, the wildlife organizations are tying, at their very best, to train all these young hunters for the future and for now. In the province of Saskatchewan you can almost get a grant to blow your nose. Now, all I am asking for is for grants to be allocated to organizations or individuals to build indoor range facilities, because we have a very long winter in this country and that is the time when most of the people working these organizations have the time to spend with our young people. Do you not think that it is time your department looked into this, of providing a grant for building ranges in Saskatchewan for the training of young people and other sportsmen alike?

MR. MATSALLA: — Let me, first of all, go back to a question that was asked earlier. I am given to understand that the Department of Culture and Youth has provided some financial assistance to the Saskatoon branch. I don't have the figure. When the Department of Culture and Youth comes up you might be in a position to ask your question then.

I want to now point out our involvement in the firearm safety program. I have indicated that our department doesn't provide any assistance for capital purposes, but we are quite actively involved in providing assistance towards the training program.

Last year, the program has been expanded and it is going to continue. The grant has been increased from \$1 to \$3 per graduating student to the sponsoring organizations. In 1978 a total of 6,415 residents of Saskatchewan graduated from the program. This represents an increase of 2,269 students over 1977 or an increase of over 54 per cent. That, in itself, would indicate that the expanded program is proving to be a very successful program.

Now if the hon. member is determined that it should be mandatory, then I think he is speaking against his own philosophy because I hear you people talking about compulsion and label the government here with compelling people to do this and compelling people to do that. Now, if we are successful in a program on a voluntary basis, I, as this point in time, cannot see a need for a mandatory program. If there is a need for it, we'll certainly consider it, because we have been considering it but in this direction I think we have been very successful and I think you will agree with me. I also want to point out that there has been an increased grant to the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation towards this program from \$1,000 to \$4,000 and this is for the administration and promotion of the program.

MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm glad you brought it up because I didn't want to have to get into one of these matches tonight.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You better look out, boys.

MR. GARNER: — That's right, you better look out because that's done it. Mr. Minister, why, in 1977, would you stand up at a convention and promise the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation organization that our government was going to implement the mandatory firearm training program? It's very nice to stand up there and get lots of hurray, the great minister is doing a good job. All of a sudden the program is scrapped. Why? Because one man makes a decision. The whole Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation organization has wanted it. They have the instructors in place to do the training. Now the minister has backed out.

Now the minister says to me, I believe in mandatory this and mandatory that. I don't believe in state control of farm lands but, Mr. Minister, I do believe very strongly in the mandatory program for training our young hunters because, Mr. Minister, maybe you or the members opposite enjoy seeing young people get shot, going to funerals because some young fellow has bought a gun and a hunting licence and a box o shells and gone out and there has been a serious accident. I don't enjoy that, Mr. Minister, so don't try to hang that on me, please.

Now, I will comment you for raising from \$1 to \$3 per graduating student. That's great. But I was very surprised to hear and glad to hear that there is a grant from culture and youth, but what has culture and youth got to do with building firearm ranges? Mr. Minister, it's in the wrong department giving grants out for that. These grants should come from your department.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's that got to do with culture, Ned?

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, another thing then. O.K., you have raised from \$1 to \$3 for the graduating student. All that these organizations are asking for is a place to build and they are not going to go out to build palaces. They just want a place where they can train these young people in the wintertime when they have lots of time. Are you saying, Mr. Minister, that you don't want them to have these facilities or you don't want these young people to be trained? Since you won't make the program mandatory you sill allow for that young person to go in and buy a hunting license and a rifle and a box of shells and go out hunting without the proper training. Mr. Minister, you don't allow someone to go and buy a car and go out and drive it without getting training first. That's mandatory, and that's good. Your department had better look at this closer.

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the issue here is not the firearm safety program. It is whether or not something should be mandatory or whether or not something should be voluntary. I am surprised to hear from the hon. member I suppose, he is talking for he caucus there that he would like to see programs being mandatory and yet when it comes to seat belts in the car, no, that's no good because it's mandatory. You are not thinking about the matter of saving lives. But, because it's mandatory that's why you are against seat belts. But, when it comes to a mandatory firearm safety program it's better if it's mandatory rather than voluntary.

I just can't understand the philosophy of the hon. member with regard to whether or not something should be mandatory or voluntary.

Whether or not a grant comes from the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources or whether it comes from culture and youth, I don't think should make the difference. Our dollar isn't any different than the culture and youth dollar. So, the fact that the Saskatoon Federation has received some financial assistance from culture and youth I can't see makes any difference. I can't see the criticism that is being put forth by the hon. member. Do you feel that if that dollar came from tourism and renewable resources it would have been a better dollar, or would have been better spent? I can't understand that. There is really not that much difference.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, first of all, I agree that there has to be some training done in the field but are you trying to tell me that you take that young person out in the field and teach him how to load a gun in the field? Most of those boys don't even know how to load a gun and yet they're allowed to buy the gun and buy the shells.

Mr. Minister, as far as where the grant comes from, it's typical of how the government is doing things. It isn't coming from the right department. Granted it's there, but by the time an organization gets through the government's red tape and the big circle they go around, they throw their hands up and say, well, that's it. Mr. Minister, this grant money for these ranges should be in your department, not in culture and youth. Nothing wrong with the grants. They're good. But I'll have to look, when we get to culture and youth, at what those grants are and who has applied for them, because I have two or three organizations in my constituency that want to build ranges, and they want to know what money they can get as grant money for this. But, Mr. Minister, we'll leave this alone, because I can see it's very evident, that we differ very much on mandatory training programs. I'm concerned about them. I guess maybe your department isn't quite as concerned about them.

Mr. Minister, I'd like to move to our provincial parks. The Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Byers) said we should all leave here and go to the parks. It would be a little cold right now. Can you give me an approximate cost of damage done as a result of vandalism in the parks last year?

MR. MATSALLA: — Before I give you the answer to that question, there's one question that was asked earlier as to how many major campgrounds and picnic sites there are along the highways. There are 65.

The cost of damage to the park facilities, our recreation facilities, was in the neighbourhood of \$50,000.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, can you tell me if there have been any court cases, or arrests, or convictions of violators or vandals in the parks in the last two or three years?

MR. MATSALLA: — I'm sorry. I want to make a correction on the first figure. I said \$50,000. It should be \$15,000 in damage, and there were some violations. We just

don't have the figure handy here. We can get you that figure later, unless it's important that it be given to you now.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, who makes most of the repairs on this vandalism in the parks?

MR. MATSALLA: — Joe, anything that's possible to be repaired by our own parks people is done by the employees.

MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, at Kenosee Lake, in the Moose Mountain provincial Park, I've noticed over the past four or five years that the campgrounds don't seem to be able to hold the amount of people who want to get into it. As a result, a lot of times they have to park in the parking lot down by the beach. Have you opened up any new development in the provincial park down there this year regarding this?

MR. MATSALLA: — There has been an expansion in the campground last year. There are some plans for this year. I just couldn't tell you at the moment how many sites this would be. We could get you that figure. There was an expansion last year and it is proposed there will be some expansion this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Great, great!

MR. PICKERING: — Another thing, Mr. Minister, the government hotel at Kenosee Lake. Has there been any consideration given to keeping that open the year round to attract tourists and maybe give some of the people on the White Bear Indian Reserve employment during the winter months?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to direct a question to clarify the question. Is it a motel or a hotel you are referring to, or a chalet?

MR. PICKERING: — The motel.

MR. MATSALLA: — At the present time the motel is not winterized, so therefore, we're not going to be able to use it until the time that we're able to get it winterized. There is a problem in getting water into it and so on so it will be quite an expenditure if we're going to do that. It doesn't mean that this wouldn't be done because we're certainly trying to provide as many services as possible for winter recreation purposes.

MR. PICKERING: — Another thing, Mr. Minister. I've been going to Kenosee myself with my family for the last 10 or 15 years and we certainly enjoy it there. It's a great spot. They used to have weekly tickets at the golf course which were at a sort of a premium price. In the past four or five years the price of a green fee has gone up. A lot of people can't afford to go that far and have X number of dollars to holiday during the summer months. It sort of places a burden on them to get out and have fun out on the golf course because they can't afford all these expensive green fees. Is there any consideration being given to going back to the weekly tickets?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, the fees have been set for all golf courses. They are the same so these would apply to the golf course at Moose Mountain as well. If the Moose Mountain golf course is an 18-hole grass green, the fee the past year was \$3 for nine holes, \$5 per day (and I suppose they can go make as many rounds as they wish). Then if we look at the weekly fee, that's for a family — \$60. There isn't an individual

April 17, 1979

weekly fee and we are not proposing to have one. The golf courses are being used quite extensively and it is not our intention to provide for an individual weekly fee. I think you will agree that these fees are quite reasonable when you compare to say the young people (or even the elders for that matter) having to go to a dance where you pay \$3.50 or perhaps \$4 or to a show at the same price. If you are able to spend a few hours on the golf course for \$5, I think that is quite reasonable. If we were to reduce the fees or keep them down, we would have to find some dollars to subsidize. As a matter of fact, we are subsidizing them now.

MR. PICKERING: — I realize, Mr. Minister, that the fees at the golf courses in the provincial parks are fairly low and they do have some really well-maintained golf courses, but my point is you are talking about \$60 per week, per family. I am talking about a husband and wife with three or four small children going down to the lake for a couple of weeks — they can't afford to go anywhere else — when they go out to golf it is \$10 for the two of them to golf per day, which in seven days is \$70. I have heard a lot of complaints; they just can't afford this. They would like to go every day, but they can't afford it. That's why I suggest you have a weekly ticket on an individual basis.

MR. MATSALLA: — I will take the member's suggestion under advisement.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, a couple more questions. Mr. Minister, you have a tourist service trailer which travels through the southern part of the continent in the United States and moves back into Canada. Could you give me the cost of running that trailer last year?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could proceed to another question and I will provide the information to the hon. member.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, what percentage, or what part of your advertising budget is spent nationally, provincially, and internationally? Could you also give me that information?

MR. MATSALLA: — Certainly.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., we will continue along then. On page 29 of your annual report, Mr. Minister, at the top of the page I notice there is grazing and hay. Who has the grazing leases and who has the hay leases? I would also like that information.

MR. MATSALLA: — Do you want those by name? Individual farmers?

MR. GARNER: — How many would there be?

MR. MATSALLA: — That would run into thousands of names.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. Mr. Minister, just the number of farmers having the grazing permits and the haying permits then?

MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Just a couple of things, Mr. Minister.

As you know in the part of the country where I come from (I told you this before), we are relatively happy with things with the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, but have a couple of things I would like clarification on.

First of all, with regard to the domestic fishing licences in the Bronson forest and Peck and Fishing Lakes area, would you give me some indication about what the status of those domestic fishing licences will be in the future?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to some of the questions that were asked earlier and then I will come back to yours, the hon. member for Meadow Lake.

The number of permits issued in 1978-79 by regions, three regions: Meadow Lake, 108 permits; Prince Albert, 93 permits; Hudson Bay 25 permits. Then the number of permits issued to farmers that are grazing in parks: Meadow Lake, 27; Danielson, 4; Douglas, 15, Greenwater, none; Duck Mountain, 3; Moose Mountain, 71; Buffalo Pound, 2; Cypress Hills, 14; Saskatchewan Landing, 6, a total of 142.

The question with regard to domestic fishing licences: the domestic fishery program was originally established in the southern part of the province in order to provide a source of food for settlers or people who might be in need of food. Now, this need has decreased as time went on and virtually the need is non-existent. Therefore, it is our plan to eliminate the domestic fishing program in the area that you are referring to. There is going to continue to exist a commercial fishing program. These licences would have to be applied for.

MR. McLEOD: — Just one further question. I heard you say something some time back, Mr. Minister, regarding the two major highway thoroughfares through the province, the Yellowhead and the Trans-Canada. I quite agree that we should be moving our tourist traffic off those. I would like to know what your department's plans are for promotion or for further promotion of the northern woods and waters route, which as you know goes across the northern part of the province. The Minister of the Environment agrees with that I notice.

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, we don't have any special program to promote the highway that the hon. member is referring to. Nevertheless in our publicity, in our brochure, we make reference to the northern route that is available and the various attractions that there are, but there is no special program as such promoting that area. I realize the organization there is very active and it certainly would like greater promotion in that area.

MR. McLEOD: — Just one thing further. I think the minister may be aware that in some provinces they have come to the stage now where they are putting some signs on the highways and marking them as the northern woods and waters route. I wonder if you would give some consideration to that or at least talk to your colleague, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) about that. Perhaps along with the signs they could fix up the roads on the way by.

MR. MATSALLA: — I'm not going to pass the buck or anything like that but that's something we'll take into account and have discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Highways.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I understand the hearings in the Qu'Appelle Valley have been completed. Most of them were held in early February, I believe. I have a few questions I would like to ask you regarding the plans for tourism in the Qu'Appelle. To expedite matters tonight I don't require a verbal answer. You can supply these answers to me when it's convenient. That would be acceptable to me, and I'll ask you the

questions. I just want to know what the state of affairs with the development of tourism in the Qu'Appelle Valley at this time is, what are the plans? I went to some of the initial hearings. I know there's been a number of briefs, and I'd just like to be updated as to what your plans are at this time.

Second question is what are the plans for highway development or road development? In your preliminary hearings you talked about loops coming in at the Manitoba border, maybe coming out of Whitewood and coming back in. If there are loops or if you're looking at a secondary paved slow traffic road down the valley, I want to know if there are any areas and if so how many areas are being removed from agricultural production? I am also interested in what historic sites you are considering perhaps developing in regard to areas in the Qu'Appelle or in near proximity. I have some ideas on the latter one that I would like to share with you at some time. You don't have to answer all of these now but they are areas of concern that I have regarding the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just be quiet back there for a minute and I'll finish . . . Qu'Appelle Valley, O.K.?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, just a brief answer. We may have a little difficulty trying to answer your questions specifically because of the fact that we're awaiting a report from the Public Advisory Committee. We will have to wait and see what they will have to say in their report, what their recommendations are. At this point in time, we haven't drawn any conclusions.

MR. TAYLOR: — That's fine. I would welcome a copy of the report when it is put together.

MR. GARNER: — One last question, Mr. Minister, and you can also just hand this information to me. I would like the salaries for your three top officials in each department for the upcoming year and the projected salaries.

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Chairman, while we are searching that out, there was a question asked earlier with regard to the number of vandalism convictions. There were six vandalism convictions in 1978. The vandalism was down by \$5,000 from 1977. I'll just provide him with a little more information. There were 39 evictions from the park for various offences in 1978 and this was 47 less than in 1977. I think we can attribute the greater security in our parks, better lighting, control gates and the rest of it for the fact that our vandalism is going down in spite of the fact that there has been more visitation.

Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to give the salaries of our senior officials. Our Deputy Minister, Mr. Hartwell
...

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I'm finding it very difficult to follow the debate here if you want to call it debate or the questioning and answering. I ask all members to co-operate with us and we will facilitate making things run more smoothly.

MR. MATSALLA: — I'm just attempting to pass over the information with respect to our three senior officials. The Deputy Minister, Mr. Art Hartwell, 1978-79 estimate \$39,511; 1978-79 actual, \$44,243.25; 1979-80 estimated, \$44,240. The Associate Deputy Minister, John Burton, 1978-79 estimate, \$37,794; 1978-79 actual, \$41,318.67 and 1979-80 estimated \$42,214. Executive Director of tourism and Recreation, Murray Laird, 1978-79 estimate, \$34,865; 1978-79 actual \$32,250, 1979-80 estimated, \$34,315.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 16 agreed.

ITEM 17

MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I notice under Item 17 that there is a decrease in the staff of four. Could you tell us exactly what this decrease is?

MR. MATSALLA: — The decrease — two positions were deleted and the other two positions were transferred our internally, within the department.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I have an answer to one of the previous questions with regard to advertising tourism advertising, within Canada and in the United States. I am not too sure who the hon. member is who asked the question. There is about 65 per cent of our advertising budget goes to advertising within Canada and about 35 per cent is in the United States.

Item 17 agreed.

ITEM 18

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, I notice an awful decrease here on item No. 18. Could you explain to us exactly what the decrease is?

MR. MATSALLA: — There have been some budget restrictions in this area: in tourism planning, there's been a reduction there, fisheries and wildlife development, tourism facilities development and alternate land use or land acquisition. As you are aware, this is a federal-provincial program and it's also under the Qu'Appelle Management Board, but these are some of the budget restrictions for this year.

Items 18 to 23 agreed.

Tourism and Renewable Resources - Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 39 agreed.

TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES - CAPITAL EXPENDITURE - VOTE 40.

Items 1 to 6 agreed.

Tourism and Renewable Resources - Capital Expenditure, Vote 40 agreed.

Tourism and Renewable Resources - Provincial Expenditure, Vote 40 agreed.

Tourism and Renewable Resources - Provincial Expenditure, Supplementary, Vote 40, Item 1 agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Does that complete it, Mr. Minister?

MR. MATSALLA: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are all finished. There is one question which has been unanswered and that's the cost of the Saskatchewan Showcase Trailer. We will provide that answer when we get it.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL - VOTE 10

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! We're dealing with the Executive Council, page 39. Mr. Premier, Mr. Minister, will you introduce your support staff, please.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Chairman, I have on my left Mrs. Florence Wilkie, who is clerk of the executive council and behind Mrs. Wilkie, Mr. Dave Kelly, who is deputy secretary of the planning and research branch. We have Mr. Mel Hinds, who is director of information services from time to time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ITEM 1

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to see that some of the Premier's officials are here. Certainly some of them are not. Some of them who are leading ones, perhaps, are not here, which is a pity because then the people of the province, or the people of this Legislative Assembly, at least, could find out who runs everybody's day to day life in this province and who looks after things.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Herman! That's why it's such a mess.

MR. COLLVER: — We're talking Mr. Chairman, in this particular set of estimates about who runs the show in Saskatchewan.

You fellows over there in the backbenches may think you have some input into it. Even some of the members of the Treasury branch think they have some input into it. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we're talking here about who runs everything. This is the boss man!

It was an interesting thing Mr. Chairman, to see on television the other evening (very late, for the edification of the Premier. I know he isn't an insomniac. I am and I can't get to sleep so I stay awake and watch T.V.) There was an interesting television program with Carol O'Connor as the lead player. He played the part of Frank Skeffington. I think the Premier will probably recall the film and the book as well. It's called 'The Last Hurrah.' Unfortunately, last October we thought that the Premier had issued his last hurrah, but I'm afraid the people thought otherwise. They weren't aware yet of the influence and the impact of the Executive Council on their day-to-day lives. They weren't aware yet of the impact of the Premier on their day-to-day lives.

You start with tonight, Mr. Premier. I want to pay you probably the ultimate compliment in the Chamber. I want to say to you, Mr. Premier that you have operated a government in such a fashion on the last number of years, that you are accomplishing every aim and every goal of the Regina manifesto, while at the same time making the people of the province of Saskatchewan believe you're doing it in a conservative fashion. And for that you have got to be congratulated. They believe, Mr. Premier and I must pay your staff and the Executive Council, and in particular, Mr. Mel Hinds, who's here with you, (I hope he doesn't leave anything behind tonight) who puts out the publicity and the public relations for your office a compliment. The people in your office advise you to take off every time there's trouble so your face doesn't appear on television when there are any real problems, and to allow Mr. Romanow, the Deputy Premier, to take all the

flak when there's a hard one to do. When there's a nice one, when the Queen's in town or when there's a potash mine to explore . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . sour nothing. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) say we're sour, but I think the Premier has done a masterful job in putting together a staff . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — . . . in putting together a staff that is implementing socialism — then another round of applause — that is implementing socialism and nobody believes it's happening to them. And I think that, in your view, would be terrific.

Now I hope, Mr. Premier you will understand those of us on this side of the House don't think that's such a terrific thing to do. We don't think that because you're a little slippery, and because you're intelligent, and because you are able to put together these people who can tomfool a whole population into believing somehow that these massive takeovers of their day to day lives, the change in the legislative program in the province to the extent where the legislature has become nothing more than a sounding board without any real decision making capacity at all, where all decisions are made, not in this Chamber, not in your caucus, not even at your cabinet level, but in your own office with your own people surrounding you. All of these decisions are made and you can get right back to them and explain away any position, slip around any position that you want. You have to appreciate that those of us on this side of the House, and some in Saskatchewan, perhaps not a majority, but some in Saskatchewan do not believe that is the way the province of Saskatchewan should move. And although you've done a masterful job in moving us there, and although you've convinced the people of the province that it is in their best interest to have ownership of all potash mines, or most of the potash mines, ownership of most of the oil wells that are being drilled in Saskatchewan, ownership of most of the farm land in the province of Saskatchewan, direct control over education to the point where local people make absolutely no input to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh, Ned. Local people and locally elected school boards make no input to curriculum whatsoever and you know it. The Department of Education . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He says tone it down, let him handle it himself. He'll do quite well, thank you very much, I am sure. But you have been able to convince people that this kind of thing is in their best interest. You know the people who you have been able to convince the most, and here again I have to pay a direct compliment to Mr. Kinzel in your department and Mr. Mel Hinds, the two of them. The people who you have tomfooled the most is the media. I can't believe, sometimes I honestly can't, the press that the NDP gets tonight on CBC, tonight. You wouldn't believe it.

Here is an industry, the potash industry, that hasn't made peanuts, as a matter of fact it has made nothing. It lost money every year it has been in business.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It makes potash not peanut butter.

MR. COLLVER: — That's right. Makes no peanut butter and makes no money either. It has earned less than bank interest on money. Far less, on the promise that maybe some day in the future this so-called investment of \$430 million of the people of the province of Saskatchewan money that somehow it is going to gain them a return. I watched television tonight to hear the press reporter . . . (and that is debatable), you guys say that it is a good thing and that it is making money. We've said we don't think it is such a good thing. We think that the investment of \$430 million for a return of \$10 million is not very good sound business sense. And we don't even think it is going to be good next year or the year after that. You are not going to make 9 per cent for a long,

April 17, 1979

long time until and unless you make your secret deals with the other potash companies and cut back the tax burden. And then you are going to reduce the taxation.

So on the one side you put the taxes up to knock the guys out of business, then you knock the taxes down so you can make a better return. I don't think you are even going to do that because the total take of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan, is going to be marginally less, year after year, in future than what it has been in the past, the total. Now, that is combining the profits, so-called, the loss of interest, so-called, and the taxation royalty structure on potash. When you total those up that is going to include the total take to the people. I predict that it is going to be marginally less.

So there is a dispute, there is a difference of opinion on that and the Premier will know that that difference of opinion has been around for four years and not just between himself and me, but between our party and his party and between the Liberal Party and his party in the province of Saskatchewan.

Yet this reporter on CBC could have been reading from an NDP brochure. Ed Broadbent is out there in a potash mine, this marvellous example, they say, example of the way Canada should be, says the CBC reporter. Here is an example of the way Canada should be! They are making a fortune in these products. It is Canadian-owned.

Now the report didn't bother to say that some \$500 million or \$1 billion has been borrowed down in the United States in the last couple or three years to finance this venture. He didn't say that it has changed from equity capital to loan capital. He didn't say that it was a marginal return. In other words, a profit-type return, where if the business is not so hot they don't get any dividends to a fixed rate of return, that the ownership of the United States now in Saskatchewan resources, and now in the Government of Saskatchewan. He didn't bother to say that now it is an interest rate that must be paid in U.S. dollars, must be paid, not if business is good or business is not good, but that it must be paid, year after year. He didn't bother to say that. No, he said, this is a profitable venture in the potash mines.

Therefore, I say, congratulations, Mr. Premier. You have set up an executive council that not only fools the people in terms of the presentation of your press releases and press reports, but has fooled the CBC reporters, has fooled them into believing only your line. There is no debate say they. There is no debate whether the potash mines are a good investment or a bad investment. There is no debate on your Government of Saskatchewan increase from some \$500 million in total debt to \$2.6 billion in total debt, much of which comes from the United States of America. There is no debate on whether that is a good thing. To them, that is a good thing. It's terrific.

We will go out and we will borrow on margin against the future of the kids of the province. We will even borrow against the future of the grandkids of the province. We will get Canadian control, so-called, over an industry, except that it is not Canadian controlled . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Did you really want to cut it off, Paul? It's not a good psychological sign, you see. You really like the below the shoulders, I mean 25 pounds later. Good grief!

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that somehow the Premier has put together a team of people that has been able to fool the people of the province of Saskatchewan and to fool the press, much of the made in Saskatchewan, into believing only your line — nobody

else's — no debate. So for that, these people should be congratulated. They should be congratulated, for example, for being the only government party in the history of our country to come on at election time with a lie. The executive council (Mr. Kinzel and Mr. Hinds and others) should be congratulated for thinking up the so-called medicare argument. If you haven't got anything else to attack somebody with, attack them with a lie, Heavens to Betsy. (I have said that before in this House and I will say it again outside of this House) a total unmitigated lie. Yet, Mr. Premier you are out there (I read it in the Star Phoenix in an editorial just the other night) as Mr. Moral Soul. You are the only one who has ever led a government, in Canadian history, a governing party that attacks an opposition party with a lie, an outright lie!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Order, please.

I ask the hon. members to try to relate their thinking to the subject at hand. We have had good decorum in the House thus far. I hope we can continue it and I would think the leader of the opposition would want to keep that decorum and we will try on both sides of the House to manage it that way, please.

MR. COLLVER: — I promise on my word of honour I won't chew any gum. I promise that. And I promise you also that I am not going to relate to anything other than what the Premier has control of and that's what the Executive Council is. This is the Premier's estimates — I am talking to the Premier of Saskatchewan and he has control of every aspect of everybody's day to day life in the province of Saskatchewan. I intend to relate my remarks to him and to the kind of belief that his employees have been able to garner for him in the public thought, in the public mind, his employees, employees of the Executive Council.

The Saskatoon Star Phoenix, in their editorial, was actually being critical of the Premier. It was being critical of the Premier in terms of his stand on Service Printers. They thought that the strict legality in the legal sense of the word, that the Premier's attitude towards Service Printers was correct. But in the moral sense, they said, this Premier who is respected, is a moral Premier. Now this is what they said, this is what the people are saying. They believe it. The Premier has seen his own polls, taken by his own people in there — they take them all the time. The Premier is held out to be moral — the only man who has led a government that faces an election against an opposition on an outright lie. And now, Mr. Chairman, we see the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan, he is going to do it again. He's going to go out now on behalf of his federal counterparts and they are going to start out with a lie. They are going to start out in the province of Saskatchewan with a lie. They are going to talk about medicare.

I congratulate his people. I say to them, somehow you have done a magnificent job. The people out there believe the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan to be totally moral and nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Chairman, the people out there believe the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan to be totally honorable and nothing could be further from the truth. The people out there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . not in comparison to anybody. You see Paul, it makes no difference . . . it doesn't make any difference what they say about me . . . it makes no difference. I'm not the Premier. That's the Premier, that's the Premier. And I am saying congratulations to him — congratulations to him and to his staff for doing such a masterful job. He's one of the few men who could lead a government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no it doesn't hurt me there — I tell you, it doesn't hurt anywhere, Ted. That's about the size of it.

April 17, 1979

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is this. They want these estimates to be finished by 10:00 o'clock so the Premier can go on his tour. We are going to do our best to finish the estimates by 10:00 o'clock. If you are going to keep on with those shots, you will make the talk even longer. I've got a few remarks to say about what this Executive Council has done to the people in the province of Saskatchewan. I am going to say them whatever time it takes. So you keep it up, Raymond, and just keep it up, Ted, and it will take longer. That's perfectly satisfactory to me. If the Premier wants to come back after his tour, listen to it again, that's up to him. Keep it up. Keep it up.

Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the ability of your Executive Council and the Premier's Executive Council and this group of people who run things in the province. I am amazed at their ability to shield and cove Allan Blakeney from the mistakes of his tenure in office. To shield and cover him in the minds of the people from the dreadful lapses in honor as it relates to the business community, in integrity as it relates to the potash industry. I needn't bother telling the Minister of Industry who knows this situation beautifully, who knows about a government that would bring in a taxation burden so high that the industry squeals, that bring in a level of expropriation legislation that says either settle on our terms or we are going to take it away. Then succeeds under those conditions in convincing some of them to sell out at exorbitant prices using moneys that you've gloomed from the increasing price, a real skyrocketing price of oil.

Then, after you've got what you set out to get, now adjust the tax level down so that your own companies don't have to face the same kind of thing as the guys that you put out of business. That's what I mean by integrity and lack thereof. Yes, you have been able to convince the people in the province of Saskatchewan that you are the epitome of integrity. In the minds of the people of the province of Saskatchewan I am the epitome of disintegrity, if those are the right words. It's a fact.

I sat in this legislature, right here, in this very legislature and listened to the members opposite, many of them backbenchers and quite a number of them, front benchers, hit the press, including the member from Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway), hit the press day after day after day with what an awful fellow I was. And, the people believed it. They did.

The little group around the Premier convinced you to do it, the little group around the Premier wrote your speeches for you, you did a terrific job. Of course, it's easy., it's easy to take on somebody that is smaller than you. Easy as heck to take on somebody that's smaller than you when you control the game, when you control the referee, when you control the rules, easy to take the guy on. But I tell you something, Mr. Member for Saskatoon Centre, I tell you that one man by himself, one man with an idea and one man that cares enough to fight you beggars, I tell you for a fact that that person is going to beat you in time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — One man by himself has done a lot against a majority. One man by himself has done a lot against the kind of personal abuse that you guys have subjected me to. But I say to the Premier of Saskatchewan and I say to his Executive Council, congratulations for convincing the people that you're not really a socialist at all while you're taking over a million acres of Saskatchewan farmland under your direct control. But you're not a socialist. Heavens to Betsy. His parents were Conservatives. Well, it

might surprise you to know that my parents were socialists. It's a fact. Well, my father wasn't but my mother was. That was back in the days when even socialist were unpopular.

The point is that nobody in Saskatchewan would believe that I was a socialist but somehow your people, your Executive Council have convinced them that you, Mr. Premier, are nothing more than a Conservative in disguise, in socialist disguise. If I've heard it once, I've heard it 100 times at least. Haven't we all? The Premier, he's not really a socialist; he's not going to take over anything in Saskatchewan. He's not going to take charge of a government that takes over anything in this province. No, he's not. His parents were Conservatives, you know. Haven't you heard that? By God, it was the best publicity Mr. Hinds and these others could ever put out. Beautiful! His folks were Conservative while he's nationalizing potash. His folks were Conservative while he's taking over land bank. His folks were Conservative while he heads up a government that is destroying medical care (and I said medical care, not medicare) in the province of Saskatchewan, while at the same time spouting off these platitudes about how only the NDP and only the CCF can preserve good health for the people of the province. Only they can do it. But the people in the Executive Council have done their job well. They've held you out there to be Mr. Clean while all of these things have been going on.

There is a situation developing in the province of Saskatchewan today which we think is purposeful. We think your little group in the Executive Council have dreamed up to say that look, our people, the NDP, don't really get out there and dig unless there's an attack, unless there's somebody to hate. I remember before the election; in fact, five or six months ago, the Premier of the province standing up in front of his own people and saying the enemy in this province is the Progressive Conservatives. I even watched him on TV and he just had hate oozing out of him. It was a beautiful performance. He said the people you've got to hate in this province are the Progressive Conservatives. Do you remember that? We all remember that. The enemies of Saskatchewan are the Progressive Conservatives. That's what he said. We've got to get people together against them, the enemy. So the people in the Executive Council over there dreamed up this other little game and this other little gambit that they're using at the moment is let's get the people together to hate the doctors. They'll be the enemy. We'll push 'em. We'll talk about, as the Premier did in his opening speech in the throne speech, we'll talk about, as the Premier said, increasing MLA pay 33.33 per cent, talk about that. But we won't find enough money to pay the doctors a reasonable return. We won't even find enough means by which we can pay them during the negotiation to ensure the guys who are in real trouble in the medical profession, the general practitioners in the cities, who don't have an opportunity because of hospital restrictions to do any cutting at all, those guys who are in real, real trouble.

AN HON. MEMBER: — But we'll pay Penman 80 grand . . .

MR. COLLVER: — But we'll pay Penman 80 grand. We won't do anything about these guys. Now what we'll do we'll back 'em into a corner and we'll get them coming out against the government saying, this government's not fair. Then what we'll do is we'll whip our people into shape and say look at that. You know most of the doctors have been Liberals or Conservatives. See we'll whip those guys into shape, we'll get our troops out pounding on doors, giving her heck out there because that'll be somebody for them to hate. And I say congratulations, Mr. Premier. You've done it again. Oh ho, congratulations are in order. Congratulations for his Executive Council for dreaming up this scheme. It's a terrific scheme. Absolute marvellous. Take the people of the province, divide them up into small little groups. Take the potash company and get

people to hate them. Get the multinationals and get them to hate them, Get the Progressive Conservatives and hate the Progressive Conservatives. We'll whip them into shape. We'll get them out there at the doors. You watch and see. That's marvellous. Mel Hinds will sit in his office and pump out week after week after week, press releases about all the wonders of our office, all the wonder of your government. Information — we'll watch them come out with information services, and list information services. We'll present it time after time as information. What it will really be is extolling the virtues of Allen Blakeney, Mr. Moral, while we're cutting the rugs out from under these various people. What we'll do is we'll make — according to the Premier and the group around him, and their great, their terrific — what we'll do is we'll destroy any reason in Saskatchewan for people to want to be free. We'll destroy any reason for it because we'll hold this guy up as being Mr. Clean, and we'll hold the other guy out as being Mr. Dirt, oh yeah, hear, hear, that's what to do. That's good stuff. You keep doing it, it's terrific . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you've been doing it for years, keep it up. We'll hold that group out as being the one we'll attack. We'll get out MLAs to attack the doctors. We'll get the head, the deputy minister of a department to attack the very profession he's supposed to work with and call them crooks. Isn't that correct? Isn't that correct? We'll get them all sorted out and we'll attack them. That's what we'll do. And for that I congratulate you, Mr. Premier. I congratulate you for a very small expenditure — just under \$3 million and accomplishing all of that. He runs the whole government of the province of Saskatchewan, he runs everybody's life, he accumulates all the land under government ownership, he accumulates the potash mines, he negates the business community, he attacks the hearing aid dealers, he attacks the very essence of democracy in local governments by imposing ward systems (your remember that one, I don't forget), he takes over the universities, puts them together and gets a universities commission that he appoints to run everything. He takes over the 4-H Clubs and at the same time that he is doing that for only \$3 million he is convincing people that he is a Conservative at heart because his folks were Conservatives and that he is Mr. clean and everybody else is Mr. Dirt. Well, Mr. Premier, I congratulate you for the excellence of the job that you've done in this area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to reply at length. The hon. member feels that my method of operation is such as to engender, I think the word was hate, addressed to a number of groups in Saskatchewan. He is the Leader of the Opposition and he is putting forward his alternative program and I take it that the address which he just gave is an example of how to engender love and affection. If that be so then it may well be that he is no more effective at engendering love and affection than I am assure him I am at engendering hate because that is certainly not my objective. I am not standing here alleging that I am totally moral because I obviously am not. I am not standing here alleging that I'm totally honorable because obviously I'm not. I have some shortcomings and I noted an opportunity was taken to present some of them. I'm not agreeing with that but I am agreeing with the general proposition that I'm not perfect. I am not totally in control of people's lives in this province. The hon. member suggests that I am totally in control of the cabinet and I suggest that the cabinet ministers are probably in a little better position to judge that than is he and there are some fairly vigorous contests there as they will assert and as I will assure him. With respect to the caucus I assert the same thing and we have a good number of people here who would be prepared to say that there are some fairly vigorous exchanges there. I don't make any point of that. The one point I want to make is the point which he makes that somehow our government (and he ascribes it to us in the Executive Council) is able to make the

people of Saskatchewan accept as fact a large number of things which aren't fact. That simply underrates and very seriously underrates the intelligence of the people of Saskatchewan. The facts are that the people of Saskatchewan are probably more politically aware than an electorate in Canada; they're probably better informed politically. This is partly because of history and partly because of the fact that so many people in Saskatchewan owe their daily bread to political decisions — to whether or not wheat's sold or whether or not wheat is transported or whether or not oil prices go up or down. Those are essentially political decisions and they have been at least as far as grain is concerned for many, many years. That together with the history, together with the co-op movement and the rest has made Saskatchewan people very politically aware. I would think that it's probably more difficult to bamboozle the people of Saskatchewan over any long period of time — and I'm not suggesting that it can't be done for a brief period of time — over any long period of time than any other electorate in Canada and I suggest North America. While I accept, guardedly, the backhanded compliment he pay us that we are so clever we're able to do this, I have to reject it because it is simply not possible over any long period of time to bamboozle the people of Saskatchewan. I'm saying that we have not succeeded in doing so. We have not tried over any long period of time. I suppose, we like other political parties, are guilty of attempting from time to time to guild the lily. It would be pointless for me to deny that we try to guild the lily, try to put our program forward in the best light. But having done that, I can assure the hon. members on both sides that the people of Saskatchewan will make their own judgment, pretty hard nosed judgment, and they will judge you with some tolerance, but also with a fair degree of skepticism. I think they've done so; we have lost elections and we have won elections. Our party was in for 20 years at a stretch and it's not true that we were fooling the electorate each time. We have now been in for three elections and it's not true again that we have fooled the people for three elections. I am prepared to trust the people of Saskatchewan that they are intelligent, they will make errors as we all do but it is simply not true that I or anyone else has all the almost magical powers the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) has attributed to me. I do want to comment on one or two of the other points. He gives me the credit. If that's the word, for being everything that — you mentioned The Last Hurrah. I happen to be going down to Boston in a few days and that is based on the life of James Curly, sometimes governor and sometimes senator and sometimes mayor of Boston.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Sometimes jailbird too!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Yes, sometimes jailbird, right. I just don't have the same class as Jim Curly when it comes to running a machine. I will tell you that. Nor will I attempt to achieve those heights or depths as the case may be.

A couple of points. With respect to the matter of resource ownership, we feel strongly that there is a case for Canadian ownership. It doesn't need to be public ownership — the Canadian ownership of resources — and we think it is vital for a much larger share . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — For the CPR?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Yes, in the CPR.

MR. COLLVER: — Do you support the CPR?

MR. BLAKENEY: — In preference to foreign multinationals.

MR. COLLVER: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

April 17, 1979

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I think the Premier gave you the courtesy to listen to your remarks and I would ask that you give the same courtesy while he is making his reply, please.

MR. BLAKENEY: — When Petro-Canada were seeking to take a position in heavy oil we preferred them to Occidental, which was an American multinational. When Alberta Bas Trunk, which is its own kind of Crown corporation, or quasi Crown corporation . . .

MR. COLLVER: — I beg your pardon. Go and tell Bob Pearce that.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it is not a case of how many directors you have. As someone has said recently Saskoil buys its Crown leases (Not all of them, but most of them); it doesn't wake up in the morning and find that it has been allocated leases like Alberta Energy Corporation is. The Alberta Energy Corporation, as members will know, is an affiliate of Alberta Gas Trunk — but we will leave that aside anyway. Whatever we want to call Alberta Gas Trunk, we preferred it to Occidental and if, in fact, Alberta Gas Trunk is a private corporation then that means we favor private Canadian ownership, rather than foreign multinational ownership. We think that's important because we believe Canadians cannot indefinitely pay dividends, service fees, management fees, research fees, and all the rest to foreign owners and expect ever to solve our problems with respect to a balance of payments or with respect to unemployment, or with respect to inflation. They are all related problems and in our judgment it is important; by the way, this view is held by a good number of other people in Canada. I make that point; I don't want to make it argumentatively, but I make it. And I want to close by making a comment on one other point raised by the hon. member for Nipawin.

We share his concern with respect to the remuneration of general practitioners. We know that, at least in our judgment, the payment among members of the medical profession means that some specialists get on a net basis, very, very much more than general practitioners because of the way that the fee schedule works.

MR. COLLVER: — In the countryside, they can cut, Al.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Yes, well, all right. I will make myself clear. Many specialist in the cities get very much more on a net basis than general practitioners in the cities. Some specialists get, well, I don't want to discuss their fees. But approaching \$100,000 and I think, no one would deny that. And while some general practitioners get . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I've said some. Many general practitioners get significantly less . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Significantly!

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right and that is a matter based upon the distribution of the fee schedule which heretofore has not been our concern. We would like to think that some of those disparities could be closed. It was for that suggestion that we and judge Muir agreed that the distribution in the fee schedule should give a good deal more to G.P.s than it does to some specialities. But that point we don't deny. We think that a case can be made there and we wish to make that point known.

Just one other point in passing and that's the references to my speech and calling people the enemy and that sort of things. First, I did not use . . . the speech was to an NDP convention. I wasn't talking about using the word hate. That is a word ascribed to me but that I didn't use.

MR. COLLVER: — I heard you. Enemy! I heard you.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Just a moment. Please, please. Hate was the word I didn't use. Enemy was the one I did use and it was not the Progressive Conservative Party that I called the enemy, but it was the . . .

MR. COLLVER: — The Collver Conservatives!

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, no. Well, all right. There's no point in arguing that. There are hundreds and hundreds of copies of what I said around and there is no real point in arguing about it. You will then, if you read, will find what I said and it is not what has been attributed to me. I think that that's enough because indeed, what I may have said two years ago is not highly relevant to the estimates before us in any case. But for those who wish to know, I am able to find a copy and would send them a copy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. COLLVER: — No, he hasn't found that yet. That's another thing, Mr. Chairman, just as an aside, and I know that has nothing to do with the estimates, but I don't know how the Premier could expect us to find articles that he's written, which are of public record everywhere, when he can't even find a simple little document that is given out by Statistics Canada with reference to the amount of civil service in Canada and in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, I've been asked by one of my members to read this. I think it's meaningful. I think that the Premier might listen to it. In 1928, which is some years ago, at a time, by the way, when this particular gentleman was not held in very high esteem by the people of his country or the people of his own constituency or even the people in his own party, Mr. Winston Churchill said (this was in 1928, at a time when he, as an individual, was fighting pretty hard against this kind of idea and was losing quite consistently, both as an individual and as a spokesman) socialism will only work in two places in this world as we know it, in heaven where they don't need it, and in hell, where they already have it. Furthermore, capitalism, de facto, is the unequal distribution of wealth, socialism is the equal distribution of poverty, and communism nothing more than socialism with a gun at your back.

I think that's a pretty fair statement, Mr. Chairman, of what we're fighting in the province of Saskatchewan. The Premier, who says that he is such a simple fellow, the Premier whose Executive Council says he makes mistakes like everybody else, is not perfectly honourable and he knows that that's a good trick. That's a good trick.

Why, Mr. Premier when people ask you, don't you answer the argument of all the takeovers of your government? Why don't you spell it out for the people of Saskatchewan, in fact? How many jobs are now government, relative to the total? How many jobs are now in the private sector, relative to the total? How many owners of farms are there remaining in Saskatchewan today compared to how many owners of farms there were eight or nine years ago?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Increasing in Alberta, decreasing here!

MR. COLLVER: — Increasing in Alberta, decreasing here.

April 17, 1979

How many civil service jobs, in fact, instead of in the budget of your Minister of Finance that you have to take the responsibility for, that your Executive Council have got to take the responsibility for? Your Minister of Finance says the total civil service in Saskatchewan has declined for every years in the last five years. Get the budget speech, it says so. Every year for the last five years the number of civil servants has declined but the office space has doubled in that period of time. Where do you put civil servants?

AN HON. MEMBER: — They're getting bigger!

MR. COLLVER: — The salaries that you pay the civil service have tripled and yet the number of civil servants has gone up. Now I admit that there has been inflation. I admit that civil servants are paid more today than they were eight years ago. But my goodness gracious, they're not being paid triple! There are more civil servants today.

Level with the people! You can't continuously add to the scope and breadth and length of government without adding more people to government who have to administer it. What you do is you create a Crown corporation. Where the Government of Saskatchewan and the Cabinet used to be responsible for finance, now we have a government finance office. Where we used to have bookkeepers and accountants in the Department of Finance. Now we have a communications and computer centre corporation where there are employees. These employees are not included in your totals, of course, The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, they aren't included in your totals. Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation, they are not included in your total. Go on and on through tremendous numbers and lists of additional government that you have had and what is the difference?

You see, that is what I am talking about, those people who have been able to help you fool the people. You know it is government and you know that government is not only in here, government is also in Crown corporations. So what you do is go through the government here and as the government is starting to increase here, you skin off a bunch of government over to a Crown corporation. How many Crown corporations have been added in the last eight years? About 60, Mr. Premier, for your information. You have about 120 now, different agencies, departments and Crown corporations. About 50 have been added, most of them in the Crown corporations area. But you have been able to convince people. I don't know how, but those people you have around you have done a whale of a job. You have been able to convince people that you haven't increased it at all. There is no more Government of Saskatchewan, today, than there ever was.

I will tell you another way you do it. It is not just the people around you, Mr. Premier, it is also you yourself. You did it tonight. You stood up and you started to give our the federal NDP blither, which is — what we really want in this country is Canadian ownership. That's what we want. What we are really out to get in this country is Canadian ownership. You said it yourself and at the same time, this afternoon, your very own member of the legislature, in a speech written by one of the guys in the Executive Council, I am sure, talks about the necessity to nationalize the CPR, which is 83 per cent Canadian owned. What we want, say the Premier, what we want says Mr. Broadbent on TV tonight is not control. We don't want socialist control We don't want the government to control everything. What we want is a Canadian ownership. Let's appeal to the nationalistic fervour of Canadians.

But when it comes down to it, that isn't what you want at all. What you want is another Crown corporation. What you want is another government agency. What you want is more control in your Executive Council over everything. Why? Because your goal, your aim, when you started out was to gain control. I don't mind debating that. I don't mind coming up to the people in the province of Saskatchewan. If you would level with them and be honest with them. If you would say, this is what we want. We think the planning per se is right. We don't think laissez faire works worth a darn. We don't think free enterprise is free at all. We don't think it is free and we don't think it is enterprising. If you would come out and say that where you have the vote all the time, the so-called vote all of the time. You debate that and let me go out and let my members go out and debate the truth and the facts. But don't go out there saying, as you did tonight, that we want nothing more than Canadian ownership, and at the same time, we want the CPR and Canadian Pacific Oil and Gas, and Canadian Pacific Investments which are 83 per cent Canadian owned.

He says tonight that Alberta Gas Trunk is a Crown corporation. Why — because the word, Alberta, is in it, I guess. Alberta Gas Trunk is not a Crown corporation. The Alberta government owns no shares in Alberta Gas Trunk lines — none. It appoints three members to the board of twelve. That's all. That is the only so-called control it has. The rest of Alberta Gas Trunk is in the private sector, yet you say it is a Crown corporation. I know people are going to believe you. They believe everything you say, absolutely everything. It wouldn't matter if it was a lie. It wouldn't matter if it was dumb. Let me give you another one he said tonight. Seriously, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about funding the Premier's office. The Premier says tonight (list to it, check the record) Saskoil doesn't get any concessions, they don't get any concessions at all.

Just last week, a third of the heavy oil action with Gulf went to Saskoil — no tender, no bid, no nothing. A nice sweetheart deal — Saskoil gets a third of the action with the multinationals.

Mr. Chairman, my first question to the Premier, because obviously there is no point in going on with this discussion, is how much of the \$336,500 in supplementary estimates was used to finance the October 18 election?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I just might draw to the attention of the hon. member that we are not dealing with supplementary estimates. We are dealing with the main estimates of the Executive Council now, and we will come to the supplementary. I would like to keep it in the regular routine and deal with them accordingly.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I would like to make one comment. I don't think we claim that there is less government than there was before. I don't think that is our claim. I don't think we are really claiming that fewer people work for government agencies than before because that isn't true.

Mr. Chairman, we have a good deal of difficulty with this. There is no doubt that, let us say the staff of the — may I use one, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office is a rapidly growing organization. A good many more people work for it than did five years ago. It's doing a lot more business . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . all right, all right. Members opposite wish to — I will choose his words so I don't fall afoul of anything. More people are employed there and that's true. The budget deals with the Government of Saskatchewan proper. That is dealt with, and what is attempted to be said is that the number of positions in the blue book has not been going up for those functions which

are covered. Now, obviously you can argue that let's say the Saskatchewan Research Council staff is going up, which it is, and the grant may be to the research council is going up, so you could quibble in a sense a little more money is being paid for staff by way of grants, and that's possible. But broadly speaking, it is accurate to say there has been little or no increase in the public service proper. There has been a significant increase in new functions of government, or expanded functions of government such as Sask Tel, which is growing, SGIO, which is growing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, well, Sask Compute Corp really wasn't there before . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . but the computer corporation performs functions for Crown corporations, for the Government of Saskatchewan, for both of the universities. Its chief customers, I would think, are probably Sask Tel and SGIO and Sask Power, but I wouldn't know that for sure — both universities, certainly their major customers as well as to the Government of Saskatchewan. To the extent that it is doing work that was previously done by the Government of Saskatchewan and was previously done by people in the blue book, the point made by the hon. member is correct. To the extent that the hundred or so employees of SaskComp are doing work that was done by employees of Sask Power., Sask Tel, SGIO, or the two universities, he's not correct. And we can debate this as to 20 people or as the case may be, but it is, broadly speaking, accurate to say that there has been no significant increase in the public service proper, as covered by the estimates. Now that's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . because by and large they're being occupied by people like the expanded Workers' Compensation Board, who are undoubtedly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no, the answer of course to that is inaccurate. I remember the time when the building occupied by the Workers' Compensation Board also housed the Department of Labour., the both of them. Now the Workers' Compensation Board has moved into that area and has taken some more office staff. This is because the WCB is undoubtedly expanded because the number of people employed at salaries and wages has very significantly increased. There's no doubt about that over the last 15 - 20 years. So, to some extent, the points made by the hon. member are accurate. They are not accurate to anything resembling the extent he is trying to stretch the, that's about all I would say.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I am talking about. You have been able to make the people believe that. I suppose that over the course of time, your use of the English language is magnificent, Mr. Premier. You say, for example, we won't have any nuclear reactors at this time. You don't rule them out but we won't have them at this time. You get an editorial in the Leader Post, for example, that makes it sound like you are coming out against nuclear reactors and in favour of more environmental protection of uranium industry which in this House, I think we have shown hasn't been the case. I don't know how you do it. I, for the live of me, haven't been able to figure it out yet. I, probably till the day I die, won't ever figure it out. I don't know what you have been able to do to capture the imagination of, especially, the media. I don't think you are paying Mel Hinds enough, even if he does leave things lying around. I think you should pay him double or triple what you are paying him because that man, from a political point of view, does an absolutely masterful job. If he is really having trouble living on what he is getting, we'll get him a briefcase so he can take his stuff home and make sure he has got it and keep that. We'll send him a present.

Mr. Chairman, the point is, that the Premier has been able to buffalo the people and knows that his choice of English is absolutely masterful. He says that we're not quite accurate. I don't know, quite frankly, what 'not quite accurate' means. I thought accurate was an exacting sort of thing, either you are accurate or you are not accurate. Not quite accurate is, it seems to me, to be not quite correct English. But, nevertheless, I am sure the Premier is using that advisably. Because what he is saying is that we have

been able to, as a government, as an Executive Council, figure out how we are going to insert in the budget information that the fellows up there are going to take right out to the people and say, civil servants decline again. That's what they are going to be able to do. That's what they've done. Every year I have been in this Legislative Chamber and a budget has been presented by the Government of Saskatchewan the media headline is, 'Civil Servants Go Down.' And yet, the Premier tonight admits the government's expanded everywhere. The member for Saskatoon centre is laughing; he knows it's true. They have expanded everywhere.

When the civil service has grown a little bit, yank out a compute corporation or yank out a finance corporation and put it into a Crown corporation. Take all the employees out of government, take them out of government service and put them into hospitals, controlled by local boards out of the Executive Council. This has gone on now since 1971. Mr. Premier, perhaps what I am saying to you tonight when you said that you weren't totally moral, neither am I. Or totally honorable, neither am I. Neither is any human being. Neither is any human being. But when you said that do you not think it might be possible for you to be a little more moral than you are? Do you think it would be possible for you to level with people and to talk to people about what in reality has happened instead of what in some theory has happened so I can convince and fool those people up there into presenting to the people that this certain thing happened when in fact it didn't? Totally accurately, completely accurately? The Premier is right. He says the civil service proper. I don't now what that is. I don't know whether it's the proper civil service, whether somebody in the civil service who works for the government directly is proper and someone who works for a Crown corporation is improper. But the civil service proper, (he's coined a new phrase tonight) has actually gone down while the number of people in Crown corporations has gone up immensely. That's a fact the Premier can't deny.

If you want to be moral and tell the people of the province the truth, you will say here is the extent of government involvement in your life on a day-to-day basis. Here are the total number of people who report in one way or another for their day-to-day livelihood to me. That's who they report to, is you, to your Executive Council. How many of them relative to the total population now, and how many of them in 1971? You wouldn't do that.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that if I were to plead, if I were to be on my knees, if we came in this Assembly and asked day after day the same question, your Executive Council, through their media manipulation, would somehow be able to convince these people to print what your side of the story is and then print the opposition story as an argument. That's really good stuff.

I noticed, today, for example, Mr. Premier (just as another aside) Mr. Shillington holds a press conference to announce this study. At the press conference he announces the study beautifully. Then after the press conference he comes in here to the Assembly, having already gotten everybody to ask the questions all they wanted, to present the statement that he's supposed to be making to this Assembly. I'm sure that, in the Premier's mind and in the minds of the people in his Executive Council, that's treating this assembly with the proper dignity and respect that is required. I'm sure you will congratulate that minister for doing such a masterful job of going out to a press conference and announcing his little situation and his little study and then announcing it to the legislature, who are responsible for the expenditure. That's always the best way. Tell them in advance. Don't tell the people who are commissioning the study. Tell the

April 17, 1979

press first so you get the best possible shot at it. That's good advice from Mr. Hinds. I think he'll continue it.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier has, in item 1, asked for another six people for his office. What in the world is he going to use six more people for? The election's over.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Just a brief reply to the preamble and then I will . . .

MR. COLLVER: — You keep referring to my preamble. I'll keep replying to your replies to my preamble.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, all right. Just the one point. A budget is not a document designed to show government involvement in the total society but the budget is designed to show what things have to be paid for with the taxes which are referred to in the budget. It is those people who are listed here who have to be paid for out of the taxes.

MR. COLLVER: — What about the grants, Al? What about the grants to the Crown corporation, Al, that pay the people that used to work for the government?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The grants is, of course, a case. You can inquire as to each one of those grants and how many employees they may cover.

MR. COLLVER: — No, you can't. We tried and you know we've been refused.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I know nothing of the kind. As I say, I really should give you some of the notes. I sat over on those two benches for six or seven years and I know what you can get in opposition and what you can't.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't give them any advice, Al.

MR. BLAKENEY: — But we have an administrative assistant to the cabinet secretary at Saskatoon. We have a cabinet press officer, Mr. Proctor, replacing a Mr. Bruce Lawson who was previously employed by a contract. That contract has been discontinued and Mr. Lawson is no longer associated with the government but Mr. Proctor is.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about his consulting firm?

MR. BLAKENEY: — His firm is not in any relationship with the Government of Saskatchewan that I am aware of, certainly not with the Executive Council. We have an assistant press officer, Geraldine Vance, who was with us but was previously temporary staff. We have two other clerical positions who were on temporary appointments and are now being made permanent. We thought we could do without them and found we could not. One was in my office. I had two secretaries, two clerical and secretarial employees. I had three before and I thought we could make it with two and we couldn't. We're back to three and one special assistant and all of those people were, in fact . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . her name is Valerie Preston and, pardon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . she's a competent person and I know that's what you'd want. So those are the six that you refer to.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, under item 1 you also indicate that other expenses are going up as well. You've taken quite a number of the contract employees out of those areas and you've put them into . . . What contracts are you budgeting for under other

expenses? What contracts with firms, such as advertising agencies or public relations firms — what contracts are you budgeting for under that administration, other expenses?

MR. BLAKENEY: — There is none, but just a moment.

MR. COLLVER: — If you could answer that question for all of them, then, I won't ask it on each one. What contracts are you budgeting for under other expenses for the whole of the Executive Council in terms of with various agencies and corporations and companies?

MR. BLAKENEY: — There is none in government services. None in information services. When you say that photographic and art . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Information services, sure, you have one. You have the one that is producing those press releases, aren't you? Some of those automatic press releases? What do they call that? That's the kind of thing I am talking about. There is that automatic press release company . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know it's a snow job. What is the name of that outfit? They came to us and wanted us to take it but we said no.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Adsask agencies does the work and we pay them job by job, there is no ongoing — O.K., we can tell what we've budgeted for Adsask, then. How much would we be budgeting for Adsask?

MR. COLLVER: — I told you, these guys are running this place, they run the whole province.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I certainly wouldn't know what we pay Adsask Agencies and I make no apology for not knowing, if you are asking me. Photographic and art, we have a number of contract there which none that are already entered into but we will certainly hire some photographic work done since we don't do it all ourselves. We do virtually no movie work and if there is any movie work to be done we tender it out and we don't know who will get the contract. We are geared up . . . well, I can give you a try at that . . .

The fees we expect to pay Adsask Agencies for their redi-print services for all of the payments under that heading would be approximately \$5,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, for photographic and art services. I should say information services for Adsask will be approximately \$5,000.

We have budgeted for art services, and the extent that we would pay for it which would cover movies as well as similar items is \$7,030.

I should tell the hon. member that it is unlikely that that will cover very much by way of movies because if movies were going to be done they would probably be done by power or telephones or someone like that, and it would be in their budget.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, you've finished that question then?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No.

MR. COLLVER: — How much money did you spend last year? You will recall that you said that the Government of Saskatchewan went down with you in your trips east and to the Premiers' conferences. You had photographs and films taken of that event. You

April 17, 1979

said that this was historical. You explained it to the press. The Government of Saskatchewan was going to foot the bill for this. I notice that Mr. Hinds is shaking his head, but you, yourself, said that last year when questioned by the press. You were going to use some of these movies and they were concerned about using them in the upcoming campaign. You will recall that you said anybody using them in the campaign will, of course, be paid for by the party. We also questioned this in the House last year. They will be paid for by the party but the other film trips, films of the China trip, for example, all of those were budgeted in your department. Who pays for that? Does your department pay for that or is that paid somewhere else?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The China trip was certainly paid by us. It cost about \$10,000 to make a film on the China trip. I remember that, it wasn't in the year under review but that's about what it was.

With respect to the Premiers' Conference at Ottawa, that was not a government expense. The photographer and all that was done was a party expense because we were frankly going to use it for electoral purposes and we did. It was a party expense all the way. The person who did the photography was somebody who worked for the ad agency.

MR. COLLVER: — How about the trip today, for example, by Mr. Broadbent and the Minister of Mineral Resources? Does that come out of your movie budget in the Executive Council, the films that are taken there? Does the cost for the Minister of Mineral Resources to fly up there come out of your budget at all? Do you pay for any of the people who are up there such as your advertising and public relations people? Is that all paid for, budgeted out of your department?

MR. BLAKENEY: — There are a number of questions there. With respect to whether any of the filming and that sort of thing done today was by the Government of Saskatchewan, the answer is no. With respect to whether or not the Minister of Mineral Resources went up there and charged his travelling expenses in the Government of Saskatchewan, I think the answer is probably yes. Yes, I suspect that we move around a fair bit and we are doing some government work and . . .

MR. COLLVER: — . . . potash mines . . . the leader of the NDP around.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, if Mr. Clark wants to be photographed going around the Cory mine, may we extend an invitation?

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I accept the Premier's offer and I suggest that Mr. Clark will be in town tomorrow. I hope the Premier would be happy to get this organized for him and to travel around the potash mine with Mr. Clark as well. I'm sure that would be terrific. I hope Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) takes Mr. Clark's visit as seriously as he took Mr. Broadbent's and has just as important business at the Cory Potash Mine on that particular day as he had today.

MR. BLAKENEY: — May I say that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) is no less nor no more a public servant than the Leader of the Opposition getting as it happens the same amount of money from the public purse and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and we all know the extent to which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition greeted Mr. Broadbent when he was in Regina. I am very sure that we will extend at least that level of cordiality to Mr. Clark.

MR. COLLVER: — Would the Premier like to answer the last part of my question which was the number of people out of your office that were travelling around? Are their expenses paid as well? People out of the Executive Council?

MR. BLAKENEY: — None.

MR. COLLVER: — What are the salaries in 1978 of your top five people? What are the salaries proposed? What was the actual salary and what is the salary proposed for '79, including Mr. Kinzel, if you don't mind?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Kinzel is not an employee but we can probably find his salary.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, we want to say that the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) has a specific reason for this. I wonder if you'd do it in a different way; we don't need it just right now. Obviously, we're not going to finish tonight. Could you give us the names, salaries, responsibilities and qualifications of all employees of the Executive Council earning over \$25,000 — '78-79 estimates, '78-79 actual, '79-80 estimate. Is that fair?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now the question is the names, salaries and responsibilities and qualifications of all employees of the Executive Council earning \$25,000 or over — '78-79 estimate, actual, and '79-80 estimate. O.K. There are some explanatory notes because people moved around in different jobs, and we'll have to do it either by person or by title or both.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:05 p.m.