

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Nineteenth Legislature**

**Wednesday, April 18, 1979.**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Quill Lakes):** — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House, I would like to introduce 58 Grade 12 students who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They came from Lanigan. They are accompanied by their teachers and chaperones, Erna Alexander, Craig Fry, Dave Coffin and Betty Ann Nagus. I want to welcome the students from Lanigan. They are in my constituency but I want to also mention, Mr. Speaker, that about one-half of this group of students are here visiting from Nova Scotia on a student exchange sponsored by Open House Canada. I want to wish a particular welcome to these students from Nova Scotia and to tell them that we are particularly fond of Nova Scotians, the reason being that our Premier, of course, is originally from Nova Scotia. So we want to welcome you here and hope that you have an enjoyable time and have some understanding of the working of the legislature. I'll be seeing you shortly after question period.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, on your behalf and on behalf of the other members of this Assembly, I want to welcome to the assembly a group of some 20 young people, members of the No. 5 Cub Pack in the city of Moose Jaw. They are located in the west gallery. They are accompanied by their cubmaster Al Kjarsguard and Robin and Dave Claffey. These cub scouts are from both areas in Moose Jaw, both Moose Jaw North and Moose Jaw South. I want to take this opportunity to welcome them here and John Skoberg (the MLA for Moose Jaw North) and I will both have an opportunity to greet them and spend a little time with them after the question period.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my words of congratulations to the cub pack that is here today. I think all of us in this House realize that the cubs are the leaders of tomorrow. I hope that they will see what goes on in this Legislative Assembly and believe that they can take part in the political process. I wish them all a very safe journey home and we will be seeing them later.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**  
**Mortgage Deductibility Program**

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — My question is to the Premier. During the past provincial election campaign, one of the very attractive promises of the NDP platform was a mortgage deductibility program. Can the Premier advise this Assembly as to when the Assembly might be able to expect that legislation to be presented?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek)

advises me that he will be giving notice on the Bill today.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Supplementary question to the Premier. A further plank in that NDP platform was the ability of the farmers in Saskatchewan to deduce the capital gains tax. Will that also be coming forward today?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, each of those provisions is essentially an income tax provision, one of them providing a deduction for income tax and one providing a refund of income tax arising by reason of capital gains being called income. Each of them is covered by an amendment to The Income Tax Act which my colleague the Minister of Finance has just given notice of.

### **Expanding Dental Care Program**

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski). In June of 1975 and again in October of 1978 we heard lots and lots of promises about the dental care program being expanded to include students up to age 18. Could you indicate to this House when the program might be tabled in the House?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, we have been phasing in the children's dental plan since it was first instituted. It is being expanded by one more year this year. It was expanded by two age categories last year. We at the present time are anticipating the program to achieve the age of up to 18 years will be implemented. We are at the present time, besides that, considering some other options as to how we might better be able to deliver to the age categories, which one would more accurately define as the high school students, who are beyond the 13 years of age. I guess in brief my answer is we're phasing it in a year at a time, but we're considering whether we need to be making some modifications to do a better phase in of the older age categories. When those decisions have been made they will be announced in due course.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that in 1975 and again in '78 this was a promise. The age would be increased to age 18. My question, Mr. Speaker, is, in how many elections in the normal course of events can one promise be made before it is finally implemented?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, as long as the promise is valid and the commitment is firm and the delivery is there as it is obviously there, I think it's a good promise. We made the promise in '75. We made it clear in making that promise in '75 that we were phasing in the program, and in '78 of October we made it clear once again that we would be phasing it in until they reached the age of 18. Indeed, we made a further commitment as a government and as a party that we would be providing a program of dentures for senior citizens as well.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **Regina Rail Line Re-location**

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina-South):** — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy) to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Whelan), whom I believe is a senior minister in the city of Regina. I noticed, Mr. Minister, that the federal Minister of Transport, Otto Lang, has recently announced the federal funds for rail line relocation in Saskatoon. We also note Regina West NDP

member Les Benjamin's opposition to the rail line relocation in Regina. Will you now, Mr. Minister, join with me indicating in the strongest possible terms your concerns about the failure of Otto Lange to supply funds for Regina's rail line relocation?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I would be happy to say that we have been making representations along this line to the federal government for some months and we welcome the support of the member for Regina South.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Supplementary. I guess I should be addressing it to the Premier, then. Have you, Mr. Premier, made any representations for Regina since Otto Lang's announcement about the supply of funds for the Saskatoon rail line relocation?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I just saw that in today's paper so I'm not aware of what the minister in charge of the Transportation Agency may have done. But we have been making representations and indeed, last December, I believe, (I think I'm right on the date) the city council passed a resolution to forward to Mr. Lang. We supported them in their representations to Mr. Lang, essentially asking him to give an answer since he had promised an answer, as we understood it, by May of 1978, and it has not yet been forthcoming.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, just a final supplementary. I am pleased the Premier has indicated support and I also think that it would indicate the failure of the Liberal candidates in Regina to help this city.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'm not in a position to speak for the Liberal candidates and I would now wish to take the time of the House as it would take quite a bit of time to itemize all their failures.

### **Grasslands Park**

**MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. In light of the delay in the announcement of the Grasslands Park in southern Saskatchewan, is it true that you have not been co-operating with Parks Canada and thus delaying the park's inception?

**HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, no, that is not correct. As a matter of fact the opposite is correct. We have been actively pursuing negotiations with Parks Canada and at the moment there is a draft agreement around and it has gone to Ottawa and it requires the attention of the federal ministers.

**MR. HAM:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not true, Mr. Minister, that the decision to proceed with the park's inception was deliberately delayed until after the federal election?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Speaker, no, not as far as we are concerned. I can't speak for the federal government.

**MR. HAM:** — Supplementary. Do you not believe it is fair and reasonable to give the lease holders and land holders of that area some kind of indication or decision when co-operation will begin to allow them to make decisions about their own future?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Speaker, we've always taken the position that we shouldn't delay the decision with respect to the development of the Grasslands Park;

**April 18, 1979**

nevertheless, delays have occurred and it's certainly not the problem of the provincial government. We've done all we can to speed up the negotiations.

### **Randhawa Report**

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education and has to do with the recently released report entitled, Achievement and Ability Status of Grades 4, 7 and 10 Pupils in Saskatchewan. I quote from the report, Mr. Speaker, to make my point. I'm quoting from the author, Dr. Randhawa:

The fact that no equating data are available makes it obvious that it is not possible to make any concrete comparisons of the 1958 achievement levels with 1978. An equating study done in conjunction with the 1978 testing of basic skills could have provided an approximate basis for linking the achievement levels of the two years; however, this study was not possible within the terms of the present contract.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is why did you not expand the terms of the contract so that a valid comparison of the two years under study could have been made?

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley is essentially correct in that different tests were used. It is my understanding that the use of the step tests had the approval and consent of Dr. Randhawa. There was a number of reasons for using the step tests rather than the Iowa basic tests, which were used in 1958. Basically the reasons are that the step test is (a) a better test, and (b) a more accurate reflection of what is taught in today's schools.

I think that if all members think over what they took when they were in Grade 4 and what their children took in Grade 4, they will see that they are being taught, in a sense, different work. You really can't give the same tests which were given in 1958, in 1978, because the courses are different. They are being taught in a different fashion and at different times. We were faced with that essential limitation that we really couldn't give the Iowa Every School Test (I think it is called) which was given in 1958. We really couldn't give it again. First of all, the test isn't being printed anywhere; it's no longer in use, but that could have been overcome. But it is just not geared to test the students on what they are learning today and that's the essential problem. I think, if I may just be granted indulgence for another moment, that when members read that report, they must read the whole report. I think, if you go on and read further in the report, Dr. Randhawa says that he has intercorrelated the two and worked it out, and he says he is reasonably satisfied with the comparisons he makes in 1958 and 1978, and he does make a comparison.

As I said yesterday in the Legislature, the comparison is something that all educators, including I suppose the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, can be quite proud of. But he does go on to say that he did compare the two and he has tried to make the best of different tests, and he's reasonably satisfied that the comparison between '58 and '79 are as good as they can be in the light of different teaching methods.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I do see that he says that the only comparisons can be made by extrapolation. There's another aspect of this testing that I'm concerned with and that is that the 1978 results of the mental abilities test show that there is an increase over the 1958. However, they also show a progressive

decline from Grades 4 to Grade 10. Surely this must have serious implications for Divisions 2, 3 and 4 in our school system and what action are you going to take to try and rectify this problem?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm delighted to say, Mr. Speaker, that we're going to go on doing just what we have been doing because that is in fact, a highly complimentary portion of that report, if properly understood. If you see a line graph, it looks as if the abilities of students are decreasing. That's not, in fact, what the report says, if you read it more carefully. What the report actually shows is that there are ongoing improvements in the school system and those improvements are working their way up through the school system. What, in fact, we'll have five or six years hence is the same level of ability through Grade 7 and Grade 10 because that's what's happening. We are continuing to improve the curriculum, continuing to improve the teaching methods and that's why Grade 4 is higher than Grade 7 and Grade 7 is higher than Grade 10 because those things have to work their way up through the school system.

The hon. member, I know, will be delighted to know that in five or six years, you'll find the same levels of skills in Grade 10 as you're now finding in Grade 4 as it works its way up through.

### **Marketing of Agricultural Products**

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). Mr. Minister, the Saskatchewan Agriculture Development Corporation, as you're aware, is responsible to your department, and is a Crown corporation involved in commencing, at this point in time, competition with many of the small grain dealers in the province of Saskatchewan, especially in the field of sunflower, faba beans and lentils. Now, I understand the Saskatchewan Agriculture Development Corporation is marketing these products internationally. Can you tell this Assembly if you are using agents to market those products internationally?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, generally the arrangements for marketing any of these products is done directly by our own staff.

**MR. ANDREW:** — My question, Mr. Minister, is (I realize that) do you also use international agents to assist in the marketing? In particular, have you involved the Cargill Grain Company in assisting in the marketing of this product?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I couldn't give him a complete answer on that because I am not aware of any involvement we have at all with Cargill, but I wouldn't want to say yes or no without having a chance to check the records.

**MR. ANDREW:** — While you're checking, would you also check about Dreyfus, Bunge and Continental Grain? Those three other companies and Pioneer Grain.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we're not involved in any massive grain deals with any of those companies.

### **Additional Maintenance Workers**

**MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — A question to the minister responsible for Sask Power. Sometime ago I had a letter from the Lucy Lake Chamber of Commerce; it was raising a concern at that time. I have had a similar letter recently. I did not get

**April 18, 1979**

satisfactory answers in the first case and I am raising it in the House this time.

The Lucky Lake Chamber of Commerce raises the concern that in the district which serves Lucky Lake, you only have one district manager working to do the repair work. He is on call 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. They feel they cannot get satisfactory service and that it is an unfair labor practice by this government.

Are you prepared to hire an assistant so that there are at least two people involved in each maintenance area?

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, the member knows that I have answered him in regard to the Lucky Lake inquiry. There is a problem in the province with some of the one-man district operators and we are attempting to correct that problem. In some instances it can be corrected by, yes, putting assistants into the area, if the assistant can be used in an adequate way. In other words, there is sufficient work for a full-time assistant. That is the case in some districts. In other districts it is clear that there is not a requirement for a second person to be employed by the corporation in that district. I think it would be legitimate for people to bring that to the attention of the corporation, if we were to put a person there who is only employed for 30 per cent of his time, because we are not getting the money from the individual that we should be. So in those areas there is some change in the boundaries and the means of servicing that district.

I believe in the case of Lucky Lake, that that is the solution to the problem. When the district office retires or moves out of that area, there will be an attempt to re-organize the areas surrounding Lucky Lake so we can give them a greater assurance that they will have the kind of continued service they have enjoyed in the past from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, I think you perhaps are now aware of the location that Lucky Lake sits in. It is cut off to the south by Diefenbaker Lake; the power feed comes in from the Outlook area, so there is really no other district except Outlook. If you take the distance from Outlook to the south end of that district, you are looking at a distance of well over 100 miles. To expect to get service that far away from the source, I think, is unreal.

When you look at a district like that and you are going to provide service to something in excess of 1,000 people, somewhere over 1,200 square miles of ground, then I don't think you can provide it with one person.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. Does the member have a supplementary?

**MR. SWAN:** — Yes, I would like the minister to answer me if he can. Would it not be cheaper to hire a second man to operate that area than it is to have a man driving from a distance as far as from Outlook out?

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, it is not simply a case of being cheaper. It is a case of taking into consideration the costs involved as well as the service and the attitude. I think of the people who are being served. Certainly, the simple solution . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the simple solution, yes. The Leader of the Opposition says the attitude of the people as if that should not be considered. The simple solution in a lot of situations may be simply to hire another person to satisfy a demand even though it may not be warranted. This government goes on record, as does the Saskatchewan Power

Corporation (SPC) in saying that there has to be justifiable reasons for increasing the employment of that corporation. There should be good returns from the hiring of an individual for whatever purpose. That's the policy now and it will continue to be the policy.

I may close in saying, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan Power Corporation serves a community that's more difficult than any other corporation, utility corporation, has to contend with in Canada because of the large agricultural sector. It has a history of being able to serve it better than any other corporation, and I suggest to the member that the changes that are taking place will continue with that history and we will continue to have satisfactory service to all of our customers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **Social Allowance Changes**

**MRS. J. DUNCAN (Maple Creek):** — A question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes), Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, has your department given any consideration to the recommendation of the Saskatchewan Council for Crippled Children and Adults for changes in the allowable earnings regulations for people on social assistance?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — What considerations have you taken?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Quite a few, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the question that the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) directs to me is a rather complicated question and it's been around for a number of years, but as I indicated to the press, Mr. Speaker, this is an area where the provinces simply cannot make a unilateral decision because it involves the federal government. It's an agreement between the federal government and all the provinces on the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) and SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan) whereby you cannot allow a person to earn more than a certain level. If you do they automatically cut off public assistance and the federal government will no longer cost share.

But I can tell the member that last fall I called a meeting with the Hon. Minister Madame Begin and present at that meeting was the minister from Alberta and the minister from Prince Edward Island and the minister from Ontario. We discussed that situation with her. We asked her at that time that she should make the regulations more flexible. She said that she wasn't aware that we were not able to do it but she would look at it, take it under consideration and I would assume, Mr. Speaker,, that she hasn't had time now that the election is on and I will contact her again after May 22.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You stated, Mr. Minister, that this has been a problem that has been going on for a few years and I would venture to say that this is another buck passing, indecision type, attitude of both levels of government. Would you not agree that the whole scope of social services is such an arbitrary department that you do nothing to encourage people on assistance to get out there and become independent and self sufficient?

**April 18, 1979**

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I have advocated to the federal government and I have ample documentation in my office, to show that when I was appointed minister in 1975, I think, one of the first items I put on the federal/provincial agenda was the exact question that you directed to me. Because I also felt that it was unfair and was a disincentive to people to get off public assistance, because if you take away dollar for dollar there is simply no incentive for people to go out and work.

I have tried to convince some of the other provincial ministers to support me at federal/provincial conferences. I have not been successful with all of them. I am telling you that the federal minister said she was sympathetic. She would try to get the regulations changed and she would put it on the meeting of the next federal/provincial conference. I am hoping that we will have a change in that particular aspect and, hopefully, the members opposite will try to convince some of their ministers, in some of the other provinces, the Conservative ministers, to support us in this particular aspect.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I will take a new question.

### **Crippled Adults and Children**

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Would you not agree, Mr. Minister, that here again, we have an example of jurisdictional dispute that in this instance makes the crippled adults and children of this province go begging?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, again the member for Maple Creek does not understand that the same conditions apply to all of the other provinces. Many of us do not agree with the conditions that presently exist and we have tried to convince the federal government to go along with us in changing that so that at least we wouldn't take a dollar for a dollar. Maybe it should be 50 cents on a dollar so that there is some incentive for people to go out and work and to increase their skills. I support that. That has been my philosophy; that has been the philosophy of this government. We will continue to advocate that kind of philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

### **Unfunded Liability of Teachers' Superannuation Plan**

**MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — A question to the Minister of Education (Mr. Shillington).

During estimates last week, on April 10, I asked you a question with regard to the unfunded liability that you have with the teachers' superannuation plan. At that time you told me that the unfunded liability was \$657 million. Is that the correct figure?

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Education):** — The unfunded liability, Mr. Speaker, is always a guess. It is for any actuary. You can pay for the best actuary in the world and they make assumptions about inflation rates, about interest rates, about what the rate of turnover is going to be. That is part of working with actuaries, they give you guesstimates. The latest guesstimate which we got was from Thomas Alexander Associates, who I believe to be one of the foremost firms in Canada. That was their estimate of the unfunded liability at \$675 million. I would not deny to the member that you couldn't find an actuary who would place that at 800 or might place it at 500. And that's life in dealing with actuaries.



COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL — VOTE 10

ITEM 1 (cont'd)

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition):** — Has the Premier those figures that I asked him for yesterday pertaining to salaries in the Executive Council?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Sorry, I have given them to Mr. Rousseau — two copies, one for each.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I just wanted to make sure. That's O.K. He didn't let me know.

The Premier will be aware of the substantial payments — not necessarily the Executive Council, but since it's the Executive Council's responsibility I would say usually for engaging these people — that the Government of Saskatchewan is required to make year by year to Dunsky Advertising and to Struthers & Associates. I wonder if the Premier could inform this Assembly what commitments he has made by way of contract or otherwise to Dunsky and Associates over the next year?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, for the Executive Council I think the answer is none. But for the Government of Saskatchewan I wouldn't have a figure. Let me be clear. The arrangement essentially is that the Dunsky agency will handle the advertising for one or other of the agencies of the Government of Saskatchewan. There isn't, I think, a formal contract so that . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** — Is it correct to assume that Dunsky does all the advertising work for the government?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No. Struthers and Dunsky both have very large accounts and some other agencies have smaller accounts. The Dunsky accounts projected and there is no contract so we're not bound. We don't even have to run the ads. If you assume that the SGIO (Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office), I think that's the Dunsky one, isn't it? It was last year.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Then you would know what I am talking about here. This is the public accounts for the year ended March 31, 1978. The payment by the Government of Saskatchewan (and you will understand that this is the payment by the Government of Saskatchewan and this is not SGIO; it is not the potash company); we realize that SGIO and the potash company and the other Crown corporations also pay moneys to Dunsky Advertising. But the payment for this particular year end was \$863,434.27.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Plus? Right below.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh!, plus another \$155,463.10. In other words, Dunsky Advertising Limited got \$155,000. Dunsky, Pradinuk and Associates Limited got \$863,000 — well over \$1 million payment in this year. I would assume that the Crown corporation's ads (since those were the vast majority of the advertising that the Government of Saskatchewan did last year) would be substantially higher than that. What do these payments include? Do they include time with the stations, or do you pay the stations separately? Do they include just production costs, and so on? What contract agreements do you have with them through the government

**April 18, 1979**

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — This is the total cost of the advertising. Let us say Dunsky handles the Feeling Good program — the health education program promoted by the Department of Health, the so-called Feeling Good Program. That covers the sort of total cost of the program and is billed by Dunsky. Dunsky then pays the radio stations or the TV stations and in essence Dunsky gets the recognized rates off the top — and it's 15 per cent — that's the general rate that goes to the advertising agency. So if that Feeling Good Program was \$300,00 (which I don't now but that's probably not far off the mark, or \$400,000), then Dunsky would get for himself 15 per cent of that — say \$300,000 or \$45,000 — that would be their fee for placing the ads and giving the advice and the rest of it.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. And you haven't talked about Struthers yet. Could you possibly talk about Struthers. They were paid, for example, \$1,422,650 in the previous year. What do they provide to you?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It will be the same type of services. Dunsky does consumer affairs and government services and highways and labour, municipal affairs, DNS, health, PSC, social services, Department of Revenue, rentalsman, transportation agency and so on.

**MR. COLLVER:** — What does Struthers do?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Oh, I'm sorry — that was the Struthers list. The Dunsky list is agriculture, culture and youth, finance, industry and commerce, legislative broadcasts, mineral resources, tourism and renewable resources and Feeling Good. There's a liquor board as well. I'm just picking out the ones that . . . I can give you some corporations if you like. But basically that's it and there is no division between them except if you look at it, there's a little bit of a tendency to give Dunsky the electronic media work and Struthers the print work but by no means all, except that Struthers has some of the heavy print work stuff. Let's say a PSC (Public Service Commission) where we . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — But that's not in here?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That'll be in the \$1.1 million. The Public Service Commission, I'm sorry. The Public Service Commission is a heavy print work thing because you're putting out big ads in a lot of papers on — do you want a job as a clerk-steno 2? — that type of thing. It's pretty well divided just by agencies. There is, as I said, a tendency to give the print work to Struthers and the electronic to Dunsky, but it is by no means divided evenly.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Premier, I'm glad you said that because that leads me to my next question. Do you mean to tell me that over and above the Crown corporation ads (that's all the advertising done by the potash company and all the ads done by SGIO and Sask Power which are the bulk of the media advertising on television, certainly, and the bulk of the media advertising in the paper) the Government of Saskatchewan pays to Struthers & Associates a 15 per cent fee to place an employment wanted ad in the newspaper?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, I think that's true, yes. We don't pay the fee. The Leader Post pays the fee; keep that in mind. The rate is the same whether you put it directly . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** — No, it isn't.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, it is.

**MR. COLLVER:** — No, it isn't.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, all right, I'm telling you, if you can find us a way of getting the rate cheaper simply by putting the ad in ourselves, if you think we can get the 15 per cent commission, toodle along a little letter to me and I will go down and talk with the Leader Post because they haven't been giving it to us.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Premier, are you asking the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan and the Leader of the Opposition to do the job of Dunsky? In exchange, would you be prepared to pay us the 15 per cent?

I was about to ask you, quite frankly (since Dunsky, I think, is probably the finest advertising agency anywhere) if you would have any objection if another political party happened to use their services from time to time? Or would you cut them off from government work if somebody else approached Dunsky?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No, I don't think so. I think Dunsky, as you say, is a good advertising agency. I suspect they may be fairly selective as to the clients they pick. But if they selected them, we wouldn't try to dictate to them what clientele they should have.

**MR. COLLVER:** — No, I'm sure you wouldn't.

I know the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman), as someone who is directly involved in the newspaper publishing business, would love to get into this debate with you as to whether or not an advertising agency collects the 15 per cent from the client or whether the advertising agency collects 15 per cent from the newspaper and whether you can get a better rate by going directly. I think the member for Rosthern will be happy to explain it to you and elucidate that to you. I will ask him, quite frankly, to send to you this letter as to how you will go about getting away without paying the 15 per cent rate to Dunsky advertising for the placing of employment ads. That's for certain.

The other suggestion I would like to make to you, Mr. Premier, in terms of this advertising budget of the government of the province of Saskatchewan is, if you take the 15 per cent of those totals alone do you have any idea, for example, last year, even in rough terms, because here we're looking at something like \$2.5 million directly to Struthers and Dunsky, what the total payments are of all the Crown corporations in Saskatchewan to Struthers and Dunsky?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, I do. Give or take 2 per cent or 3 per cent, the total advertising paid by all the government agencies (maybe give or take 5 per cent), would be \$4.4 million.

**MR. COLLVER:** — That's including the Crown corporations.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That's right. That makes clear, I think, that the hon. member is assuming that the Crown corporations are a little bigger part of the package than is in fact the case. It's about 50/50 and the government will be around \$2 million and the Crown corporations will be around \$2 million in a normal year.

**MR. COLLVER:** — So what you're saying is that the Government of Saskatchewan pays

to the NDP advertising agency and the NDP public relations agency (which the two of them are), some \$660,000 approximately, not counting the additional money that the advertising agencies make on production facilities, and the Premier will be aware that production services are over and above the 15 per cent. It is paying some \$660,000 to these two agencies, directly from the people's pockets every year. Is that approximately correct?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, certainly the short answer to that is no. It is our assertion that if we placed, let us say the half-a-million dollars that we had for the Aware program (let's say that; that was a half-million dollar program when we launched it, and we had a great series of TV ads, which people will remember about Aware for good or ill, and I thought it was a good program) . . . we don't think that we would have saved one cent by placing those ads ourselves. We would have had to pay the station the same amount which we paid to the advertising agency and we would, in addition, have had to do the work which the advertising agency does. In that case, making the presentation and working up the whole ad program was something done by the agency. We called for competitive bids on the Aware program and people made various submissions. That happened to be the case and we selected Dunskey. That presentation was, in our judgment, as good as any.

But at any rate, it doesn't matter. My point is this, that it would not have saved us a penny to deal directly with the station and in addition we would have had to hire the staff to do the job that they did.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, the point of my question is this. In the province of Saskatchewan, at the moment, there are three, I believe, advertising agencies that you might call Saskatchewan based. Now, Dunskey and Struthers, although they moved their offices here, were originally, I think, Ontario corporations and Ontario outfits, and these are out-of-province kinds of outfits. I refer you, for example, in this little publication, the Public Accounts up to March 31, 1978 (excluding the supplementary, of course, that may have occurred during this last year because of the election to which I alluded to last night). The payment to Dome Advertising, for example, which is another Regina-based advertising agency for some \$14,550. Here are two Regina-based organization both making submissions to the Government of Saskatchewan. But surprise, surprise, the NDP agency gets over \$1 million — Dunskey alone — worth of work in this particular year under review which is \$150,000 to them — surprise, surprise!

Dome Advertising is a completely integrated, same kind of advertising agency situated right here in Regina, with Saskatchewan people in control (as a matter of fact, totally Saskatchewan owned as the Premier will be aware) who perhaps politically weren't able to in 1978 win an election. They didn't do a bad job; they did a pretty good job of advertising for the Progressive Conservative Party but they got some \$14,550 worth of work which is some \$2,000 worth of fees. Would the Premier not say that that was particularly disproportionate in this particular year? Would you consider using or at least allowing some competitive bids and some competitive submissions, openly and reasonably to other advertising agencies in the province of Saskatchewan for government work?

I don't presume to try to tell the NDP who to hire for themselves. I know you pay, as we had to pay, great gobs of money for advertising in an election year to an advertising agency; the NDP have to pay it, we have to pay it. They get a good fee from that. We wouldn't presume to tell you that. This is the people's money and the government work.

Would you not suggest that perhaps Dome Advertising, or the other one in Saskatoon, could be able to get some of the government business since they are also Saskatchewan-owned, Saskatchewan-based and have a Saskatchewan head office?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — May I just make one observation on what the Leader of the Opposition has said. He has said in the course of his remarks that the Conservative Party paid gobs of money to an advertising agency and so did we. I know that if he could have saved the money by dealing directly with the media he would have done it. If we could have saved the money by dealing directly with the media, we would have done it. But neither of us could have saved the money by dealing directly with the media; we knew that we wouldn't save a penny by going past the agency, so we all dealt with the agency and the agency paid the media. That's sort of the way it is. That's the point I wanted to make. And we all would have done the other if we could because of budget limitations.

One other point with respect to the Struthers Agency; they are very definitely a Regina agency. The chief proprietor, Jim Struthers, I suspect was born in Saskatchewan — born in Regina maybe. I know his dad lived here for many years. He's been in the business here for 25 or 30 years. He has no operation outside Saskatchewan that I'm aware of but certainly his base is in Regina and has been in Regina. That is a total 100 per cent Regina agency. I know Mr. Rousseau probably is familiar with them. That's the Struthers agency. You will probably know it's been here for a long, long time and has dealt a lot with co-op work, etc. the Dunsky agency is admittedly based in Montreal. The Dome agency, Dome Advertising, is a relatively new agency and did not . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Not very good.

**MR. COLLVER:** — They're terrific on commercials. They're terrific for coverage.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes. Well, I don't know about that. I know Dombowsky and I know Spence Bozak. I know Mrs. Dombowsky is not there now, but Mr. Bozak, I think, is. I know that they have certain talents and I know that we would certainly be prepared to consider using them. There are just so many agencies one can use. The Struthers agency has been here and is, as I say, the authentic Saskatchewan agency, the only one which has been around consistently. As you said, McLaren's came and went and Dunsky may go, although I suspect that Dunsky has got a large clientele outside the government now. There is a limit to the number of agencies we can use. We'd certainly consider using Dome but I give no commitment.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, the only reason I'm asking that of the Premier is that you do use Dome. You have used Dome, though a very, very small amount. And it seems to me very strange and perhaps a little bit of concern to the people when such huge gobs of money by the government are paid to the very agency that really works hand and glove with the NDP. I think it might be similar to the Service Printers arrangements. I alluded to this last night. We don't object to debating you on the issues, Mr. Premier, on the real issues. You think that it's not immoral for the Government of Saskatchewan to use Service Printers, a company owned by the NDP. It's fine, as long as the people are aware of the extent and the involvement, that the Government of Saskatchewan is using tax moneys to pay a political party's company to do work. Then that's the debate and that's what we're prepared to debate out. The same thing is true, I think, of using the NDP's advertising agency. As long as it is emphasized to the people that that is the agency that the NDP uses and always uses and that they are supplying them every year

with substantial quantities of tax moneys of the people, then that's the debate. You say, well they are as good as anybody else. My own opinion, quite frankly, of Dunsky from a political point of view and from the Feeling Good Program, is that they're as good as anybody in Canada. I think they're terrific. I'm not arguing with the fact that they're good, because they are good. But I think that people should be aware of just precisely what's going on. Of course, they're good but there are other good ones as well. There are other good agencies and there are other good printing companies and when the Government of Saskatchewan uses tax moneys on a year-to-year basis — and substantial amounts, not peanuts, we're talking big money here — for agencies that really are extensions of the political arm of the NDP, then I think it is reasonable for the people to understand that. As long as they understand that, then that's the debate on the hustings. You have said that yourself in terms of Service Printing Company; you see no objection to it. Well, fair enough. As long as the people know what you are doing and that is the debate. You go out and debate that there is no objection; we will go out and debate that there is an objection.

We have a substantial objection. We can agree to disagree on that one. The same thing is true with Dunsky and the same is true with Struthers. In my judgment and in the judgment of our side of the House, it is immoral for the Government of Saskatchewan to give such a preponderance of its business to these agencies that are extension, really of the NDP and of the political tool of government because you are using tax moneys to fund our own political aims. That is the debate.

My next question, Mr. Premier, has to do with something else, an entirely different matter. My question is what was your personal involvement as Premier of Saskatchewan, in terms of the decision to go ahead with the Cornwall Centre in Regina?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think, that the hon. member, with respect to advertising agency, with respect to Service Printing Co., and that sort of thing, puts the issue right. If it is immoral for governments to use the same advertising agency as the political party uses that is of their stripe — and . . . preponderance. A case can be made and I don't deny that. I just say that we've got a lot of company.

If you want to look at the figures, pre 1971 and look at what the McLaren Agency got, anything we give by way of preponderance is nonsense. However, I will pass that by.

With respect to the other, I have not been making the day-to-day decision with respect to Cornwall Centre. But with respect to the original decision, yes, I was in on the original decision and was aware of it before it was made and participated in the decision which said we should go ahead with the Cornwall Centre.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Is it true, Mr. Premier, that Sask Tel had no plans whatsoever to proceed with the head office building in Regina and that the instructions came directly from your office that the Cornwall Centre should be proceeded with?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Not quite. Sask Tel had plans to go ahead with a head office building, but not in downtown Regina. They intended to build elsewhere. It was our judgment, as a government, that if they were going to build a head office building, it should be in downtown Regina and be part of the revitalization of downtown Regina which we felt was important in the long-term interests of the province.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I didn't ask that question. It wasn't your government (I notice that you

have minced the words again) . . . did this decision not come directly out of your office and instructions given that the Sask Tel office building should be built in the Cornwall Centre in Regina? Is that not true?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I don't want to quibble about whether it was my office, but it came out of the cabinet room and we decided it. I was certainly an advocate of it, and you know, on an issue . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I am not. I am, frankly, not aware. I am saying, I frankly don't remember the process except I know that Sask Tel would have preferred to build somewhere else. I think probably adjacent to their current head office or thereabouts. That was their thinking. I felt, and it was considered by my cabinet colleagues, and we decided as a corporate decision that we would . . . a corporate decision, I mean not a single decision. When I say corporate, I mean a joint decision. (I don't mean a Sask Tel corporation) a joint decision that we would go ahead in downtown Regina.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Premier, what you are saying, therefore, is that you as a member for the legislature from the city of Regina, decided as Premier of Saskatchewan and you say in concert with your cabinet (that is not what I am informed and not what I have seen in the testimony given before certain individuals on expropriation hearings and so on) to go against the Crown corporation, Sask Tel. In other words, you, the member for Regina Elphinstone, decided, as Premier, to override the board of directors of Sask Tel, to override the management of Sask Tel, to go against their preference and to put the building where you decided it should be. Is that correct?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Almost, in the sense that I am not agreeing that I decided, but I and my cabinet colleagues decided that the building should be in downtown Regina within a few blocks of where it was. We didn't pick out the location. I didn't say that block, but I said in downtown Regina and not where you want to build it. That is true. In essence, the cabinet overruled Sask Tel and said that the head office building shall be in downtown Regina. That's true and I don't deny it.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Premier, would you say that that was a kind of decision that would reflect the best interests of the people of all of Saskatchewan as opposed to just one member, or one constituency, or one group of constituencies? Would you say that that kind of decision, that that kind of instruction was, for example, acting on behalf of the people of Nipawin, when Sask Tel would have made that decision to go where they wanted to go, for cost purposes I would presume and because it would be a lot less expensive and because it would be a lot better from their corporate point of view? That would be the position they would take and that would be the position the board of directors would take. Would you say that kind of decision-making, or that kind of decision which you made and which you instructed and which you backed yourself on behalf of your own personal constituents would be, in fact, on behalf of all of the people of the province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, indeed, I would. I am not sure that it would have been in any closer to my constituency in downtown Regina than where they would have built it on Albert Street. It would have been a relatively small number of feet in any case . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, that is right, but my basic argument is that it is in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan that that be in downtown Regina. I say this because otherwise the downtown Regina area was in danger of, in real danger of, being a more or less blighted area. Let me tell you that if the downtown business area of Regina became semi-blighted so that it did not yield appropriate tax revenues and Regina got into financial difficulties on account thereof, the whole of Saskatchewan would have to

pick up the tab.

That's the nature of revenue sharing and the whole bit and it is in the clear interest of the Government of Saskatchewan to see that the business areas, the downtown business areas, of as many communities as possible are healthy. Otherwise those communities are going to suffer from diminution of tax revenue and then we, as a government, and the people of Saskatchewan, are going to have to pick up the tab. The time to move is before they become blighted and not try to reconstruct a blighted area. The downtown area of Regina was, in our judgment, in some danger and I think that this budget will solidify the downtown area of Regina. We may be wrong on this.

Saskatoon is firm, I think; the centre of Saskatoon is firm. We are building a building in downtown Prince Albert when we might have built it somewhere else. We think that even though they may cost marginally more in the downtown area, we believe that they are going to work out and work out pretty well in the long-term interest of the people of Saskatchewan.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, Mr. Premier, I think that's the judgment call that we are talking about and that kind of decision making and that kind of overriding of the appointed officials of your Crown corporations belies and betrays, if you like, the suggestion you made before in this Assembly that somehow Crown Corporations are separate and apart from government.

But, in fact, they are tools of government and they react politically just as the Government of Saskatchewan wants them to. The Premier will also be aware that, without the rail line relocation in downtown Regina and with or without that, the entire Cornwall centre could be the biggest white elephant that ever walked the face of the earth in this community. Unless that rail line is relocated that particular development is not a very worthwhile development other than government offices. And if you've got government offices on Albert Street or government offices in downtown Regina, it makes no difference one way or another in terms of solidifying the downtown core.

The Premier has gone ahead and made that decision on behalf of Sask Tel and made that decision on behalf of other people without getting any commitments at all for rail line relocation. As a matter of fact it appears now that the Liberal government, certainly if they are re-elected . . . and one sincerely hopes that they are, either minority or majority because either way they are going to be kept in office by your party in Ottawa. The only thing I can say is we'll find out for sure where you stand if by some stretch of the imagination the federal Liberals get back in and the NDP happen to be the balance of power. We'll see how much clout you've got down there to make certain that that rail line relocation occurs in Regina. Because without it your entire Cornwall Centre is in very serious jeopardy and you know it.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think I don't agree with the hon. member, basically. I think that the movement of the Eaton's store there will mean that there will be a lot of traffic with the concentration of the Sask Tel and the SGIO employees, and Eaton's. There will be a heavy traffic . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . but it will be concentrated . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, all right I don't think I agree with that. I think that a case can be made for that, certainly.

Let me distinguish here between main line relocation and the yard relocation. I think it is imperative for the health of downtown Regina over any longer period of time that the



rail yards and the express whatever they call it, LCL delivery sheds, and the rest, be moved out. Whether the main line as much needs to be moved I think is an arguable point. I think that it's arguable whether or not the movement of the main line is necessary for the revitalization, as you would term it, of downtown Regina. And I think that it's entirely consistent and indeed, we are building for 100 years. In 25 or 30 years you might make a fair case for saying that a rail line into the downtown area will be a . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, it's a question of whether it cuts it apart, whether you lower the rail one of put in subways or the like. And all of those are possibilities. I am just not agreeing with the hon. member that the removal of the CPR main line is imperative to the continued health of the downtown business community . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, the Cornwall Centre area then. I'm simply not agreeing with that. I'm not saying it would or would not benefit it. I haven't done that type of a cost-benefit analysis. But I do say that it is, the Cornwall Centre is viable in our judgment even though the CPR main line says there.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, that, I'm sorry, cannot go unanswered. First of all in question period today you agreed with the hon. member for Regina South that it was imperative that the rail lines be relocated and you said that you had made submissions to the Government of Canada time after time after time. You'd made no submissions to Mr. Benjamin at all to get him to change his stand as a Member of parliament for Regina with reference to rail line relocation. As the Premier knows, Mr. Benjamin is opposed to the rail line relocation in Regina. But the Premier will be aware of one other city that I could mention in Western Canada, where this has been a serious problem, and that's the city of Calgary. The Premier will be aware that all of the centres that were located adjacent to the rail lines cutting through the centre of Calgary were unsuccessful until there was a commitment by Gulf and others to build over the tracks, in other words, to eliminate the tracks as a separation between one part of the city and the other. He will be aware that all of those centres all the way long the tracks in Calgary were terribly unsuccessful. And here's the Cornwall Centre, right up against the supposed rail line relocation and unless that rail line is relocated the Premier knows that that will face the same kinds of pressures and problems that were faced by those buildings in the city of Calgary. I just give that as one prime example. Or, I can cite the city council of Saskatoon, and the very wise decisions which it made in conjunction with the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada in relocating its rail lines before it attempted its rejuvenation of the downtown.

What I am saying is that the decision that you made overriding Sask Tel, may have been premature to say the least and may end up costing the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan far more than you imagine unless you can get a firmer commitment on that rail line relocation. Because what you are putting your money into, perhaps, is a white elephant of the worst order which will only have to support it, the government offices which can occur anywhere in the city of Regina. And you have all this additional cost of the Cornwall Centre (and it could be a giant white elephant) without that rail line relocation. Check into it. I think it is worth checking into. I think it is worth your government paying more than lip service to the government in Ottawa about that rail line relocation. If you really want to rejuvenate downtown Regina, you have to get that rail line relocation or Regina is going to continue to be divided.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think that we are not ad idem here because there are several proposals for rail line relocation. All of them involve the moving of the yards into northeast Regina, that I am aware of. All of them involve moving the yards, the combined CN and CP yards to northeast Regina and building a loop around the north part of the city which will be what might be called the freight loop to the yards and

**April 18, 1979**

then out and joining the CPR main line to the West. The only issue is whether or not there should continue to be a CPR main line through downtown Regina.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Nobody would object if it went under ground. Nobody would object if . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I will try my best to make my answers. They are not acceptable to the hon. member, but . . .

**MR. THATCHER:** — You would never make it . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, please. I would ask the members of the Assembly to try to give each other the same courtesy that is extended to them. When one is speaking we would appreciate no other interjections coming forth.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina-South):** — Mr. Premier, were you instrumental, or did you intervene with the federal Minister of Transport, for further allocation of federal funds for the Saskatoon relocation of the rail line?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No, that was done between 1964 and 1971 and I was not . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Pardon. All right look, just a moment now. You are asking me personally whether I intervened. The answer is no. I don't know what the government may have done with respect to that. I simply cannot answer whether or not the minister in the transportation agency has been dealing with the Government of Canada on that issue.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Are you saying to us today that you would agree with the main line of the CPR remaining in the downtown location?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, on that I think we would be guided a good bit by the views of the city of Regina. The answers, I think, is we would agree with any viable alternative and we think that probably the location of the CPR main line is viable, or the leaving of the CPR main line and building a series of underpasses or the lowering of the CPR main line through the downtown core is viable, but what is not viable is to leave the main line and the yards there. I think that our position would be that we would go along with anything that was viable.

There are arguments on both sides. The keeping of the CPR main line argument is that, in due course, we will be moving a good number of people by rail, and bringing them into downtown Regina would be a positive benefit to downtown Regina. The argument against it is that the track is such an impediment to road traffic that it will inevitably hamper development. You pay your money and you take your choice. Everybody agrees that the yards and the LCL goods handling facilities and the like need to be moved. We will go with any viable alternative.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, as a member for Regina, I want to assure you that I feel that your government should do everything possible to encourage the federal government to allocate the funds for the complete relocation of the rail line in the city of Regina.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We are certainly urging the federal government to put up their money. The CPR main line is a relatively minor part of the relocation project. The major part is certainly the removal of the yards to northeast Regina and to build the lines to the new yards and to relocate the CN yards and get that problem on Pasqua Street at the CN line solved, and the rest of it.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Premier, this year your government is setting up a new department known as the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. I found this a rather strange inconsistency because, when the estimates of the executive council were up last year, I believe I recall asking you what your intentions were as far as the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs was concerned.

Your answer was roughly equivalent that, at that time, you had no intention of setting up a special department of intergovernmental affairs and that you preferred to keep a relatively small select committee. I would therefore like to ask you exactly what has transpired that has caused your change in thinking in this area.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Two things really. One is that we have launched into what I might call an almost non-stop series of conferences on the constitution (and that's had two effects) and on other things. We've had four televised federal-provincial conferences within a period of 12 months, if I'm right. And that has not happened in the history of Canada; we've never had 2 in 12 months, that I'm aware of. Quite apart from other conferences, provincial premiers' conferences and the like, we're into a series of non-stop conferences which we simply have to staff up for. We still have a relatively small group of about 18; we have 8 or 9 now and we find that we still need some more people.

The number of federal-provincial contexts keeps going up and up, including demands that we press for money for rail line relocation, if I may state one. There will be another one for Qu'Appelle Valley flood control and the rest; there are just so many. We are finding many more requirements. Today's question period — one on Grasslands park, one on SAP and Canada Assistance Plan — I wonder how many of today's questions had a federal-provincial overtone. And it's quite interesting how many. So we are increasingly getting into this area. What we are finding is that we previously had a federal government which wasn't moving in these areas and is now moving. Maybe there will be more movement in the next 12 months for reasons which you and I can speculate on, maybe there will be still more movement in Ottawa. So, we have to gear up for that and we need a few more staff.

You ask, why couldn't you simply have added them to your office of intergovernmental affairs and let it go at that? Why a new department? Answer: I want the freedom to have another minister as well as myself. I could obviously, I suppose, have a minister operating the office of intergovernmental affairs, but it's traditional to call him Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. It's becoming the pattern in Canada. Let's see: between September 1978 and February 1979, there were eight ministerial meetings out of Regina of two or three days in duration. That means that if I'm going to do that as Premier, I'm not going to be Premier of Saskatchewan. So, someone else is doing it, so the Attorney General is doing it. Since he is, in effect, doing it, I want to be free to name a minister of intergovernmental affairs and the simplest thing to do seemed to be to set up a department.

**April 18, 1979**

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Premier, in reference to the question period today, I think we read it differently. My interpretation of today's question period (it must be time to go home) was that it was awful.

Anyway, Mr. Premier, did I understand you correctly to say that it is your intention to have a separate minister of intergovernmental affairs complete with a deputy? Did I interpret you correctly in making that indication just now?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That's my present intention. When I say separate, I mean separate from me, not necessarily separate from probably somebody holding another portfolio, but somebody who is not the Premier.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Premier, that was the area that I perhaps did want to raise with you for a moment, Executive Council, because looking from afar here (maybe I'm looking too much at the political ramifications) it struck me that perhaps you have a little bit of an internal problem over there. I don't think I'm saying anything shocking when I say that within your cabinet ranks there perhaps may be the odd minister who would not be classed, shall we say, heavy weight. And you have a problem with a few bright stars on the backbenches. Now, Mr. Premier, I think at the present time we have about 18 cabinet minister plus yourself for a total of 19. I may be out one or so, I think that's what we've got. Mr. Minister, is this not the old trick, which your party has been extremely skilful at over the years and that is, number one, creating a problem. The problem of course is we've got some bright boys on the backbenches whom you can't leave there with, shall we say, what's sitting there ahead of them.

So obviously a situation has to arise where we need a new governmental department. The situation has arisen. We've got to get these new fellows in otherwise we're going to have the opposition over on that side instead of here. Last year you were pretty adamant (that's about only 12 months ago) that we didn't really need a department of governmental affairs. A few months go by, we have an election. A couple of bright lights happen to fluke a seat that they had not business winning, and all of a sudden you've got a problem. Mr. Premier, isn't that true, and why don't you make the announcement right now, that very shortly we are going to have a full-fledged minister of intergovernmental affairs complete with a deputy? I could go ahead and name him right now, but I suppose we shouldn't steal all your thunder. But would you care to let us in on the very obvious secret?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll name you the deputy now. It's going to be Howard Leeson, because he has been the director of the office of intergovernmental affairs and he will be the deputy. With respect to having a minister of intergovernmental affairs who will have no other cabinet responsibilities that is not our present intention, although the hon. member makes some comments which are accurate in the sense that we have the problem of an embarrassment of riches of talent on our side. I know it's a problem which not every political party has, but we happen to have. We expect to make some changes which may deal with that. We do not at the present moment have any intention of having a cabinet of — is it 28 or 29 that my colleague to the west of us has — 29 I think in Mr. Lougheed's cabinet. We do not intent to approach that level.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Premier, how big a cabinet do we really need? Some of your portfolios right now are really not heavy ones. In some of them the minister is primarily concerned with running a Crown corporation. That's his primary duty. Would the Premier agree that portfolios such as this really aren't all that necessary and that perhaps it's just an extra cabinet minister with a light load that's available to do some

heavy-weight politicking. I am sure the Premier is aware, has seen in other governments, some of your poorest cabinet ministers are the best politicians out in the hustings. Is that what the Premier is doing in some of these portfolios which really don't seem all that heavy? Well, shall we say the minister in charge of the Sask Housing Corporation? It's really not a very heavy portfolio that he is carrying but he's darned effective out in the hustings. Is this a role or is this part of the Premier's overall strategy? For a province the size of Saskatchewan with less than a million people, a budget that's approaching dangerously close to \$2 billion, how many cabinet ministers do we really need to run an effective government?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, members opposite me are saying 44. I don't know where they got that number . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Ralph, you can have the job. What the hon. member says is accurate in the sense that a number of the portfolios . . . I think of the member for Kinistino (Mr. Cody); I think we call him Minister of Telephones, and he would say that the Department of Telephones is the smallest part of his responsibilities. The Saskatchewan Government Telephones with 4,000 employees and still a fair number of policy decisions is an important responsibility, as is the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, as is the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. And those are significant responsibilities.

I ask hon. members to take something like the Saskatchewan Power Corporation (SPC) and say, should this take much of the minister's time? The answer is, yes it will, if he is to answer in the House questions about where the district operators are, where the district managers are. I am not in any way suggesting those questions shouldn't be raised in the House. I think they should be because I think that the people of Saskatchewan regard the power corporation as part of their service infrastructure and they should be able to get their member to ask questions about it. But if that's true, then he's got to spend a little time at it. If he's going to spend a little time at that if you're going to ask questions on telephones, which I think is O.K., and the rest, then this is all going to take ministerial time and it has to be accounted for. Accordingly I could look at where we are, 19, 20, 21 in that range, as about what we can't handle now with the range of duties we have. We have to be able to inform ourselves so we can be reasonably responsive in the House and so we can do the appropriate amount of public contact. You will refer to it as something else but I will refer to it as public contact, which is necessary in order to keep any government in touch with its electors.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Premier, I have one final question and it concerns as to how you make your decisions as to cabinet ministers, such as, when does the bottom level get reached? What I am saying is when a cabinet minister is so bad, glaringly bad, (and I am not going into any specifics) that his own department has such contempt for him they don't even tell him about what is going on, and when cabinet ministers, in question period, have a great deal of difficulty, shall we say, getting on with the business, at what point does the Premier say, that's it, you've got to go?

Now, your departmental people do it., I am sure, in the case of incompetence. At what stage in the delicate political system that we have now, do you, as the Premier, say that is enough. Because, Mr. Premier, you do know, I don't have to tell you and it is probably even more glaringly obvious to you internally. You have some cabinet people who do not carry their weight and I am not going to become any more specific than that. When do you reach that line when you say, we have to move, we have to make changes?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't agree with the hon. member that we have cabinet ministers who don't carry their weight. I have been in cabinets before. This will

**April 18, 1979**

be 12 years in cabinets with a various shuffle and this is as strong a cabinet as I have been in, I believe. I would be perfectly happy to keep any and all of the present cabinet ministers.

However, you do raise a question that there is merit in giving new people opportunities to serve. It is an exhausting job and people who have been in cabinet for a while, particularly if they have been MLAs for a while, frequently want out and I understand that. Accordingly, I am not suggesting that all of the present cabinet ministers will necessarily be cabinet minister this time next year. I am not asserting that, but if they aren't it will not be because I don't have confidence in the, but rather because we will want to give other people an opportunity to serve and they will want an opportunity to have a little less strenuous work.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, thank the Premier for providing me with this information he sent over today, so quickly. I would like to ask a few question on the information you supplied.

First of all, do you not have a Mr. Kinzel in your department?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No, I don't. Mr. Kinzel is on the staff of the Department of Finance. I am expecting that there will be a shift and I am expecting that one of the members who is on my staff will drop off and Mr. Kinzel will join my staff. I am frank to say that, but he is not there now.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Nor has he been?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well he was three or four years ago. He was my chief executive officer. They all have different names — principal secretary, deputy and all this. The names have changed. He was the deputy, whatever we called him. He then really went to the potash secretariat at the time we were having some particular problems with the potash industry. We had a little group who were working through our problems. He went there. That is really spinning down, he's really the only one left and rather than keep the potash secretariat extant we moved him over to Finance. That problem is essentially resolved, we hope. The major negotiations are winding down and he will come back to my staff.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I notice from the figures you gave us some substantial increases in salaries to some of your officials. The most glaring one is your Mr. Howard Leeson, deputy minister, intergovernmental affairs from \$22,610 estimated last year to \$38,850 estimated this year, which is an increase of 72 per cent. It seems evident throughout that there are some pretty hefty increases for your people, 30 per cent. 61 per cent, and I can go on. Where is this going to stop? How much further are we going to be going with these increases? How much more can we afford to pay? Wouldn't you call this inflationary and trendsetting?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, yes it's difficult to set out a chart like this. You don't know whether you are setting out for the position or for the man, that one carries the man. He came here from Alberta, started at a relatively junior position. He was a person with a good deal of competency as we found. He certainly wasn't deputy minister when he was getting \$22,600. Then he became assistant deputy minister to me in intergovernmental affairs when that became a practically non-stop operation. My own deputy was not carrying it. Now we have set up a new department in which he will be a full-fledged deputy at a relatively lower level in the deputies' ranges of \$38,000. We

don't expect that escalates very rapidly.

I think the hon. member is correct in saying that the senior staff salaries are at an appropriate level now and we will not expect any significant increases in them. They will get cost of living increases but we don't expect to move up the whole plateau of senior staff salaries.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Was Mr. Leeson deputy minister when you paid him a salary of \$30,000? Your estimate was \$22,000 but I notice that the actual salary paid was \$30,350. Was he actually the deputy minister at that time?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — He was assistant deputy minister for most of the period and deputy minister from December on, I think — January 1, so that actually represents nine months at a lower level and three months at a somewhat higher level. It's a mix.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Just to carry on a little further. I notice you have three people in your office, Mr. Premier, who perform exactly the same duties. The three people I refer to are Rodney Dickinson, Valerie Preston, and Gordon Vichert; however, I notice (and I'm going to look at one column, which is the 1979-80 estimate) that Mr. Dickinson, with a Bachelor of Arts and the three years of experience is getting a ballpark figure of \$29,000. Valerie Preston, who has a lot more qualifications in education, is receiving \$26,607, and Mr. Gordon Vichert, who has more again, is at \$39,174. Are you, by any chance, practising some kind of discrimination against women in your department?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No, it just happened that Mrs. Preston has only been with us a brief time, relatively. She just came on July 1 and therefore just hasn't worked up the scale. You're quite right in saying that she's highly qualified and is doing a first-rate job. Mr. Vichert spends a lot of time writing speeches and preparing papers and he's again highly qualified. Mr. Dickinson is less well qualified academically, but has a good range of background, and deals with the problems which seem to come into a premier's office in large volumes, of various kinds, which you attempt to deal with. He's been there for three years.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — O.K., he may have been there three years, and I'm sure that your Valerie Preston — She got paid \$25,765 last year so I presume she was there last year. You must know her qualifications by now, or her ability I should say. The fact is that when you are hiring you must be taking into consideration qualifications, so I say that there is certainly some discrimination there.

Now, on Mr. Vichert, it doesn't say how many years he's been with your department. Has he just started? Is he a new man or has he been there for a long time? How long has he been there?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Vichert has been with the government about four years. He was with the Minister of Finance for awhile (Mr. Smishek) and then with me.

As for Mrs. Preston, I put in \$25,765, which is what she would've gotten, had she been there a full year.

**April 18, 1979**

That is the salary rate rather than the salary. She has just been here since July 1, so she has been with us less than a year and with Mr. Vichert for less than a year. Gordon Vichert has been with the government for at least four years and Rodney Dickinson, for at least three years and maybe more.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, part of that I can accept — but not really because I still think there are some discrepancies in your calculations in your allowances for salaries to these people. I don't know whether I should say there are too high or they are too low or that they are not fair, but there is certainly some justification to say that they are not right. However, you say that Mr. Vichert has been there for four years. What justification do you have for a 35 per cent increase in his salary in one year?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, he got a negotiated increase and he also was still getting an increment. We felt that he was doing a good job, and I admit when I look at it, it is a substantial increase. I must say that I was surprised that it added up to that much, but those are the reasons.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You are saying now that you are surprised to see that kind of an increase. In light of that statement, are you prepared to readjust it at this point in time?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'm not prepared to cut it, if that is what you are asking. It may well affect future increases.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If you will allow me one minute, Mr. Chairman, I would like to look further at the salaries.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Chairman, the field of advertising today has become a highly specialized and technical art, and much of it is geared to the emotions of people and geared to the subconscious. My question to the Premier is that in a news release by the member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) in the Big Country News, he states, even after expenses are paid, that leaves a pretty good income by anybody's standards. A number of constituents, particularly older people . . . I think doctors have done well financially under the present government. By a strange fact, the very same article was printed in the Maple Creek News, as a first-person press release from the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter). What I would like to know is, does someone in government information services write these articles, and how many of these articles were released by members opposite to various weeklies in the province?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The answer is, no. Nobody in government services wrote them. If they bear some similarity you perhaps can inquire at the caucus office. I know, not as the Premier, but from other things, that the caucus research staff does suggest to members what might be appropriate topics they might cover.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — I realize that, Mr. Premier, but the old adage, 'great minds think alike and fools seldom differ', might apply to this.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — On salaries again, I've another here I'd like to question the Premier on and that is your Chief Electoral Officer, Carole Bryant. I notice you moved her from \$18,600 to \$26,000 which is a 40 per cent increase. I don't have her years of experience but I do note she has a Bachelor of Arts and one and one-half years towards



a BSW. First of all, what a BSW?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Bachelor of Social Work.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Social work. What's that got to do with chief electoral officer? Nothing. So that has no bearing on the job. Why would her position move that much?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Here again we had the problem of the person in the position and we weren't entirely sure what you had in mind. The previous chief electoral officer got, I suspect, a good deal more than that. I suspect the previous officer got even more than \$26,000 (He was Don McMillan, a fairly senior person). Carole Bryant was an executive assistant in my office who I thought could assume the additional responsibility of being chief electoral officer, which she did. That represents a change in her position rather than an increase in the amount paid to the job. She is a young woman in her late 20s, I suppose, early 30s.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I think her age is irrelevant.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — She is a relatively younger woman who was an executive assistant in my office, who was competent and I thought, let's see if she can do that job and I believe she is doing it well.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I don't question her competence, Mr. Premier, but I'm wondering . . . and you made a statement a little while ago about, yes, you agreed that there are some pretty hefty increases here. Can we expect this type of an increase, and again in the light of the statement you just made now that the previous chief electoral officer was paid much more than even the \$26,000, again next year?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Let me say again, no. Shortly put, no because she's not likely to move to another job. If she became a deputy minister in the next years, she may be. But if you're asking whether the chief electoral officer will get an increase, the answer is no. If she stays in the office of chief electoral officer, she will not get an increase of that percentage.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — What kind of percentages are you looking at for the next year at this point in time?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We're looking at probably at something in the 6 per cent or 7 per cent range. We haven't sorted that out yet because the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) contract is not signed.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — You suggested that Carole Bryant has just moved to that position and, therefore, got the additional sum. If I remember correctly, she was in charge during the Pelly by-election which would indicate that her term in the position as Returning Officer is longer than you're indicating in your prior statement.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — She certainly was there during the Pelly by-election. There is no doubt about that. She became Chief Electoral Officer for the two prior by-elections. If that is so, then obviously if she was paid \$18,600, then she was paid April 1, 1977 and if in fact she was paid \$18,600 that obviously was a probationary rate, because we certainly didn't intend to pay the chief electoral officer at that rate. But that's about what she was getting in my office.

**April 18, 1979**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — One more person, and I believe it is the lady sitting beside you, Mrs. Wilkie, is it? I notice she was appointed to the job on September 12, 1978, so I will accept that from \$22,000 to \$35,000. My question is: why have you cut her salary?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The estimate went in before Mrs. Wilkie was appointed. The estimate was in on the basis of the previous incumbent and Mrs. Wilkie was a lateral transfer from another agency. She was running the career development office in the Department of Finance, and we decided that we could amalgamate that with the women's bureau of the Department of Labour and put them together, which we did and in effect rubbed out the career development office of the Department of Finance as a separate agency. Mrs. Wilkie came over as chief electoral officer and she carried with her . . . (Clerk of the Executive Council, a she points out) and her salary level in the previous one dictated that she get the \$35,567, which she is getting and the estimate was in for the previous incumbent who was not as high a level. She will get more than \$35,452 — probably 6 per cent.

Item 1 agreed.

## **ITEM 2**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Earlier, under item 1, the point was brought up of national advertising firms and so forth. I just couldn't resist getting into that one. I would suggest to the Premier that he would save on the million dollars he spent last year on advertising if he did not use a national advertising firm. It would be \$571,000, not \$1 million. If he would like to see how that works I would suggest that the national firms, as he indicates, get 15 per cent. The national firms dictate a rate that is higher than what is considered an in-province rate. In other words, let's give you a quote of one-half a page it's \$40 for versus \$70 on a national basis. The 15 per cent is taken of the \$70, where if it is local and was put in the newspaper by Information Services, they would pay the \$40 rate, which would be quite an abundant saving to the Government of Saskatchewan. I am quoting rates from a newspaper — I went out and phoned them and checked the rates.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Let me say first that we pay the national advertising rate if we put it through Struthers, which is not a national agency. I don't know whether that's true or not.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — It's the national rate. I have checked that too.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I will say that with respect a relatively small part of our advertising amount is newspaper, really quite a small amount. And then we would have to gear up to deal with 80 newspapers and the rest and we'd have to make a judgment on that.

Items 3 — 5 agreed.

## **Item 6**

**MR. HAM:** — Mr. Chairman, where have you had any complaints of poor service in the Provincial Inquiry Centre?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I haven't but I'd welcome any comment there. I'll just make a very brief comment. We started out with around 1,500 or 1,800 inquiries per month and we're getting up around 4,000 inquiries per month with still the same basic for staff and it may be that we just can't hack it. I don't know.

**MR. HAM:** — I believe you answered the question. I tell you personally that the service I've had has been excellent except that on numerous occasions I have attempted to phone in (I'm obviously concerned for constituents now) and the phone has been busy up to half an hour to an hour. I see you've decreased the allotment of funds for that department and I would suggest that we should reverse that attitude. Obviously if you've had more calls and it's increasing by month, you should consider more staff and increase expenditure in that regard.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'll just give a brief reply. We have decreased the amount and what we decreased was the advertising since we felt we couldn't afford to advertise that service any more because we're barely dealing with the level of service we have now. I think we'll probably have to add at least one person. I think it's a valuable service. It's not terribly expensive and it does a job particularly for people outside Regina who can phone in on the toll free. We're certainly looking at it, and thank you.

Item 6 agreed.

#### Item 7

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What does that mean?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That means that is a token vote that is put in there to cover the cost of the time vote or votes under The Time Act, which we may have one a year, but also by-elections and general elections. And that one last year was \$1,000 and we overspent it by a couple of million.

Items 7 — 9 agreed.

#### ITEM 10

**MR. KATZMAN:** — One question, Mr. Premier. Does that include all of the benefits that are required for the ministers? And I add a sub to that. Their MLA stuff, I believe, is separate, but the special benefits they get because they're cabinet ministers — is that the total figure? Does that include their car and so forth?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, that is just the money paid out. That's \$24,580 to the Premier in salary and the \$327,000 is just 18 times whatever the MLA's is and the \$9,000 is the legislative secretaries and that's just salary there. The cars are paid for by the Central Vehicle Agency or by their department. The travel expenses are over in the administration vote of Executive Council. So, that's just the bare salaries.

Item 10 agreed.

Executive Council Vote 10 agreed.

#### SUPPLEMENTARIES

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Premier, doesn't the election show up there or is it another vote?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I could tell you what it is, but it's a charge on the consolidated fund. Because it's a statutory vote, it doesn't show up as a supplementary. It doesn't need to be voted. But I've got the figures if you want them. I promised the Leader of the

**April 18, 1979**

Opposition that I would give him some slight detail on this supplementary which he asked me yesterday. The big item there is \$192,000, which we didn't vote or budget for the Royal Visit and there is another \$40,000 for the premiers' conference which wasn't fully provided for and \$53,000 for some people we added in mid-year which I outlined, the six over and above the temporaries and that's basically the big items.

Item 1 agreed.

## **ITEM 2**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Just one question, Mr. Minister, Intergovernmental Affairs is not a proper department yet, is it?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Once again this money is being held in trust until that department is created, am I correct?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That's right. The money which we just voted for intergovernmental affairs is for the months of April, May and June and we expect to set up a new department of intergovernmental affairs on July 1. What you have in this Executive Council vote which we just voted was three months. We have another intergovernmental affairs on page 63 and you are quite right in saying that that can't be spent until we get a new act. We put it in Executive Council in which we can spend it and, with a little luck, we will have passed that act by July 1. That's all I can say.

Item 2 agreed.

Supplementaries, Executive Council agreed.

## **INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS — VOTE 42**

Items 1 to 4 agreed.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Just one question here. I assume the people you were indicating you added to your office are the people who will be moving into this department as time prevails.

Intergovernmental Affairs Vote 42 agreed. The committee reported progress.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

### **Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Oil Well Income Tax Act.**

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

### **Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Oil and Gas Conservation, Stabilization and Development Act.**

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Road Allowances Crown Oil Act**

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Pipelines Act**

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

**Section 3**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Why are you moving gravity and density? What's the reason for the change?

**MR. MESSER:** — It's part of the metric conversion. You move from gravity to density.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed.

Section 5 as amended agreed.

Section 6 as amended agreed.

Section 7 as amended agreed.

Section 8 as amended agreed.

Section 9 deleted.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute Act.**

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.**

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Pest Control Act.**

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Apiaries Act.**

### Section 1

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Minister, during the debate on second reading of this particular act, I asked several questions and it went through second reading without you replying to some of the questions. One of the questions was: (I realize this act does not cover it), but I asked the question, what act covers the other type of bees which are not referred to in this act — and I refer to leaf cutter bees and that type?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — I think there is no act that covers those bees. They are not a honey producing bee and they are, therefore, not covered under The Apiaries Act.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — And the equipment that they use is not covered either? For example, if somebody brings in diseased equipment, houses and so forth, does this act control that?

**MR. KAEDING:** — yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is no relationship between the two kinds of bees and the kind of disease that would be spread.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — In the bill itself (not the one we are amending today), there was a clause which I should compliment the government for not touching, and it is a clause which I think should be in a lot more agricultural bills. It leaves the people in the industry controlling the affairs of the industry. This is one of the few bills I have found that in and I would hope that the minister would consider — when we come back into the House — that kind of clause in the other bills which he looks after, like the cattle check-off and so forth. Those are the comments which I wish to relay at this time.

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 agreed.

Section 10 as amended agreed.

Section 11 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

### **Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.**

### Section 1

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, during second reading I asked if it was possible for your department to supply is with a list of people who have been receiving these funds in the past. It is suggested you are going to make grants under \$10,000 by your department and the grant exceeding \$10,000 . . . You'll give me a minute. Is this the list?

I notice within the grant list that you have given me — could you give me some criteria? I have no argument with any of the people whom I see listed here, and the idea that it is for. I realize it says on the side, explanations of what some of the grants are for, but what is the criteria for who receives grants? I notice that we have agricultural societies and the 4-H and so forth, along that line, and small fairs. Is there any criteria that you rule these on?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Generally, we have policies which cover most of these operations, but the general criterion is that it is to the benefit of agriculture. It is an expenditure for the benefit of agriculture and it can take various forms.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, as I said earlier, when you came with this bill, it bothered me to give you an open cheque book because basically that is what you are asking for. Yet most of the grants you have shown us on this list were proper and I assume, by the look of them, were non-political, to be very candid.

Where do you find the list on things like Saskatchewan Livestock Association and others? They are for the betterment of the agriculture industry, the National Farmers' Union and so forth, but they don't show here. Where do you show them?

**MR. KAEDING:** — O.K., they would come under the section which requires me to go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. These are grants which I can pay without going to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The other ones must be put before the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — For an example, \$8,200 is this figure to a farmers' market, which you will be able to pass by this amendment. Now in the same one there is \$11,000 and \$13,000 to the same type of groups, so I would suggest for the \$13,000 you have to go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

**MR. KAEDING:** — What happens there is that these are grants. That is a total lump sum of the amount of grants to all of those organizations. But when they are paid out they are paid out in smaller sums and so they are paid out in \$1,000 and \$1,250 or whatever the amount is.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, that's exactly the part that has been bothering me about this bill. You can pay out \$9,900 to an organization (let's assume the Saskatchewan Livestock Association) for one project and then, we can pay out on another project for Saskatchewan Livestock Association for another \$9,000 and another \$9,000 for a third project. They're all separate projects, therefore, the total is under \$10,000; or the NFU (National Farmers' Union) or any other group you want to bring forward.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's correct but the amount that is paid out in the total must stay within the appropriation which is passed here in this legislature. And therefore, we can't in any way exceed that appropriation. So it's really governed by the appropriation you have for that particular subvote in your estimates. So, if I'm only allowed to pay so many dollars out for this particular estimate, then I have to stay within that and I have my projects which I have to get within that framework. If I put more money into something, I've got to take it out of something else.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I would disagree with you because in the past what you've done when you've over spent in one area, you've just come in with a supplementary budget in different departments. If you spend more money than was voted to you in a certain area, you can, I understand, if you cut back in another portion of your department, use those funds. Because the total vote is for your department even though it's not voted under that section, and secondly, if you spend more money, you can turn around and come in with a supplementary estimate to give you the funds that you require. So, basically this is an open cheque book and that's what's bothering me

about these two amendments here.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, the power is still there to spend more than the budgeted amount when doing it as you indicate. And all this does is separate the amount of money which can be spent by the minister without consulting the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. So, if I wanted to over spend I could simply go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and say, well, I want to over spend on this item and if it was legitimate, certainly they would give me approval for that. So it's not a matter of that I couldn't get approval if I wanted to over spend. There's a division point where I can make the decision and where the decision has to be made by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — The difference is — and here is the key difference — when you have to go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, there is a piece of paper that tells everybody that you've spent the money because it has passed the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. When you pass it within your department, nobody knows that you gave \$9,000 here and \$9,000 there and \$9,000 there. But each time you have to go to anything over \$10,000, we will know because you go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council; but everything under \$10,000 is not going to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and therefore you can nickel and dime wherever you want and the opposition will never really be able to scrutinize where you're spending your money.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, they have the opportunity to scrutinize it in public accounts. In the next year, you can look at public accounts and if you see me abusing my privilege you could very soon bring it to the attention of the Public Accounts Committee.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I believe the minimum figure in public accounts is low enough that we wouldn't see some of the spending in the different areas. Or is it \$5,000 or anything over \$10,000, I think is what you report to public accounts.

**MR. KAEDING:** — I think if the Public Accounts Committee were asked for a specific accounting they could get it right down to the last nickel but the public account's book only lists those above \$5,000.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm hesitant, because of the good work the money has done, to go against this bill but I also don't want to give you an open cheque book. That's what you're asking me to do by approving these two amendments which say that under \$10,000 you do as you please, over \$10,000 you go to the Lieutenant-Governor. I agree with you if you go to the Lieutenant-Governor at least everybody knows. I wonder if the minister would consider (and I don't think it causes him hardship) that all grants which he has to do now go through the Lieutenant-Governor — why would he not continue that practice?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, the problem simply is the mass or volume of material which has to go through the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. If you are going to have to go to the Lieutenant-Governor and have an order in council for every little appropriation that you make, we have difficulty in our cabinet to the extent that it takes a lot of time to approve all of these little appropriations. We are assuming that as long as it is budgeted for and as long as there is an appropriate mechanism to make sure that we don't overspend in any unreasonable way, the minister should be responsible enough to be able to authorize anything up to \$10,000.



**MR. KATZMAN:** — You say it's time consuming and there are delays (basically cabinet or Lieutenant-Governor in Council) by having to take all these small grants of money to the meeting to be passed. I don't think, as Mr. Romanow tried to suggest systematically, that the House should go bang, bang, bang as the minister stands up and makes recommendations and then go for the Lieutenant-Governor's signature. Would you be willing to supply the opposition, even though it isn't mandatory, with every grant you grant under the \$10,000 per item?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Not except through the public accounts because in public accounts it's all recorded and everything has to be recorded there. You have every opportunity at that point in time to get your oar in and find out whether we are spending our money wisely. If you can identify in public accounts that we have not wisely spent our money then certainly that's your opportunity to dispute it.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, that's the key difference. You are asking me to wait for two years to make any comments on how you spent your money. As long as it is handled of what method it is now, I will know about it at the time of spending the money which means I know a lot sooner obviously and if I have any criticism or agreement on what you've done, I can state so publicly. With this bill you're going to bury all the funds that you grant under \$10,000. I suggest to you that unless you're willing to be fair with the opposition, you are forcing the opposition to the point where they must vote against giving you permission to get an open cheque book below \$10,000. You're forcing us to go against something which basically we agree you should be allowed to do but you should allow the House, the members of this House, to know where you're spending the money. That's why I say, when it's going through order in council, we are at least notified where the money goes. We may not agree or we may agree with where you're spending but we have the right to hold the orders in council and to make comment on them. But by doing this, we will not see where the money went for two years, except for the ones that are over \$10,000, where now all of them must go through the Lieutenant-Governor. I suggest either give us one point or the other or we're going to have to go against the minister on the point that you're asking us for an open cheque book.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not accept, of course, the arguments that he's putting forward. I think that every minister of the Crown is responsible for the job he does. We are under the appropriations; we're responsible to administer funds as they are approved by the legislature. I think that really it's not anything special that we're asking. We're simply asking an extension of what is already there. At the present time, the minister can grant grants up to \$1,000. We're saying we simply want to extend that to \$10,000. Since the original legislation was passed, dollars have escalated and it just takes a lot of work off our hands. We're prepared to stand by this recommendation.

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Section 2 as amended agreed.

### Section 3

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's proper . . . it's Mr. Chairman, the portion of the grants under \$10,000 that we're on division on. I don't know if you can separate it out or if it would have to be the whole section.

Section 3 agreed.

**April 18, 1979**

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 48 — An Act respecting the Funding of Agricultural Research Activities**

Sections 1 to 21 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The Conservation and Development Act.**

1 and 2 agreed.

3, Section 2 as amended agreed.

4, Section 6 as amended agreed.

5, Section 8 as amended agreed.

6 (14) agreed.

7 (16) agreed.

8, Section 18 as amended agreed.

9 (50) agreed.

10, Section 73 as amended agreed.

11, Section 87 as amended agreed.

12 (91) agreed.

13 deleted.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend the Watershed Associations Act.**

1 and 2 agreed.

3 and 4 agreed.

5, new sections 23 to 23(2) as amended agreed.

Section 6 agreed.

Section 7 amended agreed.

Section 8 amended agreed.

Section 9 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend The Trust Companies act.**

Sections 1, 2 and 3 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill 12 — An Act to amend The Trust and Loan Companies Licensing Act.**

Sections 1, 2 and 3 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend The Prescription Drugs Act.**

**Section 1**

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment. I know this is a terrific bill and I can see that we're even going to have the Attorney General's support. I just want to know what you're trying to do with it, that's all.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to outline quickly the three things that the bill does.

First of all, one amendment authorizes the minister to be able to provide financial assistance to programs which provide information about drugs for physicians and pharmacists. We do this now. We have a contract with the university. But we have to do it through another provision in the Department of Health Act because there is no provision in The Dental Plan Act. So it was thought it would be administratively much better to do it with the agency that's responsible.

Secondly, it authorizes us to enter into agreements for the purpose of conducting studies and tests to determine whether payments should be made for certain drugs. So that's simply an administrative matter.

The other one, which I suppose can be fairly said to have the major substance in it, is that the minister is also authorized to furnish information to physicians and pharmacists in hospitals, about drugs received by a beneficiary. This is for the purpose of controlling the inappropriate use of drugs and abuses in the drug program.

You will find that, in the amendment as it is outlined and as it is provided, this will only be done on a recommendation of the Drug Utilization Committee. This is a committee that has some very qualified people on it, from all the professions involved with treatment and with the dispensing and prescribing of drugs. That's really the major amendment in this piece of legislation.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — I agree with what you're trying to do here. My only concern was in section 3(2). I had some concern as it relates to doctor-patient confidentiality. I suppose there's nothing you can say that can ease that concern. I do support what you're trying to do. I just have a little concern about that section.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

**April 18, 1979**

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 52 — An Act to establish a Health Research Board**

**Section 1**

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Chairman, again, this is a great bill. It just falls a little short of being serious, with \$750,000. I know that's all you've got, but I wonder if you wouldn't bring some pressure to bear on cabinet to bring a few more dollars for a very worthwhile cause in health research. This \$750,000 is peanuts alongside the Alberta situation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . \$30 million a year following a \$300 million start up grant and I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . but it's a great program — just not enough.

Section 1 agreed.

Section 2 agreed.

Section 3 as amended agreed.

Sections 4 to 6 agreed.

Section 7 as amended agreed.

Sections 8 to 25 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 59 — An Act to amend The Mental Health Act.**

Section 1 and 2 agreed.

Sections 3 to 12 as amended agreed.

Section 13 agreed.

Sections 14 and 15 as amended agreed.

Section 16 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:10 p.m.