

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

April 24, 1979.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. D.F. McARTHUR (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 63 Grade 8 students from Argyle School here in Regina. They're sitting in the west gallery. The student are accompanied by teachers Larry Huber and Fred Chriest. I'm sure all members join with me in wishing these students an enjoyable visit and an educational visit here at the Legislative Building this afternoon. I will be meeting with the students at 3 o'clock and look forward to seeing you then.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E. KAEDING (Saltcoats): — It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 38 students from Saltcoats and Bredenbury schools in my constituency. They're Grade 8 students and they're accompanied by their teachers Shirley Huziak and Ms. Charlotte Theis and their bus driver, Elmer Dickson. I trust that they'll have an educational and informative afternoon. I'm sure all of you will want to join with me in welcoming them here to the legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR ASSISTING IN FLOOD AREAS

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise in the Assembly today. Apparently the right wing of our party was celebrating the tremendous victory in Prince Edward Island last night of the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. The Premier will be aware, I know, that six weeks ago the opposition suggested to the government have they have contingency plans with reference to flooding, severe flood conditions which might arise in the province of Saskatchewan. We were advised that there were no such contingency plans. The Premier will be aware that as late as two or three days ago, we asked the Government of Saskatchewan what action they were taking and we were told that it was not their responsibility; it was the responsibility of the EMO (Emergency Measures Organization) and of the local municipalities.

My question to the Premier is this: in the light of the statement today by Mr. Ray Pentland, the hydrologist with the Department of the Environment, that 140,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan would be directly or indirectly affected by the flooding conditions in the province of Saskatchewan, what programs or contingency has your government prepared now at this point in time to declare the certain areas of the province of Saskatchewan disaster areas and to get in and help the farmers who are going to be so materially affected by this tremendous flood runoff this year?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I would not want hon. members to think that I agreed with the statements of alleged facts which preceded that question. We at no time said that we were not prepared to deal with the flood situation and we have, of course, had a number of plans to deal with flooding which is a normal function of the Emergency Measures Organization. The minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office (SGIO) recently announced to this House the government policy which has been in place for sometime with respect to disasters and the method of declaring disasters. That policy stands.

We do not share with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Collver) the contempt which he has for local government organizations, the contempt which he showed the other day suggesting the city of Regina was unable to cope with what are relatively modest flood conditions in Regina compared with past times, and the contempt he showed today when he suggested we should intervene and declare disaster conditions in rural Saskatchewan on the grounds that the rural municipalities would not be able to even to make that sort of judgment on behalf of their ratepayers. We do not share that view, and we believe the policy enunciated to deal with the declaration of disaster areas is the appropriate policy.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier will be aware that Mr. Pentland, and I refer specifically to the absolutely severe conditions that exist along the Carrot River basin which happens to be in the Nipawin constituency, (I recognize that the Premier is little concerned about those areas of the province that didn't happen to support the NDP in the last provincial election) is the Premier aware that along the Carrot River basin there are seven rural municipalities that are going to be severely affected by the flood conditions? What is the Premier prepared to do since SGIO regulations announced by the minister responsible the other day, do not cover those farmers who are going to find themselves in the position of not being able to plant their crops because of severe flooding? What is the government prepared to do now to assist those farmers, especially along the Carrot River basin?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin has a somewhat restrictive view of the size of the Carrot River if he thinks it does not run through any constituency other than Nipawin. The Carrot River basin will no doubt cause difficulties this year as it has in many years in the past. I think the Leader of the Opposition is somewhat premature in suggesting crops will not be seeded in the Carrot River this year. He may well be right, but he may well be wrong as he has so often been in the past. I think we would be better advised to wait until the facts reveal themselves rather than to assume they will be as described by the member for Nipawin.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Premier is aware there are many municipalities involved and since the municipal governments couldn't possibly cope with the extent of flooding that is going to be extant in terms of the Carrot River basin this year especially, and since it's now pouring rain in Estevan and may be a severe problem in Estevan over the next two or three days, will the Premier today inform this Assembly what steps his government is going to take with reference to: (a) protecting the farmers from severe financial loss, and (b) for protecting life and property in the event of a disaster?

AN HON. MEMBER: — And our member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) is down there sandbagging.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a couple of issues. First with respect to severe financial loss, I think that it is appropriate to ascertain whether or not severe financial loss has been suffered before programs are launched to deal with the severe financial loss which is reported farmers in the Carrot River Valley will suffer if and when the flood comes. I think we can safely wait until that comes to deal with the financial recompense.

With respect to the issue of guarding against the flood, I think that the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy), would be able to give you in detail what the Emergency Measures Organization is doing to assist local people in the Estevan area and the Roche Percee area, of assistance available in the Oxbow area if it's needed there. Certainly, a great deal is going on there. I could mention the member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) who was busy filling sandbags last Saturday and I gather the member for Estevan is engaged in that activity today. I think that each of the hon. members is assisting locally as is the Emergency Measures Organization and I have no doubt that a great deal of assistance will be brought to bear by the use of both provincial and local resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

FLOODING IN CARROT RIVER BASIN

MR. COLLVER: — Has the Premier of Saskatchewan at any time in the last six weeks, having been alerted to the potential disasters which can occur, having been alerted by his own officials to the severity of the problem in 1979, flown over the Carrot River Basin or been in the Carrot River region? Has he at any time flown over the Estevan area to examine the extent of the problem?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, I have not flown over the Carrot River Basin. I very seriously doubt whether my flying over the Carrot River Basin would materially assist one single farmer in that area. Our joint capacity in this Chamber to produce hot air may be substantial but I do not think it will be sufficient to dry the Carrot River Valley. I have had reports from time to time by my colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) and my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy). I have had a report from my colleague, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) who last weekend visited some points in the Carrot River Valley (they being close to his constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale and, in fact, in part, in that constituency), and he advised me while there is certainly a potential difficulty, the difficulty is not greater than at some times in the past, and it is not certain that we will have a major disaster in the Carrot River Valley at this time.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that in Manitoba which is experiencing similar conditions, the premier of Manitoba at least had the decency to meet with local government officials to develop an overall plan in case the situation became too dangerous for the province of Manitoba? Is the Premier of Saskatchewan saying that he is totally prepared to ignore the kind of leadership put forward by the Premier of Manitoba and refusing to take his responsibility in that area?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, if in fact the flood conditions in Saskatchewan are as serious as they are in Manitoba, we can only fault the news media across Canada for not reporting that since they are uniformly reporting that the situation in Manitoba is very much more serious than it is here.

There are dikes, from what I hear being reported on the news, that are threatened to be breached which would flood major areas. I am not aware of any dikes which are threatening to be breached in Saskatchewan and which would flood very major areas. I know the hon. member recommends that we follow the practices of Manitoba. I read here in the Winnipeg Free Press that the residents of Manitoba are angry because they are being charged \$1.10 for sand bags. I realize that that is the policy which he is recommending to our government but we do not propose to follow that policy.

FUTURE OF PRIVATE SAWMILL OPERATORS

MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, are all of these people cheering for me? No? O.K.

A question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Byers). Mr. Minister, earlier in this session, I asked you a question regarding the concerns of private sawmill operators, over the future of their production and delivery contracts which had formerly been with Saskatchewan Forest Products and had been transferred to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan when certain mills had been transferred from Saskatchewan Forest Products to DNS. Your reply was that you believed they had no cause for concern on either the short or the long term. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: In view of the answer you gave them on February 26, how do you account for the fact that they have now received notice from your department that their quotas have expired and that no further quotas will be available to them?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, when the Department of Northern Saskatchewan acquired the sawmill at Green Lake from Sask Forest Products, for the purpose of putting together the octagon log operation at Meadow Lake, DNS took over certain responsibilities from Sask Forest Products. The private contractors in the Meadow Lake and Green Lake areas had a contract with Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation until March 31, 1979. Sask Forest Products had advised the private operators two or three years ago that they were to be given an extension of their contract to March 31, 1979, and that contract had expired days after DNS took over the saw mill operation from Sask Forest Products. Therefore, DNS has not broken any arrangement with the private contractors to whom the hon. member refers.

Secondly . . . well, the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) apparently wants some information on this subject, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to give it to him for his information, too . . . secondly, some of the private contractors were under the impression — or I got the impression that they were under the impression — that they would get their timber cutting rights from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. That is simply not the case. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan is not in the business of allocating timber rights, or timber cutting rights. That responsibility rests with the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. And when the private contractors, through their lawyer, approached me about this by mail in the order of six weeks to two months ago (and it was they who wrote to us about it), we replied that they should apply to the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources for cutting rights, because tourism allocates them.

MR. McLEOD: — Supplementary question. Since your department, or your government through whatever department you want to slough this over to, is responsible for the unfortunate circumstances these operators find themselves in now, what provisions

have you made, or will you be making, for them to be compensated for their rather large individual investment in equipment and machinery and so on, not to mention the over 20 years that many of these people have been involved in the forest industry?

MR. BYERS: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have broken no arrangement through the Department of Northern Saskatchewan with these small private contractors. I want to say that they were in trouble in 1971, and they were told by the former Liberal government that there would be no cutting rights for them going beyond 1970, and we have kept them going for nine years. These are the portable sawmill operators. It is certainly not my responsibility to allocate timber cutting rights to them because I don't have the jurisdiction over timber rights to allocate to them.

MR. McLEOD: — A final supplementary. The question still remains. On February 26, your answer was that you believed we had no cause for concern over the short term or the long term; (the long term obviously would mean more than a couple of months down the road) and they could feel somewhat secure in that. Now, to get a notice for your department that it would be cut off, is that a change in policy of what was the problem there?

MR. BYERS: — I'm not sure that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan told them they would be cut off. Their contract was with Saskatchewan Forest Products until March 31, 1979. The Government of Saskatchewan, through its agency (Saskatchewan Forest Products) met the terms of the contract with them. The contract has expired; therefore we have breached no contract. So there is simply no basis for providing compensation to a group of people who have fulfilled their contract with an agency of the government, namely Saskatchewan Forest Products.

COSTS FOR HELICOPTER SERVICE IN THE NORTH

MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Byers). (I'll just do my buttons up, here. It's a habit it seems.) Yesterday you stated that you had awarded contracts for the 1979 season for helicopter service in the North. Was there an increased cost per hour of your rental of helicopter services in DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) from Athabasca Airways and also what was the increased price on that renewal contract?

MR. BYERS: — The increased price on the renewal contract was in accordance with the tariff schedule which the companies in the charter business file with CTC and have approved by CTC (Canadian Transport Commission).

Each charter company must provide to CTC the rate per hour for a certain type of plane, and that's called the tariff schedule. This is the price for service for flying this plane for one hour, and the rate that DNS is paying to Athabasca Airways under the extension of the contract is the published tariff rate which the CTC approved.

BUSINESS LEGALITY OF SERVICE PRINTERS

MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. In light of your previous answer to this Assembly about the legality of Service Printers doing business with the Government of Saskatchewan. Is it true that the NDP is contemplating ownership, either complete or partial, of another organization or organizations which will do business with the government?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member perfectly well knows that question is totally out of order and I decline to answer it.

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

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

BUSINESS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY NDP

MR. COLLVER: — I have a new question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier of Saskatchewan. Is it true that the Government of Saskatchewan is contemplating doing business with an organization that is owned and controlled by the NDP?

MR. BLAKENEY: — That question is in order and the answer is no so far as I know.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you saying Mr. Premier that it would be legal for this party to form companies in 61 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will take the next question.

EXPENDITURE OF CROP DEPREDATION PROGRAM

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewal Resources. Mr. Minister, as you would be aware in the 1980 estimates the expenditure that you allotted in the 1978-79 crop depredation program was in the neighborhood of \$1,560,000. In 1979-80 you have no figure listed. Why is that, Mr. Minister?

HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the reason that there was no amount listed in the estimates is because of the fact that the federal government has withdrawn its responsibility towards the migratory birds and the damage that they may be doing to the farmers in Saskatchewan. Until the time we are in a position to hold discussions with the federal government as to a new crop depredation program, there is not going to be any amount in the budget. But when our discussions are going to be proving fruitful we will, of course, have to reconsider our position.

MR. BIRKBECK: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The observation I would make, Mr. Minister (and I would ask if you would agree) is that since you had made a \$1,560,000 expenditure in 1978-79, would it not have been appropriate for your government to at least set the example and act in good faith and lay the same money on the table for those farmers who are suffering from crop loss due to fowl damage as you did in 1978-79? Could you not have done that in the 1979-80 estimates?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, again I say that the responsibility for the migratory birds lies with the federal government and we certainly want to be in a position to negotiate with them in the best interests of the province.

With regard to our lure crop program, it is our intention to proceed with it because we do have the land in place and much of the acreage is leased out to the farmers and we are hoping to continue with the leases which we have with the farmers in putting the crops in for the purpose of lure crops.

LOAN TO ATHABASCA FOUNDRY IN SASKATOON

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for SEDCO. SEDCO, I understand, has negotiated to give a loan to an Athabasca Foundry in Saskatoon. Is one of the conditions of that loan, as recommended by the department of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder), to bring the occupational health standards up to a suitable level? Is that a condition of the loan that you have given Athabasca Foundry?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether there are any conditions. I am aware that there is an application from Athabasca Foundry. I don't know the details. It has not come to the board as yet.

MR. KATZMAN: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the Department of Labour recommends that a place will have to be closed down if it does not bring up standards, is your department giving funds on those conditions when they make a loan, as is the Athabasca condition?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, any time a loan is disbursed to any organization SEDCO takes everything into consideration and I am sure they will take that as well.

MR. KATZMAN: — Will SEDCO take into consideration that those funds must be designated for that? Otherwise, it is just throwing good money after bad, because the plant will be shut down, unless it is not brought up to standards. Are you going to put . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will take the member for Maple Creek.

RICHERS REPORT

MRS. J. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes).

I understand that the federally commissioned Riches report was based in part on responses to questionnaires by employees in your department. Is that correct?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the member to repeat the question, please? I didn't get the question.

MRS. DUNCAN: — I understand that the federally commissioned Riches report was based in part of responses to questionnaires done by employees in your department. Is this correct?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that that is correct. I will take the question under advisement.

LIVESTOCK RELOCATION

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). Some weeks ago the provincial ombudsman made a recommendation to you as it relates to a Larry Rutten of Carlyle and an intensive livestock relocation situation which we have discussed before. Could you indicate to this House why you chose not to follow the ombudsman's recommendation?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, this particular case was one

which was dealt with under the intensive livestock operations. It was a case where the complainant was attempting to get from the department money for moving from one area to another because of a problem he had with his neighbor. He had a problem with his neighbor, simply because his neighbor didn't like the fact that he was so close to him. We have determined that there is no obligation on the part of our department to undertake any payments in that case and we have indicated that to the ombudsman.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Everybody that knows anything about this case, except you, knows that the government hosed this poor young individual and almost drove him into bankruptcy. Why is it that only you are in the position to judge whether this kid was in fact not justifiably due this money, especially in light of the ombudsman investigating it and recommending that he should have some compensation.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the ombudsman has all of the facts of the matter. We have communicated with the ombudsman on this case. We are still pursuing it. I am not sure that there is a complete resolution of it at the present time. It is still under discussion.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

FLOOD SITUATION

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I want to give the Assembly a very brief report on the flooding situation as I have received it from the director of EMO (Emergency Measures Organization) who is on site in the Estevan area.

The hon. members will be pleased to know that the pressure, given a break with the weather, obviously the weather is a problem . . . I can report to the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) my reports are that it's not pouring down at Estevan but there is a light rain there. But given a break with the weather it appears the pressure is off at Weyburn, Moose Jaw and Regina. At Estevan the water has not yet reached its peak. It appears that the diking will hold given the sandbagging which has taken place. I was pleased to hear from the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) that the hon. member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) has been filling sandbags — that was not my report but I'm pleased to hear that he is. There are about 15 vehicles, front end loaders, trucks — including Department of Highway's trucks and R.M. of Estevan trucks — on site.

Contrary to the news reports, Mr. Speaker, the R.M. of Estevan has taken control of the situation and that municipality is doing a good job.

On the matter of Highway No. 47, Mr. Eaton reports that the highways engineer is on site taking control of the situation. At Roche Percee the dikes are holding and everything appears satisfactory. At Oxbow, it appears to be O.K. North Portal could be a problem, not from flooding of the Souris River, but from flooding of farmers' fields and Mr. Eaton is on his way to North Portal this afternoon.

In the Carrot River area, all of the municipalities have been informed and they have in turn, informed the farmers in the area and it's our understanding that the cattle and the grain have been moved in the flooding area. With respect to the Fishing Lakes and the Qu'Appelle Valley, we do not expect any massive flooding problem.

So, it appears, given a reasonable break in the weather, it will not be as severe as

perhaps some have been led to believe.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, once again, we see an example from the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy) today of total contradiction. The minister responsible somehow thinks that the people of Saskatchewan are going to believe him before they will believe Mr. Ray Pentland, Saskatchewan environment's hydrologist, who says that it will be much more severe than in previous years in the Carrot River basin.

Now, I can only take the reports as I hear them and what I hear is one thing from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and quite something different from Mr. Pentland, the hydrologist. I'm inclined to believe the hydrologist before I would believe the minister. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, what we hear is the Minister of Municipal Affairs suggesting that somehow it's not a serious problem and all they've had to do is report to the local municipal councillors that there's a lot of snow up there and we could have severe flooding and the local municipal government is going to be able to handle the most severe conditions that, in accordance with Mr. Pentland's comment, could possibly exist in Saskatchewan's history in the Carrot River basin. There are no contingency plans, nothing in advance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, the minister's statement must be brief, factual and specific and it might be on a policy statement or . . .

MR. THATCHER: — They haven't said anything factual since this House went into session.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order! I'll start again. The minister's statement, when he gives it, can be on a major policy statement or announcement. It should be brief, factual and specific and I found that to be the case. The response to the minister's statement must be brief, strictly relevant comment and no debate can take place because there's no question before the House. Now, I'm not so sure the minister's statement contained anything about the Carrot River Valley. I may be wrong on that, but I think that we're entering into a debate on the matter now and I would caution the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) that we cannot be debating the issue because there is no motion before the House.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate your comments in terms of debate. But when an emergency exists in the province of Saskatchewan as it does with reference to the Carrot River basin, just moving the cattle is not enough. The minister knows well if this becomes a serious problem, that action has to be taken now. The full resources of the Government of Saskatchewan have got to move into this area and this is not debate. This is a statement of fact. The only debate may be when they should move in.

MR. SPEAKER: — I just asked the member for Nipawin to be relevant and brief to the comment that was made by the minister. It is not proper for the member to introduce debatable material or new material. He can comment on the ministerial statement and I want the member to stick to that.

MR. COLLVER: — Very briefly, the minister was not factual. Mr. Pentland is factual. There is a serious problem. It's time the government got off its prat and started to do something.

SASK TEL EXTENDING SERVICE

HON. D. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to announce yet another change in Sask Tel's policy aimed at responding to the needs of rural Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Effective immediately Sask Tel will be extending its area service program to enable customers in an exchange area to call or be called by all customers in one of more adjacent exchange areas without paying a long distance charge. Mr. Speaker, this program will, as in the case of the rural assimilation program, be volunteer and will only be implemented upon completion of a vote by the users of a given community, 60 per cent of whom must be in favor. Mr. Speaker, any community wishing to participate under this newly revised extended area service program must meet the following criteria:

1. During any six month period of a calendar year more than 30 per cent of the subscribers in the exchange area seeking extended area service must make long distance calls to the other exchange area.
2. A vote will be held and must pass with 60 per cent of the eligible voters being in favor of the extended area service.
3. Only communities where the distance between exchange areas is 30 miles or less are eligible to apply for extended area service.

Subscribers opting for the extended area service will be charged the same monthly rental as is being paid by customers in the larger area, plus a monthly surcharge for this extra service. The monthly surcharge for extended area service is dependent upon the distance between exchange areas. The distances are: from 0 to 18 miles residents will pay \$2, a business \$4; 19 to 24 miles a resident \$2.50, a business \$5.25 to 30 miles a resident \$3 and a business \$6. These rates apply to smaller exchange areas only when connected to a larger exchange area for the purpose of extended area service. When the exchanges are approximately the same size the subscribers in each exchange pay one-half of the surcharge.

Mr. Speaker, Sask Tel is a fine example of positive government action for rural Saskatchewan. It, in a day and age when the principles of Crown corporations by many people in this province and throughout Canada have been under attack, is continuing to carry out its mandate of providing economical and high quality service to all the residents of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the Minister of Telephones. I am overjoyed to see this has come into existence. I think Mr. Minister you have just become the minister in the last few weeks. If you had taken my advice probably about three weeks ago we might have had this a little sooner. My colleague for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) says he mentioned this two years ago. However, I must go back to make a point here that the Premier is one of his initial addresses in this legislative Chamber, I remember him saying very distinctly, we want some concrete proposals, let's have some ideas. Well, I think there is a good example of where ideas have come from this side of the House and a minister on the other side has been sharp

enough to pick these up and put them into practice for the benefit of all Saskatchewan. I think your rates are a little high compared to Alberta but I say, at least, it's a good start.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ERROR IN LEADER POST - NEW LABOUR ACT

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg the indulgence of the House to make a correction and draw attention to a Leader Post news item which was carried in today's Leader Post, Tuesday, April 24 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, am I provided with the opportunity to continue? I'll take my direction from the Speaker, if I may. The article is entitled, Injured Workers Guaranteed Wages. The article in question bears so little relationship to the actual facts that my advice to members of the Assembly and to the general public would be to disregard it in its entirety. It says, for example, supposedly quoting from an interview:

Snyder said the new act will provide a lump-sum payment of 35 per cent to 45 per cent of the worker's income at the time of injury to a maximum of \$10,000.

And that is untrue and inaccurate, Mr. Speaker. Other portions of the release indicate the disabled worker will receive income maintenance indexed to inflation to ensure the worker is no worse off than he was before the accident. That is inaccurate to the point of being able to be distorted. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the article attributes to me the suggestion that the only Muir recommendations not followed was to make farmer and teacher participation mandatory and that, also is untrue and inaccurate, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make this point in the event that members inside and outside the House may regard this as factual information and it basically bears no resemblance to the facts.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I waited until the minister was done. Mr. Speaker, we regard your decision to allow an announcement such as this to proceed as a precedent, because, Mr. Speaker, I think I can recall the numerous occasions that we have been ruled out of order on similar occasions. We regard your actions, today, as a precedent and I trust when a similar situation arises we will be accorded the same privileges. We are shocked that a press clipping, a press interview or whatever, is brought into this Assembly and the minister is allowed to make a correction. Hansard or anything to do with this, the operation of this Assembly or the official record, no question about it, it is certainly valid, but for a press interview in the Leader Post, we regard this as precedent setting. Mr. Speaker, I just ask you when a similar situation arises on this side of the House please remember the date and place.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will take this opportunity to remind the member for Thunder Creek that I didn't make any decision with regard to it. The member had the floor and the member proceeded. Now, the member raises a point of order. If he wants me to bring back a judgment whether the member was in order or not. I will gladly do that. But members shouting raucously from their seat, order, order, to me doesn't constitute the Speaker making . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order! The same as your comment right now doesn't mean a thing.

If the member has a point of order he should stand up, like the member for Thunder Creek did and ask for a decision. If the member for Thunder Creek wants a decision I'd

be glad to give him one later after I have had a chance to peruse the record. I am sure there is no new precedent being established at this time.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I do not ask for a decision. I am not asking for one. I ask merely for Mr. Speaker to remember this incidence, today, in the future, nothing more.

MR. SPEAKER: — If the member for Thunder Creek wishes to put caveats on all future activity of the Assembly (which he is doing at this time) that might mean something to him, but it means nothing to me. I will make the decisions as the situations arise when they arise. If the member for Thunder Creek wants a decision on what the Minister of Labour said, I will be glad to give him a decision at a later time.

ANSWER TO QUESTION RE SALE OF GOLDEN ACRES

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, on April 20 last, I was asked a question as to when we will finalize the sale of Golden Acres in Moose Jaw. I said April 20, thinking all the time that April was May. I want to correct Hansard, and Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the proceedings of that day to change the date from April to May. It was my error and I don't know why I used the month of April all through the questioning period when it should have been May.

MR. COLLVER: — Before the orders of the day, I rise on a point of order.

Today, prior to orders of the day, the Minister of Labour, (Mr. Snyder) when told to come to order by this side of the House, said, I'll take my ruling from the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I quote to you from Beauchesne's, page 117, section . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I made no ruling with regard to the member for Moose Jaw South. I don't want the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) to proceed on a wrong assumption and that is what he is doing at this point. I think an examination of the record will show he is proceeding on a wrong assumption at this time. Therefore, I am not prepared to let the member proceed.

MR. COLLVER: — A point of order. The Minister of Labour today, read from a newspaper and said it was a newspaper interview.

MR. SPEAKER: — Is the member saying the member is out of order? If he wants me to make a decision, I will make a decision on it.

MR. COLLVER: — I would like to cite a ruling from Beauchesne's, section no. 332, page 117 which states as follows:

(1) On March 17, 1933, a Member quoting a newspaper in debate was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker who said: The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the House, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order . . .

Today, during the points of order raised in this Assembly, the minister quite clearly asked for a Speaker's ruling. I asked for a Speaker's ruling and I wish Mr. Speaker, had

made a ruling when the minister himself asked for one rather than let him go through his entire diatribe, correcting an interview that was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — The member is not speaking on the point of order now. He is getting into a debate about it and he wants me to get into the debate with him. I don't intend to do that.

Now, the member for Nipawin has clearly said, he wants a decision on whether the Minister of Labour was correct in proceeding. I will be glad to give that to the member for Nipawin.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, may I reply to comments from the minister in charge of SEDCO?

MR. SPEAKER: — No.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 2:52 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the bills presented to him.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 10 — PROTECTION FROM HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS

MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River) moved, seconded by Mr. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley):

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its failure to adequately protect the people of Saskatchewan from the consequence of the escape of hazardous chemicals, materials and elements.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have previously spoken in the House on many occasions on PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyl) and definitely with very sober and sincere concerns.

Since this resolution was put forth, however, an account of a PCB spill in Ontario has been published which makes our PCB problems even more serious and should be top priority. Mr. Speaker, the spill I refer to is a train wreck in Ontario which to date has required the removal of thousands and thousands of tons of contaminated earth resulting in expenditures of millions of dollars by both the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) and the Government of Ontario.

On a news report of March 22, 1979, on our local station, a spokesman involved in the Ontario spill advised that the PCBs are now evident in the underground water and they are experimenting with the digging of wells which they hope will act as sumps from which they can remove the contaminated water. The report went on to say, however, that there was no guarantee that the proposed sumps would be the answer and if it proved they were not, it would cost untold millions to remove all the earth which has now been contaminated by the underground streams which are spreading the PCBs over a large area.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated before, all the reservoirs in this province are important

but in my opinion, the order of importance is first, people; second, water. Oil, gas, potash, uranium, etc. have no value whatsoever if we do not have the most important resource next to people — clean water. A good clean, ample supply of water is vital to survival. I sincerely ask the Minister of the Environment (I'm not sure he's listening but I'll ask him anyway) if he would advise this Assembly and particularly the people of Saskatchewan if there has been any escape of PCBs into the underground water supply, whether or not he and/or his department has been made aware of the problem in Ontario and perhaps learn from their experience to date to solve some of the problems in Saskatchewan, thus alleviating many of our local problems and fears here.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge members on both sides of the House not to take the serious issue of political cover-up for explanation. Hazards such as PCBs, which can penetrate our underground waters and expand into possible sources of water used for human consumption, are of utmost importance and should receive top priority, regardless of cost.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the public will demand for, and must have, complete disclosure by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) of all of the serious hazards such as PCBs which have escaped, either by design or by accident, large or small, and on any occasion, whether in polluted, populated areas or in the hinterlands. I would be most grateful, and so would the public, if the Minister of the Environment, on behalf of his government, would stand in his place and announce that a priority of his department and our government would be to guarantee a safe and adequate supply of water to every hamlet, village and city in this province.

Mr. Speaker, water is still the most important resource acquired for human consumption. Let us not fail to keep this fact foremost in our minds when we are investigating our heritage funds and resource development, etc. People are more important than royalties from Crown corporations, if and when they are paying ventures.

Mr. Speaker, I really should make a copy and send it to the Minister of the Environment because he never heard one word I have said.

Mr. Speaker, I move Resolution No. 10.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, there are a few comments I would like to make regarding the serious problem of protecting the people of Saskatchewan from dangerous spills in our environment. I think it's been brought to the attention of this Assembly many times, the dissatisfaction by members on this side (and I think we are expressing the dissatisfaction of many of the people in Saskatchewan) about the failure of the Deputy Minister of the Environment to inform the past Minister of the Environment about the PCB spill. I think this type of thing has been brought to attention many times. I'd just like to tell the new Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) that we would hope things of this type do not happen in the future, and that you have complete control of your department so if there are hazardous spills that affect the general well-being of the people in Saskatchewan you will take action on this and make it known.

While I'm on the topic of PCB spills in Regina, I understand the National Research Council has been investigating this bill; we are looking forward with great interest to their recommendation. I think one of the things that we in Saskatchewan have to look at very seriously is for some method of disposing of hazardous spills. My understanding is

that at this time we don't have anything of this nature. I think we're living in a chemical age; we're all aware of this. I would urge all members of this Assembly, especially our friend, the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, Mr. Prebble, who I think is quite concerned about the environmental issues of this province, to take this issue up and try to press this government to establish some safe place, wherever it may be, that we can dig up to dispose of these hazardous spills if they should happen in our society.

From Crown corporations, I believe also that there are certain converters throughout Saskatchewan (the minister, Mr. Messer, tells me) situated in many of our small localities, which contain PCBs. He assures me the crews know how to deal with these spills. I don't know if the people of Saskatchewan know, as I didn't know, that there is a considerable number of power line poles stored right in the city of Regina, which have had transformers or converters explode on them, which are contaminated by PCBs and are awaiting some type of disposal.

So, defending the findings of the National Research Council, I would urge the government and say that I think it is of prime importance we establish some safe place to get rid of any of these environmental contaminants that may happen from time to time in our society.

Another concern I have is the number of train wrecks that have been happening. I see the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Kramer) is in here. I hope he's aware that from 1978 to 1979 (I was doing a little research on this the other day), there have been 11 major train derailments right within our province of Saskatchewan; 266 cars have been piled up. Luckily, most of these cars have not contained dangerous chemicals. I relate to a spill that happened in my own hometown in January of this year, where 42 box cars were derailed right within the town, and there was chemical leaking out of these box cars. Fortunately for the town of Wolseley, it was not a hazardous chemical, and most of the box cars contained fertilizer and most of it has been cleared up.

But I think if we look at the newspaper clippings throughout the United States and the rest of Canada, we are seeing that there are these dangerous chemicals that are being transported by rail, and also by truck throughout our society. I think it is only a matter of time until we in Saskatchewan will be faced with a serious spill by a rail tanker, if we continue with this number of derailments. When I am speaking on this I would like the minister responsible for transport to maybe do some looking into this because I think this is a rather growing thing — these derailments in Saskatchewan. There seems to me to be more of them, and they seem to be very serious. However, I just suggest that.

I'd like to get back to the topic of the spills. I would request that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) or the EMO, as we heard today, would set up a plan, and be ready to deal with any type of major spill that may happen due to trucking, or due to train derailment in our society today. I also feel that the government opposite should be looking at the necessity of these type of converters that the SPC has in place throughout Saskatchewan that contain PCBs. I also must point out that the term PCBs and the danger of PCBs is a relatively new concept to me. It wasn't until the spill at Federal Pioneer, I must be honest, that I was really aware of this hazard to our environment. And I think I express the words of many people in Saskatchewan. I don't know all of the items or things that PCBs may be contained in, and I wonder if the environment have made a study, and the minister is nodding his head, and if you have, I congratulate you. But I would hope that the Government of Saskatchewan does know where all these hazardous chemicals are.

Secondly, I would again urge you to implement and have ready some type of emergency task team that can go in, dig up, and dispose in a place that is safe to the people of Saskatchewan, and the Saskatchewan environment, any spills of hazardous chemicals that may affect our well-being. As my colleague has said, ground water, safe drinking water is a precious commodity. Today, many people in my constituency are at the position where they are concerned about the feasibility of using surface run-off, dugouts, for human consumption. You don't have to look too far down the road to see if we're going to be putting chemicals, hazardous chemicals throughout our environment and if we're going to be relying on surface runoff water, that the day may be fast approaching when this might not be safe for human consumption. So with these considerations, it gives me pleasure to support the motion from the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead).

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, in looking at the resolution that's being proposed by the hon. member for Arm River, it reminds me of the day in question period when the hon. member was worried about the Moose Jaw River and the Qu'Appelle Chain and Buffalo Lake. I believe that the hon. member actually thought that the Moose Jaw River flowed into Buffalo Lake where the city of Regina and Moose Jaw obtain their drinking water. If, in fact, that is his understanding when he associated the Moose Jaw River with the water that comes down from Lake Diefenbaker by way of ditch, then that reasoning is as well researched as the resolution we have before us today.

I might also say that I agree with the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley that there are some real problems with the handling of hazardous materials by train and by truck. The only difference is that on train and on the trains that are handling hazardous materials, all of those chemicals have to be placarded and the crews advised of the location on the train of those particular hazardous materials. I agree with him and I do urge and I support the position that the minister in charge of our transportation agency should immediately and he already has, ask for an investigation into the derailments that we have had here in Saskatchewan. There's no question in my mind as we look into the paper and I, as a practical railroad individual, realize that the lack of maintenance that we have now on our main lines and elsewhere are a main contributing factor to the derailments that we have had. I would hope that the Canadian Transport Commission would have and will have a complete investigation into the derailments and the near deaths that have occurred to the crews operating these trains over the past while.

The only main point, of course, that we have to be concerned about is the fact that at this particular time in Saskatchewan and Canadian history, there is no legislation calling for the federal government to impose labelling standards on industrial chemicals. I think that has to be done. We do know, as we worry and talk about the supply of water, I agree that we have to be concerned about that. But surely the members of this House are fully aware of the fact that public health inspectors presently take samples of drinking water from the five sources in the Buffalo Pound system each week so they'll be alerted promptly should health problems occur. That doesn't resolve the problem insofar as the labelling of the hazardous materials is concerned if those materials do get into the Buffalo Pound Lake and into the drinking water. But at present, Mr. Speaker, 99 per cent of the chemicals used in Saskatchewan are brought in from outside of the province and these chemicals are sold under trade names because the manufacturers wish to protect their product from competition. While the federal government has standards for labelling of foods, drugs, pesticides and consumer products, industrial products in many cases are exempt.

Saskatchewan's market is too small to force the manufacturers to label their chemicals, and that is why federal legislation is urgently needed as soon as possible. We feel that the labelling should include chemical names of hazardous and toxic substances, exposure hazards, symptoms of exposure or overexposure. Emergency treatment and precautions for safe use should be made available to those people that are using those hazardous products.

A comprehensive program of identification, labelling, employee education and training, and access to records was launched by the United States Occupational Health and Safety Administration a few years back. In fact, it was 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the federal government would be well-advised to consider that similar legislation is passed in Canada. It has an obligation to protect workers at least as well as it now protects consumers with the federal requirements for labelling of food for consumer use. I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, at its 1978 convention, called for the federal government to develop labelling standards for industrial products. That still hasn't been acted upon by the federal authorities. It is a position of this government, Mr. Speaker, that there are three basic rights of workers in this area of concern, and we have designed our occupational health and safety program around those three basic rights. They include the right to participate, the right to refuse dangerous and unhealthy work, and the right to know. And I'm sure that all members in this House would agree with me that those three rights are very, very necessary when you're handling dangerous commodities.

We are proud to say that our occupational health and safety legislation is the most advanced legislation of its kind in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. members opposite that some of the comments made are very valid. But I would also suggest to them that the responsibility in the labelling of dangerous commodities lies in the hands of the federal authorities, and that is where that should be directed.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that all the words after Assembly, in Resolution No. 10, be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

go on record as encouraging the federal government to enact legislation which will result in a program of comprehensive labelling of all chemicals, materials and elements imported into Canada or manufactured in this country.

I'd like to move that, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Debate continues concurrently on the motion and the amendment.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is the point of order?

MR. KATZMAN: — Does not the amendment, from what I have heard you read, change

the whole basis of the original motion? In the original motion it suggests the escaping and so forth. In that motion it calls on labelling which are two different products, as much as I may agree with the motion. I am just wondering if they are on different areas.

MR. SPEAKER: — It is always important that members look at amendments which are offered in the light of the rules. I refer to Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, page 154, item 431:

An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

And further in Beauchesne's, item 425:

The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the questions.

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the House, the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

Now the original motion deals with the hazards of escaping chemicals, material and elements. The alternate which is submitted by the member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) deals with the labelling of such chemicals, materials and elements, so that their (I assume) hazards can be recognized. I find the amendment in order for that reason.

The member for Shaunavon.

MR. D. LINGENFELTER (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to be in a position to second the amendment as moved by the member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I see the windmill for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) is once again giving a little speech from his bench, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could have the floor?

It is important to notice the positive note which the amendment interjects into this debate. As with all other resolutions introduced by members opposite, there was very little constructive information in the debate before the amendment was introduced.

First, I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we must at all times strive to make our environment safe for all life forms. It is my opinion that Saskatchewan has, in fact, taken the lead in the area of environmental safety standards.

It is interesting that the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead) spoke of PCBs when in fact tons of 2-4D are presently being spread around his constituency. It is interesting to note that the member doesn't debate this point or feel concerned enough to bring it up when he, in fact, represents a rural constituency.

At present, the Department of Agriculture is conducting a number of public forums discussing alternate uses to chemicals in agriculture. So far two meetings have been held at Qu'Appelle and one at Muenster. This positive debate will go on and at all times

we must be aware of the extreme caution we must exercise in dealing with dangerous chemicals.

Because there are many other things I wish to say on this most important topic, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon Sutherland) moved second reading of Bill No. 77 — **An Act to provide the City of Saskatoon with the Authority to Impose a Moratorium on any Demolition, Alteration or Modification of the Capitol Theatre.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to move second reading of a bill to provide the city of Saskatoon with the authority to impose a moratorium on any demolition, alteration or modification of the Capitol Theatre. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to give the city of Saskatoon the power to prevent the demolition, alteration or modification of the Capitol Theatre. This power is provided for in sections 4 and 5 of the bill under which the Saskatoon City Council may designate the Capitol Theatre as protected property where it is of the opinion that the Capitol Theatre is of significant historical and architectural value.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does not in any way interfere with the ability of the current owners of the Capitol Theatre to sell the theatre. It simply prevents its demolition, modification or alteration.

I would like to comment for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, on the reason why I am bringing forward this bill. An Edmonton developer has acquired an option to purchase the Capitol Theatre property and has proposed the demolition of the theatre and the construction of an office building on the site. The demolition of the theatre would, indeed, be a very sad day for the people of Saskatoon and is a matter that I think would be of concern for all people in Saskatchewan. There is no comparable structure to the Capitol Theatre in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The Capitol Theatre is one of the last remaining old movie palaces in Canada and it is one of the few structures that has been built for both live theatre and movie purposes. The Capitol Theatre was built in 1929 and I think that its unique features will make it an important historical building in years to come. Anyone who visits the theatre will quickly appreciate its unique architectural qualities, the long corridor entrance, the unique ceiling and the special features of the auditorium. The structure, I believe, is symbolic of a vanishing era which is important to the people of Saskatchewan.

The Capitol Theatre is also important to the people of Saskatoon because it has served as a major social centre in Saskatoon since its opening. Apart from the movie presentations, the Capitol has served as the centre for local and touring performances, especially before the construction of the Centennial Auditorium. It has been used for university convocations and for other important social gatherings. I think it is fair to say that the Capitol Theatre has many fond memories for people in Saskatoon. In fact, I think many will still remember the 1929 opening night.

I also want to briefly bring to the attention of members that the Capitol clearly has considerable potential for use in the future. Several requests have been made for the establishment of the Capitol Theatre as a cultural centre which could be used by

theatre groups in Saskatoon. Clearly, the theatre has potential for many other cultural pursuits. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that a feasibility study might be undertaken to examine the various use options of the theatre.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that one of the reasons why it is important to bring this bill forward at this time and why I hope it will receive support from all members of the House is because at the present moment we still do not have in place provincial heritage legislation that would provide for the protection of private property. At this point we only have legislation which will insure the protection of government-owned buildings. I think this is another important reason why it is necessary to bring this bill forward.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to move second reading of the bill and I hope it will receive support from all members of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regard to this motion, but further to that, we do have another Saskatoon MLA who is unavoidably absent at this particular moment, who would also like to say some words. So for those reasons, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR VOTE 20

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Before we start, I will ask the minister to introduce his support staff, please.

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Yes, Mr. Chairman. On my left, I think members of the House will be acquainted with Mr. Robert Mitchell, the deputy minister of labour. On my right, Mr. Bob Sass, the associate deputy minister of labour and director of the occupational health and safety branch. Directly behind me, Mr. Craig Dotson, the executive director of the development branch, and to his left, Mr. Pat More, the acting director of administrative services division. And behind the rail Mr. Ron Duncan, executive director of the industrial relations branch, and of course, last but not least particularly in light of our attitude with respect to equal opportunity and that sort of thing, Lynn Pearson, the executive director employment services and the women's program branch.

ITEM 1

MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments to the estimates prior to proceeding on, and I will indicate to you, Mr. Chairman, that in this session, of course, we have two major pieces of labor legislation. I don't intend to get into those pieces of legislation at this point in time. I take it that there will be some debate as we proceed on in that. In fairness to the minister, those are two newer directions in the total field of labor law in Saskatchewan, and in the Department of Labour. I would suggest that the other, perhaps new direction in the Department of Labour especially now during the federal election campaign is the new alliance with the NDP party and the Canadian Labour Congress. It would appear that your party has deemed it desirable to make the connection with the CLC and that's the direction that you will proceed as a party. I suggest that the rural farmers of Saskatchewan who have

supported your party are going to have some problem accepting that, and we'll wait in anticipation to see just what direction you, as a government, take following the coming election.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Amalgamate and call it the CLT.

MR. ANDREW: — And I think the connection appears to be between the people of the NDP, the power of the NDP and the labor bosses. It was heartening, I suppose, to watch the CBC poll last night with regard to that, and rank and file labor seemed to choose the NDP as the third of the three political parties. But so much for that.

The other area that I wish to touch on briefly, is that the Premier at the last premiers' conference indicated that he supported the view that all governments in Canada would be required to practice restraint and I suppose that that appears to us to be somewhat of a hollow cry. The information from Statistics Canada as advanced by the leader of our party, indicates that the Government of Saskatchewan leads all other governments with, again, a continued increase in government employees, some 13 per cent. That is a substantial increase, relative to everybody else.

This ties in with the total approach of the NDP and the total labor situation. I believe that not only have we increased our number of people in Saskatchewan but I think once this year is over, in the increase in pay to those civil servants as well, we are going to see Saskatchewan once again leading the country. I think what we are going to see is senior civil servants in this particular government with 20 and 25 per cent increases in their pay. I say that is some kind of a system of restraint.

An example I advance is the Canadian Data Systems publication. This covers the area of salaries in the computer industry in Canada. I think that anyone who has been at all involved in watching the computer industry in Canada will know of course, that SaskComp virtually has run most computer companies out of the province of Saskatchewan, and by and large, the city of Regina is the centre if you like, of the government computer centre.

It is interesting to note that of all the cities in Canada, the average salary paid to senior computer people is, substantially, the highest in Regina. Really, I think that probably goes hand in glove with the fact that the main people in the computer industry in this province are working for the government. So the government, I suggest once again, is leading the field in that particular type of wage settlement.

On the total view of where we are going, both as a province and as a country, as it relates to productivity, I suppose we are somewhat concerned in Canada as we watch our place in the world markets sort of go down a step each year, a step further down each year. Our production goes up, our productivity goes down, our production costs go up and we become less and less and less competitive in the world markets and that is starting to play havoc with us. I think it has a total bearing on the total international trading situation of our country. I don't blame the minister for that. That's clearly not the case but I think that we, as legislators, must look at that problem realistically and say how can we try to resolve that problem to increase our productivity. I think one area we must all look at is clearly the field of labor relations where we must get better production from our working staff and better relations with our working staff. Now that problem, I suppose, has been around for a long time and it has probably been debated thousands of times in this given legislature right here. I don't suggest for a minute that there is some kind of any easy solution to it. I don't, for example, advocate the right-to-

work legislation. That isn't going to solve anything. The concept of labor courts has been thrown out. I don't think that is going to accept anything but what we have to come to, what we have to look for is to try to perhaps work away from the adversary system that so much is a part of our labor relations in the whole industry today. That, I agree, is a very difficult problem and I suppose that perhaps we have no solutions either but I think one area that we have to look at is maybe the human elements involved in labor negotiations, more human elements involved in that total field.

I go back to perhaps the small situation where I acted for management in the town of Kindersley in a labor dispute. It strikes me that here was the type of situation that we faced. Here was the town of Kindersley that in fairness, I suppose, some of them had somewhat bigoted views on the whole trade union movement and they saw a bogeyman around every corner in the trade movement whenever a representative came along. At the same time, the representatives from the given trade union were out there and they were concerned about what they were looking at and the overall plain of the province and how this would affect them in Canada or at least, in Saskatchewan. The last thing that they seemed to be concerned about was the 14 or 15 workers that they happened to be working for. Eventually, we were able to negotiate an agreement on the basis of what was best for the workers and quite frankly, it was between myself and the workers that the whole thing came through to pass. I think that perhaps that does strike an area that we have to work towards in this field. For surely, we have to both as management and as labor, look at the end result down the road, that some day we are going to make our system work better, that we, as people, have to make that work better so our productivity goes up and in the end we become a richer country for it, a richer province for it and with those riches we can then supply the necessary social legislation we need.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Right on. That's good.

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I listened with a good deal of interest to some of the remarks of the hon. member opposite. And I don't find myself in general disagreement with a great deal of what he said. I think particularly the point is well taken with respect to new thrusts in industrial relations. I think this is one of the areas which every government must pay some special attention to in the time directly ahead because the economy generally, and industrial relations have undergone some very major stresses and strains over the last number of years, in particular during the time of double digit inflation and during that period of time we saw ourselves eyeball-to-eyeball, as it were, with a system of restraints imposed upon us by the Government of Canada at a time when I think it was acknowledged by many that restraints of that nature, that is to say wage and price controls so-called, would not solve the very basic problem of rising living costs. I think those who forecast the difficulties were very accurate in their prediction. We saw costs continue to rise but in essence with the restraint program relative to wages, we saw wages pegged to increases that did not in effect keep pace in many cases with the cost of living.

So, as I indicated, there will be stresses and strains in the whole field of industrial relations that we must address ourselves to. I think we're moving, at least in some direction, in this budget to provide some additional resources to take that matter into account. You'll find there's an additional body available in the Industrial Relations Division of the department. That person will be stationed in La Ronge to take care of some of the major industrial relations problems which will obviously be a part and parcel of the development in the North. We expect over the next year to be developing some industrial relations seminars and improving the dialogue between management

and labor. We want to explore more clearly and more deeply, if you like, the whole question of the quality of working life and perhaps put in place, with the co-operation of the parties involved, some experiments in industrial democracy.

Additionally, as the member will know, we have made some steps towards improving, we hope, the industrial relations climate in the construction industry by the introduction of a piece of legislation which, while it does not have the unanimous support of all parties involved, will we believe be a vehicle which will provide some additional measure of flexibility and stability in the whole bargaining process in the construction industry. So, certainly, we are of a mind that some of the thrusts we'll be making in terms of improving working conditions and at the same time paying attention to the industrial relations features that are so very much a part of the warp and woof of things in Saskatchewan will continue to be addressed and hopefully be given the proper amount of consideration.

MR. ANDREW: — I do, of course, reserve the right to debate the question and the proper form to debate that question is when that bill comes forward. I would simply caution the minister that to develop a better climate in the total field of the construction industry, I think it is absolutely important, absolutely imperative that this particular program be able to get off on the right foot in the sense that both sides, to a certain degree, do advocate or do accept the program. It would be very unfortunate, I think, if the objections to the program of the two parties involved were such that the whole program got off on the wrong foot. I think, whether properly so or not, the people of the province of Saskatchewan tend to look at the legislation as the be-all and the end-all that's going to solve the labor problem in Saskatchewan in relation to the construction industry. I doubt that is going to happen. I just make that brief comment. Clearly it will come up in the question of debate on that matter.

I would if I could, Mr. Chairman, simply ask a few questions that I do have with regard to this department and then perhaps we can let the matter go. In particular with regard to the grant program set out in item no. 13 where it is increased from \$57,600 to \$74,500, can the minister give some kind of an indication just what those grant programs will be?

MR. SNYDER: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, the subvote 13 is the appropriate subvote. Grants to organizations, agencies and institutions concerned with labor policy and employment practices estimated 1979-80, \$74,500 and estimated 1978-79 was \$57,500. Some explanation perhaps was requested on the grants paid out in 1978-79. It was the provision of \$1,600; \$800 to a representative of the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce and another \$800 grant to a member of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to provide financial assistance for Saskatchewan representatives to participate in the Canadian Labour Congress study tour, the international labor organization in Geneva. The department provided an \$800 grant to the employer organization in that particular case, the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce and the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to assist them in travel costs and things of that nature.

The province additionally (another item) supported a research project conducted by Dr. Brand, a cancer specialist on uranium miners at Eldorado Nuclear. This was in the Montreal Institute of Cancer, \$49,535. The research project was considered to have substantial implications for early detection and prevention of lung cancer in miner's population at large and in addition the research may provide a substantial contribution to our occupational health program. The reason for that grant then is obvious, I believe.

Grants in the fiscal year 1979-80 estimated at \$74,500; Labour College of Canada for the purpose of providing funding of two scholarships for Saskatchewan residents to attend the Labour College in Montreal. The scholarship is awarded for the Department of Labour by the admission committee of the Labour College from a list of Saskatchewan residents. The Labour College program is an integral part of the labor movement in Canada and its students are active in economic, social and community affairs.

Another project which will be part of the \$74,500 is a \$50,000 figure, a research project on low radiation for the purpose of conducting research into the effect of radiation on workers and to establish effective methods of monitoring radiation. Finally, of the final figure making up the total of \$74,500, is a \$20,000 grant to the industrial relations centre to undertake a review of the feasibility of establishing an industrial relations centre through the University of Saskatchewan.

That gives you a basic outline of the expenditure, the estimated expenditure of \$74,500 for 1978-79 fiscal year.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Minister, did I understand you correctly to say that radiation study was \$50,000?

MR. SNYDER: — Yes, that is right. Research project on low radiation — \$50,000 was the figure — to conduct a research on the effect of radiation on workers.

MR. ANDREW: — Could you perhaps elaborate to a degree on that particular program for us?

MR. SNYDER: — Related to the research project on low radiation of \$50,000. That is the one you are asking about specifically. I am not sure we have detail on that one. You asked about the wrong one apparently. We have some particular detail on one, the Montreal Institute of Cancer. Mr. Sass indicates to me while that information isn't readily available at the moment, we can make it available to you at a later point in time, later this week if you wish. Is that satisfactory?

MR. ANDREW: — That would be satisfactory. Primarily what I am interested in in the study is, who is conducting the study? How long it will last? And how many people are involved in it? It seems it is making up the bulk of your grant money. I would be interested in that particular question.

MR. SNYDER: — We'll see to it that you get that information. The length of time, what were the other details? The length of time which the study will cover? What people are involved? O.K. We'll see that's made available to you.

MR. ANDREW: — Thank you. The only other question I have at this point in time is, has the department done anything further with the Markham report on the potash dust problem in the potash mines?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, I think I indicated on one other occasion the Markham study produced what we believe to be a document which told us very little we were not already aware of. The department has been actively engaged over a number of years in providing some of the measures that would reduce not only the level of dust in

Saskatchewan potash mines but the level of carbon monoxide and other noxious fumes if you like. The department, through the Occupational Health and Safety Division is still in the process of doing all of those things and continuing with their own research into the question of reduction of levels of the noxious fumes as I indicated and the potash dusts and other foreign objects. While it appears the member has attached some degree of significance to the report, the Occupational Health and Safety Division found nothing particularly new or exciting in the Markham report.

MR. ANDREW: — Would it be fair to assume then that the Markham report has, for all intents and purposes been tabled or been filed away?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, I think the Markham report has perhaps served whatever purpose it might have served. I repeat once again, the Markham report contained nothing very new or outstanding that was not already known to the Department of Labour through the Occupational Health and Safety Division. The recommendations contained in the report were being acted on at a time prior to the publishing of the Markham report because we had acknowledged well in advance of the tabling of his document some of the things Markham drew attention to in his study.

MR. ANDREW: — Well, I suppose the two things I am concerned about are number one, the Markham report indicated that people involved in the underground mining, at least, are susceptible to chronic bronchitis. Is the minister indicating to me that that problem has been rectified, or is there still a potential danger of people suffering from chronic bronchitis through long hours of working in the mines?

MR. SNYDER: — There's been a general belief that not only the dust in potash mines might have been a contributing factor, but more probably the ventilation (which might be inadequate in some of the mines) was the basic cause of bronchitis among those workers who were involved in underground mining. The department has been devoting itself to working with the management and the occupational health and safety committees in the mining operations to improve the ventilation system in such a way as to reduce those hazards to the very bare minimum. I think we've enjoyed a fair degree of success in that connection.

MR. ANDREW: — Have you, in that vein, further investigated that particular thing with Dr. John Markham, or has Dr. Markham been basically put aside personally?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, I have to tell the member first of all that the study was not commissioned by the Department of Labour. It was a national research grant which provided the funding for Dr. John Markham. The study was not put together at the direction or the suggestion of the Department of Labour. It was done, as I indicated, through a national health grant and whatever value the Markham report may have been, the department will be prepared to use whatever intelligence or knowledge sprung from it, but I don't think we are in the position to believe that Markham's report was an earth-shattering document.

MR. ANDREW: — Are you still of the opinion (I believe some of the members of your staff were of the opinion) that the foundation upon which Markham based his study was on pretty shaky grounds with regard to the data that he had accumulated?

MR. SNYDER: — I think there was some suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that the information contained in the report was based on a premise that may not have been entirely logical or sound. I think experts in the field might be inclined to differ with respect to the

conclusions that were drawn because of the basis from which Dr. Markham proceeded with his study.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — You mentioned two scholarships that were awarded to the labor college. Would you kind of give me an outline of what goes on regarding the people who have received these scholarships?

MR. SNYDER: — Well the Labour College of Canada conducts courses that have been going on for a good number of years, at McGill I believe, and the trade union movement has sponsored a number of people who have been active in the community and active in the trade union movement. The courses are related to — I am not sure. We don't have the curriculum here. Perhaps the hon. member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) might have a better understanding of this. He was one of those who attended the Labour College of Canada sometime ago. I can't give you precise details — I think it was something in the order of a two-month course. It dealt with a number of features, including sociology and what have you. I am afraid I just don't have the details and I am not sure that my department would have the details with respect to the curriculum which is offered at the Labour College of Canada.

MR. TAYLOR: — Now these people who are selected, are they from your department, or are these people in the labor union movement? Who would be selected to go on these scholarships, or who was?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, generally speaking the people who attend the Labour College of Canada are people who are nominated by the Federation of Labour, by whatever internal mechanism they devise to choose a person who has been active in the trade union movement, usually a younger person with a good deal of effort which can be contributed to the trade union movement after his return. I can't tell you precisely how they make that judgment. It's in large measure a determination which is made by the trade union movement in assessing their membership and determining those people who will be most productive on their return.

MR. TAYLOR: — The other question I have (and this is in keeping with the general questions we have been asking of all departments) and that's for the actual salaries — 1978-79, the estimated salaries — 1978-79, and the estimated 1979-80 for the top two in each of your subvotes? You can supply that to us in writing; we don't need it immediately.

MR. SNYDER: — We were anticipating the question and we will get it to you directly.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Minister, you have some legislation before us right now which . . . I am not sure, did he draw up that particular bill . . . it pertains to him anyway . . . anyway, Mr. Minister, it has always been a hotly debated point as to how much freedom a working person has in this province. It has always been a debatable point as to whether he is coerced to join the union or whether he joins one out of freedom of choice and that the number of people agitating to unionize is very minimal and all of a sudden we've got a vote, etc. In short, what I am saying, it seems to be relatively easy for a minority to establish a union. This is nothing new, it has been this way for a great many years.

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

MR. THATCHER: — Oh no, no! Quite the contrary, quite the contrary.

Mr. Minister, tell me what gave you the idea? By what stroke of genius did you decide to unionize the contractors?

Now we have a bill before us right now which amounts to about that. I suppose there is some difference in phraseology, but call it whatever you want, it is legislation from the government to unionize the contractors. Very briefly, Mr. Minister, would you tell us the genius, the logic which is behind this little gem?

MR. SNYDER: — I find the member's comments interesting. In the first instance, his suggestion, first of all that it only takes a minority in order to establish a trade union and somehow or other that has become fixed in his mind as the method of operation in the formation of a union in the province of Saskatchewan. Really, nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Chairman. I think that in order for a trade union organization to come into existence and in order for a vote to be taken before the Labour Relations Board, it is necessary for that union to show something on the order of a minimum of 25 per cent support, by card support, in order that they may demand a vote be taken by the Labour Relations Board. In the event that that vote carries in the affirmative, 50 per cent plus one dictates whether a union will be formed or whether it will not be formed. In the event that 51 out of 100 workers decide that they do not want a union, then that situation prevails in the work place. If the opposite is true and 51 per cent or more determine that they wish to have a union represent them, then this applies in total throughout.

The question then was raised, I suppose, and equated to what the hon. member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) refers to as the mandatory unionization of contractors, of contractors in the construction business, and he wanted to know why or how that gem of wisdom fell upon me.

You know, I think he could direct that to some very close friends of his who have been deeply involved in the construction industry and who have been requesting of the department for some time that some measure of stability be put in place with respect to the construction industry and that they have, in effect, an opportunity to speak with one voice in order that their dissident members, if you like, do not have the opportunity to splinter off one at a time, reach agreements that are advantageous to them and to the disadvantage of the construction industry and to the trade union movement and to collective bargaining as a whole.

I think we have seen examples of that time after time after time in the construction industry. In my period of time I've seen some pretty nasty and some pretty vicious strikes that took place with all of the hard feelings that emerged as a result of that. I think what the hon. member should do perhaps is to consult more closely with some of his very close and dear acquaintances to have them inform him as to where the idea actually originated and why those pearls of wisdom fell upon me, because I, in this respect was something of a reluctant bridegroom for a period of time, and it hasn't been particularly easy sledding in terms of getting the agreement of the majority of trade unions. I think we have that at this point in time. To get the general acceptance of that group of people who look upon this kind of legislation with a degree of scepticism, it's taken a great deal of time and a great deal of effort on behalf of the officials in my department to put in place the document that we have before us. We do not represent it as any kind of a panacea, but we do represent it as a legitimate tool that can be used with the advice and consent and with the goodwill of both parties to the collective

bargaining agreement. We believe that it's essentially a step in the right direction. You know, I think the hon. member really deserves to have the opportunity to talk to a larger number of the people in the construction industry to see whether they believe this to be an appropriate mechanism or not. If they believe it isn't, then I suppose we would have to have another genuine good look at the whole proposition to determine whether this is the appropriate route.

MR. THATCHER: — Do I understand the minister correctly to say that if the construction industry, whoever they may be, asked you to pull that bill that you would pull it? Did I interpret you correctly?

MR. SNYDER: — No, I didn't say that. What I did say is this. I would like to have a consensus from them and I believe there is a meeting which takes place tomorrow at which time they will have an opportunity to look at the bill in some detail. I had communication from them, or from one of the larger segments of the construction industry, saying only a short while ago, in the event that these two clauses (they specified two particular clauses), if these two clauses remain in the bill then we cannot support it. In good faith we said we will go part way with you and remove one of the clauses which they regarded as being offensive. I'm inclined to believe, Mr. Chairman, that having compromised in the way that we have and in light of the support that has been offered over the past number of years for some system of more civilized bargaining, I believe that we will have the support of the vast majority of the people in the construction industry.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, if they're meeting tomorrow why are you drafting a bill? You've got a bill before us right now. If you are saying that you've got this bill because the construction industry has rushed and persuaded you, and that your department has been at work persuading the unions then again, you know, it's so typical. Your department has been at work persuading the unions to accept it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please. I'd just like to draw to the hon. member's attention that we are not debating any legislation here, and you'll have an opportunity to debate that when the bill comes before you, and you'll have that opportunity at that time. We are on item 1.

MR. THATCHER: — What item are we on, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We are on item 1.

MR. THATCHER: — And I shall treat it as item 1, thank you. Mr. Minister, you've indicated that this proposed legislation under your department is in response to a great deal of pressure from them. Would you tell us if they are meaning to discuss it now? How did such pressure originate? As you would indicate, they had been to your office. They had virtually coerced you into it, yet now you are saying they are meeting tomorrow to discuss it. I don't know whether they are or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please. I ask the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to adhere to the regulations regarding the estimates. We are debating items in the labor estimates here. This that we are approaching and you are treading on and are debating now is a bill before the House in legislation. At that time you will have opportunity to debate, discuss, amend or whatever might be. But at this time we cannot debate that because you have already stated it is legislation before the House and we cannot debate it in the estimates.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me we were talking a little earlier about trade unions. Once upon a time there must have been legislation introduced to set up trade unions. Somewhere these clauses had to be written. We talk about them under item 1. We do every other piece of legislation. We have been talking very generally about a bill that hasn't even been named by either one of us right now, in a highly general sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. The hon. member, now is debating my ruling. I have made my ruling and I call now to proceed with another question on item 1.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, we are sort of hopeful we can wind these estimates up but if you want a filibuster that is, of course, your choice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! I asked the hon. member, and I think in quite an appropriate way, to adhere to the rules. I, once more, will ask him to do that. If they do not proceed in that manner I have no alternative than to proceed in the manner which is open for me.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, changing the subject, briefly, and with the chairman's permission to talk about legislation, bills, clauses, etc., you have indicated to us a union can be set up when 25 per cent indicate a desire to set up a union. Correct?

MR. SNYDER: — A vote should be taken.

MR. THATCHER: — All right, a vote should be taken. Mr. Minister, tell me what percentage is required where there may be a union, an establishment, and they decide they don't want a union or a change in union? What per cent is required at that stage?

MR. SNYDER: — In the event to form a union if a vote is taken before the Labour Relations Board, after a display of strength of 25 per cent, then a vote must be taken and the vote must be in the affirmative and it will be 50 per cent plus 1. In order to decertify or to certify another trade union, then a vote must be taken and the majority, once again, a simple majority will be 50 per cent plus 1. And that's a good deal better than a lot of members who sit in this Legislative Assembly. There's another very crucial point that you should remember, too. On the anniversary date of the certification process, members have the opportunity during the 30-60 day hunting period, to have that decertification vote if there's an indication that they would wish to have the union removed or exchanged for another union. There's a 30-60 day hunting period prior to the anniversary date of each certification process. You know, it takes four years to get rid of one of us in here, under normal circumstances. Trade unions have the opportunity to do this once every year.

MR. THATCHER: — Who do they make this application to? Do they make it to your Department of Labour, to their union? What procedure is open to them?

MR. SNYDER: — Their application must be made to the Labour Relations Board. It's what is referred to as a rescission, an application to rescind.

MR. THATCHER: — How many of them or what percentage?

MR. SNYDER: — In the event for a rescission application, majority has to be shown and accordingly, that's the route that they go in order to change or to rescind an application or certification vote that has been taken previously.

MR. THATCHER: — You said a majority of the total union? Fifty per cent plus 1 of the entire one or those who might choose to vote?

MR. SNYDER: — The employees in the union, a majority of those who are covered by the certification order.

MR. THATCHER: — Well, Mr. Minister, would it not be equitable when you say that 25 per cent of the employees would like the union, if that is what you consider the magic figure to have a vote on, why would it not be 25 per cent of the employees to have a decertification vote? What's the difference or why do you deal with it in a different manner?

MR. SNYDER: — I think, Mr. Chairman, in order of having a degree of stability. Actually, the turnover is not considered to be a remarkable one. On the occasions when there is a number of employees who have been covered by the certification order who determine that they want to decertify, then, this is done in a fairly straightforward manner. I think there have been only recently, two or three decertifications that have taken place. I'm thinking of several that I have looked over recently. The rule that has existed for a good many years is the provision for a vote to be taken in the event that a majority indicate that there is majority support to see a union decertified. I suppose it lends a degree of stability. I'm not sure that I can mount a particularly impressive argument that perhaps it shouldn't be less, but it strikes me that the Labour Relations Board would, on occasions, find itself burdened with the responsibility of taking a vote because 25 or 30 people (30 per cent of the workers) indicated that they wanted a vote to be taken only to have it fail, and on the anniversary date following that, go through the process again. I am not at all sure it would be a productive use of the Labour Relations Board's time to be continually conducting votes unless there was a genuine indication that the majority of employees would wish to have the union decertified.

I think, on the other hand, there is a guarantee under The Trade Union Act, clause 3 of The Trade Union Act, which provides that each and every worker in the province of Saskatchewan is guaranteed the right to join a union of his choice and that opportunity is provided by this process. Under most circumstances, the wish is not terribly emphatic to have the union replaced by another union or the decertification process to take place.

I think the compelling argument is that the Labour Relations Board, which is a very busy body, would be burdened with the responsibility of conducting votes, perhaps more regularly than would be considered necessary. Accordingly, the provision stands and it is not unusual in other jurisdictions. I think it follows a fairly familiar pattern.

MR. THATCHER: — So in the interest of stability it is 50 per cent plus 1 that must apply to the Labour Relations Board. Yet, also in the interests of stability, (whose stability I am not completely sure of), 25 per cent of the employees can petition for a vote, again in the interests of stability, and they can get a vote and they may win it or lose it. Let's say they lose it. In the interest of stability they wait six months and then they petition again and he gives them another vote. They may win or lose it but let's say they lose it. In the interests of stability, they get another vote and it goes on and on until ultimately they finally win it. Then in the interests of stability, if they are in the union for awhile and for whatever reason choose to be certified or change the union, in the interests of stability — again I think the key question is, whose stability — it has to be 50 per cent plus 1 to apply to the Labour Relations Board.

Somewhere in your warped and twisted logic, as dictated by the Larry Browns, etc., you call that equitable. You call that stability. Stability for whom? Who is it stacked in favor of? What is wrong with giving them the same chance to get out of a union as to get in? Nobody in the province and I don't think anybody anywhere, is going to debate with you, the right of an individual or the right of a group of individuals to set up a union. That is their right.

At the same time, why don't you give them the same break to get out of one or to change it, or to give them some sort of a choice instead of rigging the ball game against them? You know very well getting 50 per cent plus 1 to petition to the Labour Relations Board is an extremely difficult and complex thing. It's very, very difficult under our existing labor laws. It's not very tough to get 25 per cent to say we've got to have a union. Then if they lose the first one, keep it up, wear them down and ultimately you get them. Fine, that's their right and there's nothing wrong with them wanting to have a union. Why don't you give them the same break? If they want to change it, or if they've got a bad union, or if they've got bad people running it, why don't you give them the same break to get out of it? In other words, the little guy who is paying his union dues, why don't you give him the same kick at the cat as those who got him into it? Why don't you turn the control back to the little guy in the unions? I guess that's the main question.

MR. SNYDER: — I'm deeply touched by the hon. member's feeling for the little guy. It's rather a strange mantle that fits rather awkwardly on his shoulders I must say, because his compassion for the little guy hasn't really been one that has been noted on other occasions as long as I've known the hon. member, or known of him for quite a few years. I think the hon. member should appreciate one thing. There is very seldom an application before the Labour Relations Board for a vote with something less than a majority support because the union, under normal circumstances, recognizes that it's a waste of their time, their effort, and their money to conduct a vote if they have no hope of winning that vote. The unions resources are limited too, and by the same token the opportunity of that union to get out or to change, if it were reduced to something less than 51 per cent, I think would do nothing other than increase the inter-union rivalry, and the things that would bring a greater degree of instability to the trade union movement and to the industrial sector.

The associate deputy minister indicates to me that in the United States they followed the line of reasoning of the hon. member for Thunder Creek and labor legislation provided for getting out of the union or demanding a vote with something less than 50 per cent plus 1 of the vote. This just was responsible for creating inter-union rivalry and the raiding of one union on another to the point where employers were almost demanding of the government that they revert to the old process of having to have 50 per cent plus 1.

I think the hon. member should have a chat with the member for Rosthern because the member for Rosthern obviously has something of a basic understanding of trade union organization which the hon. member for Thunder Creek never had and I expect never will because his appreciation of the problem is overclouded by a great many other factors. I think the hon. member for Rosthern could give the member for Thunder Creek a few basic instructions in what trade union organization is all about without any tainted point of view that has any real political overtones.

MR. THATCHER: — Well the same minister that is pretty good with the obscene gestures and the comments across the floor, when he is a little stuck for an answer

then, of course, we have to switch into personalities. But one point he never did answer. I acknowledge that I'm not an expert in unions; but when it comes to knowledge about unions the member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) and the member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) and the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) are out of my league as far as knowledge of unions is concerned. But, Mr. Minister, I think regardless of our knowledge of unions, we can ask a few points about labor legislation. Again, there are people in this Assembly who have forgotten more than I know about it. I acknowledge that. But you still haven't answered the point, for those of us who are not experts in the field of labor, who really don't know that much about the union movement. You still haven't answered our question: why 25 per cent to get a vote? Then if you want to change your mind, if your union isn't cutting the mustard, or the people who are running that union aren't doing the job and you want to change it, tell me why the vote must be rigged before it can even go to the Labour Relations Board? You have said that it must go to the Labour Relations Board and they must have 50 per cent plus 1. In other words, the thing is cut and dried before it goes there. That is what you are saying — having it rigged before it gets there. If I am saying something that is incorrect by all means correct me. But have it rigged before you get there! That isn't good enough, that doesn't get the decertification — 50 per cent plus 1, which is a monumental task at the best of times. But that isn't enough. Then you insist on conducting a vote after the majority have already said we want out. I don't think you need to be an expert on anything to know that something is a trifle inadequate here, that it is slightly weighted to say the very least on the opposite side.

So in other words what are you doing? Suppose 50 per cent plus 1 do go to the Labour Relations Board — what do you do then? Oh, we have to have a vote. You have to give them a chance to reflect and oh, you might be making a tragic error. What about the cause for reflection when they are coming in, if 50 plus 1 say we want a union? Is there any such pause where we will think — guys you should think about it for a while, you don't want to rush into this, it's tough to get out — heavens no! In other words, Mr. Minister, that thing is weighted for the big international unions. It's not set up for the locally-run unions; it's set up by the big guys. Business managers in Vancouver, Toronto and Denver, that's who it is set up for.

Once again, tell us why the vote has to be rigged, based on the assumption, for whatever reason, that the membership, in their wisdom, choose to either decertify or to change unions, why must they rig their votes before they even to go the Labour Relations Board?

MR. SNYDER: — I've heard this sort of nonsense repeated over and over again. It's a repeat of the tactics that were used by another gentleman that sat approximately in this chair in the legislature a number of year ago, and he did a disservice to the community that he represented. He did a disservice to the trade union movement. He did a disservice to industry. The attempt that the hon. member makes to indicate that an entirely different set of rules apply to get in than to get out — I dispute that entirely. It takes 50 per cent plus 1 to get in; it takes 50 per cent plus 1 to get out. The fact that it is made somewhat easier for a group of people to make their wishes known in order to have a vote placed before the Labour Relations Board is not an unusual one. It's not unusual for a particular reason. There are often very difficult circumstances which make it particularly awkward in a shop where . . . let me give you a classic example . . . pretty difficult in a place like an automotive firm that I mentioned some little time ago, where employers in question choose to coerce and intimidate. They invite people into their office and deny them the right to exercise a right conferred under the law of the province of Saskatchewan. Those things happen. They happen on a regular basis. And

ask some of your friends, some of your party supporters, who have a closer association with the Labour Relations Board than obviously you do. And you will know of the fact that, in a great many circumstances, when there is any indication that a vote is about to be taken, or if there is any activity to organize a group of workers, that is the signal in a number of instances to start the process of coercion and intimidation. I say it doesn't happen often, but it happens regularly enough that there is a bit of a safeguard built in to prevent that sort of thing from being the ultimate and controlling factor. So if there is, in the process of organizing a trade union, a show of support of some 25 per cent, then this is enough of an indication to the Labour Relations Board that a secret ballot vote should be conducted, and I don't regard that as being unusual. I don't believe that that's anything that the hon. member should rise up in holy horror about. It's not an unusual show of support in the order of 25 per cent. Under the previous Liberal government, I believe The Trade Union Act said 40 per cent, and then a vote had to be taken, 25 per cent is a figure that I think strikes probably more reasonably at the circumstances in question. But it certainly does not provide anything other than the opportunity for members then to express their wish, and I don't regard it as being anything out of the ordinary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — You know, Mr. Minister, I think probably I've seen some things in this Assembly that may not be the greatest. I think you just hit the all time slimy low. You know, you say what you want about me. You attack me in any way you want and that's fair game. But I'll tell you, don't you ever attack my father again. You had your opportunity . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you know exactly what I said, or so help me you'll regret it right here in this Assembly. You say what you want about me. You have had your opportunity. He is not here to defend himself. That is the most despicable thing I have ever heard. He has been there to defend it. You have taken your shots and that is fair. You can say whatever you want about me, that is fine; I can look after myself but that is about the lowest I have seen yet. Coming from you, I would have credited you a trifle better than that.

The comments you made about one of the members in this Assembly . . . I invite you to step outside this Assembly and make them where he has recourse to you in the courts. It is fine to make statements like that in here where you have all the immunity. Step outside and I am sure one of those gentlemen would be happy to meet you there. I am quite sure they would be happy to meet you. Let's see how much guts you have then. I've got a feeling that you haven't got the nerve to do it. I will guarantee it. I venture to say one of those gentlemen would be happy to be there, to quote you.

Mr. Minister, we just simply haven't gotten back to the point and it all started from one basic little question. Again, it must be a sore point for someone to ask you a very simple, basic, innocuous question. Why 25 one way, why 50 plus 1 the other way? You skirted around it. You have answered it; you haven't given one single reason. There must be a

reason for it.

Simply tell us and let's move on and let's not bother about bad-mouthing people here and there. Say what you want about me if that turns your crank. Simply answer that question and tell us what the basis is behind it, unless the basis is what we have suggested on this side. If it is something else let's hear it and let's move on, if you can stick to the subject.

MR. SNYDER: — The hon. member repeats the anti-labor diatribe which I indicated to him earlier I have seen and heard in this legislature on other occasions. If he takes offence to that, then so be it. I am referring not to personalities, but to the speeches that were offered in this House in the kind of anti-labor diatribe which I think has no place in this legislature and should not be the political platform upon which a party stakes its fortunes. That we see happening in a federal election today, that we saw happening when the Liberal Party was put into complete demise. I warn the hon. member that he will probably reap his just rewards as a result of the attitudes which he displays in this House. We will make sure that they are well known.

I am going to repeat, once more, for the hon. member, that to get into a union it takes a vote of 50 per cent plus 1. In order to get out of a union it take 50 per cent plus 1. That opportunity is provided to members of a trade union movement on the anniversary date during the 30-60 day hunting period prior to the anniversary date on each and every trade union agreement. In each case of certification the employees have the opportunity to get out of that trade union in the same way as they got in, except for the one minor feature that I drew attention to and it's not an earth shaker. It is in effect in many other jurisdictions so the member need not believe that he's unearthed something that's somehow out of keeping or out of tune with the whole certification process in other jurisdictions. I don't intend to justify . . . I'll repeat my answer as often as he wishes to repeat the question.

There are instances when it is very, very difficult because of a slim number, a rather minute number of employers who are prepared to coerce and intimidate and prevent union organization from taking place. I mentioned that point and I mention it again and it isn't a matter of me stepping outside the legislature and drawing attention to it.

It is on the record of the Labour Relations Board, the written word, the printed word which indicates that an hon. member of this House was convicted of an unfair labor practice charge for doing those things which I drew attention to. There is no necessity for me to step outside the corridor and repeat something that is the printed word, a public record in this province. I don't know what the member is attempting to prove. I will sit down again and let him repeat his question once more.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, let me make two comments clear, just so I'm totally clear, Mr. Chairman, 25 per cent causes the vote, 50 per cent plus 1 person gets you into the union. If you want to decertify, even on your anniversary date, you need an application by 50 per cent of the membership plus 1; then there will be a vote called for. Am I correct in that statement?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, that's what is necessary in order to trigger action. In some instances I expect, if it is something well in excess of 51 per cent, probably the board will regard a vote as unnecessary under those circumstances and would decertify without a vote. But in order to demand a vote be taken, there must be 50 per cent plus 1.

MR. KATZMAN: — You suggest that management will coerce and suggest to people not to form a union. Is it not true within the union solidarity clause that if a member tries to have a union decertified and he loses the decertification vote that the union will get rid of him and they are allowed to by their solidarity clause?

MR. SNYDER: — I think the hon. member is as well acquainted as I am with the facts and he will know that in the great number of instances where an attempt has been made to decertify a union where it has been unsuccessful, there have been no repercussions, no retribution as a result of that. You will know that that has taken place and you will know that the reverse has also taken place. I can think of one instance in particular where a person whose actions were regarded as actions against the trade union and his membership in that union was denied.

MR. KATZMAN: —So, Mr. Minister, basically, unions coerce (or threaten, take your choice of words) their membership if they try to decertify, probably, and I think because of the solidarity clause, probably more than any management does. I say that from my experience within a union.

MR. SNYDER: — The hon. member will know of a number of incidents. I can bring the record to the House where unions have (a fair number of them within the last 24 months) have decertified and obviously there have been other attempts to decertify that have been unsuccessful. I know of no particular abuse except in one particular instance that I can think of, where I believe it was inclined to be somewhat marginal, but I am not in a position to cast judgement or make my opinion known with respect to that particular case.

MR. KATZMAN: — To get the record clear, Mr. Minister, it is a fact you indicate that the management will coerce. I say to you that unions have the same right and do use it to coerce, to try and stop their membership from causing a decertification by their solidarity clause. I think you are agreeing with me and that's the point we are making. As much as you want to say that some management works against the forming of a union, the unions work against anybody within trying to decertify the union. That's all I am saying. I believe you are agreeing with me by what you have said up to this point. If I'm wrong on that statement, correct me, but I believe we both agree that that does happen.

MR. SNYDER: — The member will be aware of the fact that The Trade Union Act has provisions within it that provide that it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to coerce or intimidate. It is also an unfair labor practice for a trade union to coerce or intimidate or influence in that way the judgment of a member or a prospective member. So, in both instances, it is an unfair labor practice and I don't hesitate to suggest that both parties are guilty, in some instances.

Item 1 agreed.

ITEM 2

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Chairman, before you pass this subvote, I want to point out that an error was made in the sums included in the estimates for the Department of Labour. I should draw this to the attention of the committee at this time. In preparing the estimates material the department officials made an error consistently through all of the subvotes and consequently the salary figures for each subvote are too high by 6 per cent. The total amount in the printed estimates before us then is too high by \$365,650. This error was detected only a short while after the estimates were printed and the

excess of \$365,650 was formally frozen by Treasury Board more than a month ago and, of course, will be not made available to the department. So, hon. members will know that an adjustment then needs to be made with respect to the salary figures in each subvote in the amount of 6 per cent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Before we can pass these subvotes, that error will have to be corrected by motion form. That's the only way in which we can do it and I would have to ask the minister to make that correction and put it in the form of a motion here. It would be made in that manner.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Mr. Chairman, do we need a motion for each one or just one to cover the whole works?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We have to have it done in the correct manner. I can only say that the motion should apply to each subvote, I believe, because there are going to be different results at the end of each subvote. Unless there is another manner in which we can proceed to go through and bring this motion in at the end of the estimates, then I would consider that.

MR. SNYDER: — It might be helpful, Mr. Chairman, if we were to proceed on the basis of the printed blue book subvotes and the amount contained therein and to distribute to the members the updated figures, the revised figures for 1979-80 with a motion at the end of the estimates with an indication. I'll have my people prepare a motion before we vote the last final vote. My understanding is, of course, that the money is frozen here. It was discovered a short while after the estimates were printed. Accordingly, the money has been frozen by Treasury Board. It will be known, of course, that these are essentially estimates and Treasury Board has given the indication that the money is not available and, of course, will not be spent. But if it is possible, I can have my people prepare a motion with the assistance perhaps of the Clerk and we might proceed on that basis, if people are in agreement. We are in the hands of the committee.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the minister will have to correct votes 2, 3, 4 and each one as he goes down. This will require the total vote to be changed. This will require the budget figures to be changed later on down the road, the total estimates. This will require changes in many areas, so I don't think he can do it except by individual items. If we amend the whole total then we have to amend the budget as well because the budget will be a lower figure than is indicated. This will require . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SNYDER: — To expedite matters it has been suggested that a tabling of the document which represents the revised estimates, which will be distributed to hon. members, will give an indication of the estimated 1979-80 figures, then the final revision by reducing by 6 per cent the wage bill, and on the right hand column it will give you an indication of the difference between the printed and the revised figures. Accordingly, with the committee's permission, Mr. Chairman, I will move:

That this committee adopt the corrections to the printed estimates for the Department of Labour, as tabled by the Minister of Labour, April 24, 1979, seconded by Mr. Romanow.

Motion agreed to.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I'd like to know the salary your deputy

minister has budgeted for this year.

MR. SNYDER: — I think that question was asked and we were going to provide it to the hon. member. The deputy minister's projected annual salary, \$44,711; the 1979-80 budgeted salary, \$45,690.

MR. THATCHER: — What else is involved? What other benefits are provided?

MR. SNYDER: — My deputy falls in the same category as other ministers in other jurisdictions in Canada. The recipient of the automobile pays 1 per cent per month for the purchase price of the automobile for personal mileage. The maximum purchase price for said automobile is \$8,000.

MR. THATCHER: — Could you tell me the qualifications of your deputy?

MR. SNYDER: — The Deputy Minister of Labour, education — Bachelor of Arts, Economics, LLB at the University of Saskatchewan in 1959; 1960 to 1970 private law practice; 1970 to 1973 at the Canadian Department of Labour as director of the Legislative Research Branch in Legal Services, Department of Regional and Economic Expansion as director of the Legal Services Division; from July 1973 to April 1974, International Labour Organization service with the government of Dominica; five years in his present position.

MR. THATCHER: — I have a great deal many more questions to ask this evening; I would therefore like to call it 5 o'clock because some of them are rather extensive.

The Assembly recessed from 5 until 7 p.m.