

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

**May 2, 1979.**

**EVENING SESSION**

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**SECOND READINGS**

**BILL NO. 87 (CONTINUED) - AN ACT RESPECTING THE INDEPENDENCE OF MEMBERS OF  
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I think it's safe to say that Bill 87 - An Act respecting the Independence of Members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, is giving all of us some trouble.

Mr. Minister, I think that the point has already been made that the public perception of their MLAs and their elected representatives must be unquestionably clean. Without that what have we got left?

I believe it's safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that the image of politicians at this point in time — and it doesn't much matter whether you're talking about Great Britain or the United States or Canada — is not good. There are reasons for that. The actions of certain people in the Watergate business in the United States put politicians on trial everywhere. Because of that the public has very little sympathy for elected people.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it's safe to say that on all sides of this House there is no dispute that the image of their politicians, as far as possible, must be as clean and as perceptive as possible.

The question is how do we accomplish this, because it is really not that easy to bring it about? It's one thing to say, look, we're all good, we're all knights on white chargers. Unfortunately, it just doesn't work that way. Unfortunately, in the words of somebody whom I respect a great deal — I think he's a constituent of the member for Cut Knife, one Johnathon Fox — said that a reputation is made by many deeds and is destroyed by one deed. Unfortunately, a few politicians have done a few things that have greatly outweighed the vast majority of the good deeds that have been done by other people in public life.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that public life is really not the great bed of roses that many of the people out in the public perceive it to be. Every one of us here is on questionable circumstances after 1983. Granted, some of us are safer than others. But, when you must be reviewed every four years, it does give one pause to wonder exactly what his future may be.

Mr. Speaker, because of that, because of the difficulties associated with public life such as ours, I think that we must be very careful as to the rules and the guidelines that we put down for ourselves so the best possible people will be able to come forward. I do not believe that it is in the overall long-term interest of anyone to restrict those who may possibly choose to put their name in nomination for election to this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I think the public has a great misconception as to where the power in this province truly is. Granted there are 61 of us in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, we've all been here for some time and even the new members now fully realize the power really does not lie in this Assembly, that granted, decisions are to some extent made here. Mr.

May 2, 1979

Speaker, for instance, if we could take the case that we have in this Assembly now, when you have a count of 44 to 17 there is really not a great deal of suspense as to what is going to happen when the government does make up its mind and it's going to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, when we examine where decisions are made in this Assembly or in this form of government, may I respectfully suggest, (this may come as a shock to some people in the press gallery) not very many of the decisions are made on this side of the House. In fact, in my limited time in this Assembly since 1975, the next decision that I see made in this Assembly on this side of the House, will be my first. Mr. Speaker, I am not being disrespectful to anybody on that side of the House but frankly I don't think very many decisions are made on the back row of this Assembly. Some are made on the next row up.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is that in this Assembly, even though the public may foresee that each and every one of us are down here and many of the public feel that every one of us has his hand in the cookie jar, we all know that that is nonsense, because Mr. Speaker, the basic decisions that are made in this Assembly under our system, are made in cabinet. Mr. Speaker, it goes beyond that; they are made at the high bureaucratic level, at the deputy minister level, the department of Treasury and the heads of the Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am attempting to make, however well I may be making it, is that there are far more important decisions made by deputy ministers, heads of departments, heads of Crown corporations, people on Treasury Boards, than are ever made by approximately 40 of us — 39 or 40 of us.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) I think very briefly had demonstrated some of the loop holes that are present in Bill 87. Mr. Speaker, Bill 87 is a bill that really does not accomplish a great deal. All it accomplishes is that the government of the day can say, we have a conflict of interest bill on file. That's all it does. They say they have got it on file.

Mr. Speaker, briefly let me give you one example, one little clause — if you go to section 2, clause (c) the naming of real property. For those of you that are farmers, if you have your farmland in your own name you must list it. If you choose before April 30, 1980 to incorporate that into a company then you don't have to list it. Mr. Speaker, that is nonsensical. Mr. Speaker, would some member on that side of the Assembly tell me what difference it makes to one resident of Saskatchewan or to anybody or how it affects their ability to perform in this Assembly, whether or not they have 10 acres, a quarter, a section or what else of farmland? Mr. Speaker, goodness sakes, there is just no point to that whatsoever. If you want to know what farmland any member of this Assembly has got, drive out into the general area that he lives, any of his neighbors will show you what he operates or what he rents or what he farms and if you really want to know then go down to the land titles office and search it.

Mr. Speaker, the point of it is it has no relevancy. Why would you ask a member to list it? He can get out of it; all he simply does is set up a company and he doesn't have to list it. But for what purpose? For what purpose? Mr. Speaker, I genuinely fear that this bill as it now sits could become a Pandora's box for us because I question that it has any great deal of value. I question we should be prying into the affairs of each and every one of us and make no mistake, maybe not this year, maybe not next year, but as time goes this is exactly what will happen and you know what will happen. Things happen in the

heat of debate. Tempers get lost and the first thing somebody throws out a crack, I know you didn't disclose this, etc., then somebody on this side of the House fires it back and you know what we've got right there. Then we start moving; we start changing this and changing that and we are going to work ourselves into trouble to the point where nobody can live with it. We are going to get to the point where the interests of the people are not served. Surely the interests of the people of Saskatchewan are to enable the best possible people to become involved in politics. Surely that is what the ultimate object for the people of Saskatchewan is.

Mr. Speaker, I really question that this is the route to go. Mr. Speaker, the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) has indicated he is concerned that senior civil servants are not included in this disclosure. I think the member for Qu'Appelle has a very valid point. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about people who can go into conflict the fastest I suggest to you that the heads of the Crown corporations, particularly the large ones, very quickly could be in a conflict far faster, in a far more dangerous fashion than any of us. I don't for one moment suggest that any of them are right now. I am saying the avenues, the possibilities are there far more than for anybody in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in Crown corporations this year we had an example which we all handled very delicately of a director of one of the Crown corporations sending out correspondence to resident managers of that Crown corporation regarding the potential sale of equipment to that Crown corporation of a company in which he had an interest. Mr. Speaker, I am going no further on that because there was nothing wrong with that. We acknowledged, I think, both sides, there was nothing wrong. Mr. Speaker, this is only one minor example of what can happen. I suggest to this Assembly, I suggest to you very respectfully, that the dangers for misuse of any funds are far more prevalent with your senior civil servants than they are with a good 40 of us in this Assembly.

Now with the cabinet people that may be a different situation but for those of us who are backbenchers, not in the cabinet, well, those of you that have been there you know very well if we wanted to be corrupt, if we wanted to sell our services and we put our services up to the highest bidder, you all know there wouldn't be one taker because there's not one of us that could deliver anything, not one of us.

Mr. Speaker, why have we got this bill for the 40 of us? Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that we are all caught in a dilemma which all of us would like out of. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier I greatly fear there are ramifications that will arise from this bill over the years that will not serve the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we do not need a situation where any of us are given the opportunity to, shall we say, peek into each other's private affairs. I have no interest in looking into the private affairs of any member on that side of the House and I'm sure the same is true of your side. As this bill was written, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the bulk of us who wish to could virtually turn in a blank sheet of paper and be completely within the law. I know I can and I'm sure most of you can if you want to.

Mr. Speaker, what does that really accomplish? Things will happen, things will be said in the heat of debate further on down the road and inevitably we will be led into a situation that none of us really require. Mr. Speaker, what I'm attempting to do while I digress here, is to get a motion to present to this Assembly that hopefully, will be acceptable to all sides of the House.

Mr. Speaker, (if I could briefly tell you before I introduce that motion while it's being

May 2, 1979

prepared) what we are proposing to suggest is that the question of conflict of interest or disclosure or whatever it may be should be taken out of the realm of partisan politics. I suggest to this Assembly, that it does none of us any value for the NDP to present a motion, any more than it would be for the Conservatives to present a bill. Mr. Speaker, what we are attempting to do is to get together a bill in which there can be input — on a non-partisan basis, and I want to emphasize that — and which we can all live with, which is fair to the MLAs who are in this Assembly today and the people who may wish to become MLAs in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must be very, very careful of what we put down. I think we must respect the right to privacy of any individual who comes into politics. All right if you become the Prime Minister, things happen. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody in this Assembly puts the privacy of their family well ahead of their job in this Assembly and rightly so. I believe very firmly that we should respect that right to privacy. I frankly, do not believe that whatever disclosures may come out of such a committee should necessarily be public knowledge. I think perhaps they must be deposited with proper people, perhaps the judiciary, but not necessarily with the public because I do not think an MLA should have to read about what he has written down supposedly in confidence and I don't think he should have to read about that in the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, we're coming along as quickly as we can. Mr. Speaker, we're trying to find our way out of it. I say to the government, there may be things wrong with this motion because it's being very hastily drafted. But the intention is to come to a compromise that we, as legislators on a non-partisan, non-political basis, can agree is acceptable to the MLAs' past, present and future and yet insure that the interests of the people of Saskatchewan will be preserved. Mr. Speaker, surely that should not be too difficult. I ask the members across the way . . . there are undercurrents in this Assembly today that we can very quickly and clearly resolve and I ask you (as this motion is presented and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to do this within order), to think about this very carefully before you reject it. Now if I could read the motion . It's moved by the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher), seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson):

That this Assembly strike a special committee to sit inter-sessionally, consisting of two opposition members and four government members, for the purpose of studying all ramifications of Bill 87 and that Bill 87 not now be read a second time but put before this committee for the purpose of making recommendations to the Assembly as it relates to conflict of interest legislation.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I find there are some technical problems with the amendment which has been offered in about three areas. However, I don't intend to deal with the technical problems but I will get to the meat of the amendment.

According to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, citation 740, there are three types of amendments which may be proposed at the second reading stage of the bill. The first one is a six-month hoist of which this is not. The second one is a reasoned amendment. I don't regard this is a reasoned amendment. The third way in which it could be amended is that a referral of the subject matter to a committee and that's what this amendment intends to do.

I carry on further with regard to Beauchesne, under the heading of referral of subject matter to a committee, citation 748(3):

An amendment cannot propose the reference of the subject matter of a bill to a body which is not in existence.

The member is, in fact, attempting to refer it to a committee which is not in existence at this time. Therefore, I have to rule the proposed amendment out of order on that basis.

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments on the present motion before the House. I would like to echo some of the statements made by both the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Thunder Creek. I think there clearly has to be some kind of distinction in this particular legislation between the people who stand over here and the people who stand in the back rows, who have virtually no power, and that's not peculiar to this legislature. The same situation exists in the federal House. I think it is even accentuated much more in the federal House of Canada wherein the people who make the decisions sit in that little circle — the political people that make the decisions — sit in that little circle near the front row. Those are the people who make the decisions and those are the people who can influence and can have some cut with government. How many people on this side of the House have a chance to make contracts with governments? To do anything with the government? But those people can.

Now don't get me wrong. I don't allege for a minute that you are, but surely there must be some rule that distinguishes over there from the people over here, or the people in the front row, the people with the power to the people in the back rows with virtually no power. Surely the legislation in question must take care, must make a point of that question as well. This is one thing which this bill does not address itself to. The other thing which this bill does not do is that the bill is brought in not to disclose anything.

I have some more things I wish to comment on with regard to this bill and I would ask the indulgence of this House to allow me to adjourn debate at this point in time, with the assurance that we can (with consent of all — and I will give the assurance from this side of the House that that assurance would be forthcoming) bring this matter up in debate later on this evening. I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## SECOND READINGS

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 95 — **An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Income Tax Act will serve three general purposes:

1. The amendments will raise the personal income child tax cut to \$40 per child from \$30 per child, per year;
2. The amendments will provide for a mortgage interest tax credit and a capital gains tax rebate in 1979, as announced in this year's budget speech.

3. A series of technical amendments are proposed to conform, Mr. Speaker, with recent changes in the federal income tax system. These changes are necessary for the purpose of administrative arrangements under the tax collection agreement.

Mr. Speaker, let me first turn to the section of the bill which deals with the tax reduction for dependent children. Members of the House will recall that last year we increased the general tax cut from \$120 to \$160 per taxpayer. We also introduced a child tax cut of \$30 for each dependent child under the age of 18 to a maximum of \$180. This child tax deduction is available to a taxpayer with wholly dependent children, grandchildren, nieces and nephews.

In order to ensure fairness of these enriched tax cuts, the total tax cut was reduced in 1978 by 15 per cent of the amount by which the taxpayer's provincial tax exceeds his maximum tax cut.

Effective as of January 1 of this year, the child tax cut will be increased to \$40 per dependent child to a maximum of \$240. The child tax cuts will be changed to 20 per cent of the amount by which the provincial tax exceeds the amount of these tax cuts. The general personal income tax cut and the child tax cut have been important elements, Mr. Speaker, in making Saskatchewan's income tax system one of the most progressive in Canada. The measures currently being proposed will serve to further increase this progressivity. The Saskatchewan tax cut in 1979 will be equivalent to a 4 per cent point reduction in our tax rate for the average taxpayer.

What this means is that, in comparison to the other provinces, our personal income tax rate with tax cuts would be the same as 49 per cent rate on average without any tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, section 5 of the bill introduces the Saskatchewan mortgage interest tax credit and the Saskatchewan capital gains tax rebate. As part of our party's election program announced last fall, we promised to help Saskatchewan families in carrying part of these mortgage payments. During the election campaign we proposed a provincial tax reduction based on up to \$1,000 of the first mortgage interest paid on a principal residence. The maximum credit for any year would be \$250. Saskatchewan supports, Mr. Speaker, the idea of a national tax system. In fact, Saskatchewan has been a strong supporter of maintaining and enhancing the national tax system. We believe that the taxpayer is better served at minimum cost by one income tax system administered by the federal government. It was and is our belief that this mortgage interest tax credit should be administered as part of this national tax collection system. It should come as no surprise to the members of this House that the present federal government does not support the idea of a straight deduction of mortgage interest. For this reason, the federal government has agreed to administer this measure for Saskatchewan only if it is in the form of a special tax credit. In this way the federal-provincial tax system would continue to have one common definition of taxable income. In order to ensure that Ottawa would administer the program, we have designed this proposal so that it is consistent with other provincial credits administered under the tax collection agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan mortgage interest tax credit will become effective for the year 1979 taxation year. Homeowners will be eligible for a credit of up to \$250 based on up to \$1,000 of mortgage interest paid on family homes. As I announced in the budget address, the tax credit will be structured so that the benefits taper off as taxable income rises. However, if the homeowner pays at least \$1,000 in mortgage

interest a year, he will receive a minimum credit of \$100 regardless of his or her taxable income. If a homeowner pays less than \$1,000 of interest in a year, that person may still qualify for a credit of less than \$250.

Mr. Speaker, we estimate that this measure will reduce the 1979 Saskatchewan income tax for over 100,000 taxpayers by a total of \$18 million. Mr. Speaker, we believe this measure is a fair one. More importantly, it is part of our overall balanced approach to help all Saskatchewan families. I'm referring here particularly to our new renter's rebate of up to \$115 per year. Mr. Speaker, this bill introduces one other measure which was promised during the election campaign in our New Decade of Progress for People. I refer here to the capital gains tax rebate.

Our government realizes that in many cases farmers and people who operate small businesses reach retirement age with little or no pension income. Their retirement income must, therefore, come mainly from the proceeds received from selling their farm or their business assets. We believe that these taxpayers should be provided with some relief from the tax on the capital gains incurred on a disposition of their property. The capital gains tax rebate will pertain to the provincial income tax paid on the capital gains arising on the sale of certain residences, farms or small businesses after December 31, 1978. To date, Mr. Speaker, we have been unsuccessful in our attempts to have this rebate administered through the national tax collection system, but we fully intend to continue our discussions with the federal government. Because of the complexity of the mortgage interest tax credit and the capital gains tax rebate, the details of both of these measures will be dealt with by regulation.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is conceivable that there could be a change in the attitude of the federal government after May 22, 1979, concerning the tax treatment of mortgage interest and capital gains. Any decisions taken by the federal government in these areas could directly impact on the provincial income tax system. It is therefore somewhat premature for us to outline the detailed specifications of these two new measures. We hope to be in a position to provide more information over the coming months. Nevertheless, the people of Saskatchewan could be assured that this government stands prepared to act in 1979 on this election commitment we made, and we are asking this House, this legislature, to give us the legislative authority to do so.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me briefly outline the technical amendments which have been proposed. Subsection 1 of section 3 of the bill will adjust the provincial foreign tax credits for individuals to ensure conformity with the foreign tax credit under the federal act, and to ensure that the provincial foreign tax credit is deducted by the taxpayer before the proposed mortgage interest tax credit.

Subsection 2 of section 3 of the bill will redefine the term, 'tax payable under the federal act' to exclude the federal tax reduction which pertains to the 1979 temporary retail sales tax reduction program.

Subsection 3 of section 3 of the bill clarifies the term, 'non-business income tax' for purposes of provincial foreign tax credit.

Section 6 adds payments from the registered retirement income fund to the types of income from which income tax may be withheld at source.

Finally, section 7 of this bill amends this section of The Income Tax Act, which governs

May 2, 1979

proof of service by mail of a request for information. Section 8 redefines the term 'province' for income tax purposes to also include Northwest Territories, effective as of January 1, 1958.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is somewhat technical. I'm sure the members opposite are aware that, except for those changes that have to conform with the federal statute, all of these amendments we are proposing are in conformity with what I had the privilege of announcing during the budget speech address.

The bill has been in the House and distributed for a number of days. I'm sure the members opposite have had a chance to review it. I have a feeling they likely are in support of the changes that are here. But if there are any technical areas perhaps they're best deal with in committee if there is a need for further explanation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that an act to amend The Income Tax Act be now read a second time.

**MR. ANDREW:** — I wish to make perhaps a couple of brief comments and I won't unduly delay the Assembly. I can assure the Minister of Finance that the members of this side will be supporting this bill. In particular we wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance and the Government of Saskatchewan for bringing in legislation first of all advocating the reduction or the elimination of capital gains in the sale of farms and small businesses. At this point in time during the federal election campaign we should check around and see which of the three parties advocates or how many of the three parties advocate a similar type system . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

We advocate that and come May 22 perhaps the legislation relating to the elimination of capital gains tax will have really no further requirements as the federal parliament will, I think, assist the minister in taking care of that given problem. The same applies of course to the mortgage deductibility clause that I think is interesting the national leader of the NDP refers to as a welfare system for the rich. The NDP of Saskatchewan of course bring in legislation that although the Premier indicates is substantially different. It simply advocates that system and leaves the rest to regulations as to how it is going to be implement.

I can make one short comment and then we'll let this matter proceed. That's regarding the capital gains. I suggest to the Minister of Finance perhaps he looks at some of the progressive conservative brochures in the present election campaign. Some of the points that we say are required in this capital gains law to ensure its proper implementation.

(1) That it should only be allowed at one time. In other words a farmer is not allowed to sell — continue to sell throughout the time. He can make one sale and only the person who is a bona fide farmer can take advantage of this. In other words, you have to eliminate the speculator.

I wish to say no more on this bill other than to say that the members of this side of the House congratulate the Minister of Finance for bringing in this legislation.

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 96 — **An**

### **Act to amend The Department of Finance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the rules, in order to proceed with this bill in order to proceed with this bill, we have to get leave. Mr. Speaker, I made a copy of this bill available to the hon. member for Thunder Creek earlier in the day and since the bill has been distributed, I wonder Mr. Speaker, . . . there was some unfortunate delay in getting the bill printed . . . I wonder if I can get leave to proceed with second reading of this bill tonight.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Your rule 5.1 leave has to be given and I gather leave is given. The minister may proceed.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this may be the shortest speech that has been made in this legislature during this session. The bill to amend The Department of Finance Act will accomplish two things. First, one amendment will permit the salary of the Provincial Auditor to be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. This new procedure is in accordance with that which is in effect in other provinces and really responds to the opposition's suggestion that the current method is unsatisfactory.

Secondly this bill will formalize some special tax arrangements. Concerns have been raised in the past about the use of a remission to grant forgiveness in advance of a collection of any tax or royalty. While this concern may be one of semantics only, it seems advisable to make clear that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may authorize an agreement for the remission of or exemption of any tax, royalty, rental or fee that is payable or that may become available. Mr. Speaker, while the current section 78 provides for remissions of taxes, royalties, rentals or fees by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, there has never been specific authorization of agreements with individual firms to exempt them from taxes imposed by statute even though, based on our review, this has been done for many years.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment will permit the government to enter into such agreements with private firms such as transportation or resource industry. I would be again pleased to provide examples during Committee of the Whole if there is any need and Mr. Speaker, I therefore move that Bill 96 — A Bill to amend the Department of Finance Act be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE CULTURE AND YOUTH VOTE 7**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Before we start item 1 I'll ask the minister to introduce his support staff, please.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth):** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm delighted to introduce my support staff. On my left is Ms. Dowdeswell, the deputy minister of Culture and Youth as of July or August of this year. Seated on my right is Bill Clarke, executive director of the Sport and Recreation Branch. Seated in front of me is Louis Jule, the executive director of the Cultural Activities Branch. Behind me is Barbara Zimmer, executive director of the Central Services Branch. Seated at the back are John Storer, acting director of the Heritage Museum Division; Ron Borden is directly behind me and he's director of Youth Employment and Youth Vocational Services. Glen Tuck is sitting at the back. He is director of Recreation and Cultural Facilities Grant

May 2, 1979

Program. Roy Ellis is director of Regional Services Division and Milt Parker is director of the Film Classification Board. Those are the officials in the House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister.

## **ITEM 1**

**MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone):** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I will just make a few brief comments regarding your department before we go into asking further questions on it.

I consider the Department of Culture and Youth a very worthy department. It involves all the people of the province in some way, shape or form.

I would also like to compliment the department for the grants they've made available and for the winter works programs to make recreation centres (especially in the rural part of Saskatchewan) a reality.

I spoke briefly yesterday on a motion I put before the Assembly to urge the removal of the demand meters in the recreation centres. We will be asking questions on that.

Other things we will be asking questions on will be your sports programs throughout the province and some of the emergency funds for the retention of cultural properties. Of course these are large donations.

I'm advised that there is a study being conducted to find out exactly what the people of the province want from the Department of Culture and Youth. I would certainly appreciate a copy of the results of that when it's made available.

I'd like to spend a few moments on heritage as related to Saskatchewan. The importance of our heritage is evident in the fact that we have the highest number of museums per capita of any province in Canada. Approximately 190 museums in a province of our size is something to be proud of. But perhaps what we should be proudest of is the fact that the majority of these museums are locally funded and locally administered. This should indicate to the government the importance placed on heritage by the people of the province. The importance of our heritage is further evident in the number of ethnic organizations in the province. These are the groups that promote and maintain their cultural heritage. These groups should be recognized and encouraged. These are the groups that present the rich mosaic that makes our province strong.

Mr. Minister, quite often, in our quest to modernize and expand, we forget our heritage. I would suggest to you that the province be divided into heritage areas. A board of advisors for each of these areas could be charged with protecting heritage buildings, artifacts, etc. these boards could be appointed from the army of volunteers who now work for cultural protection and cultural preservation of things dear in their areas. I'm sure the minister is aware that people at a local level are far more aware of the importance of the historical related matters to their own areas. I would hope you would take this suggestion under consideration, Mr. Minister. The government could supply the technical advice and guidance but the bulk of the thrust would come from the local level.

Perhaps I could close with those few brief comments. Mr. Minister, I'll let you comment

and we'll go into the question.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I'll wait until I get the specific questions re the demand meters.

Let me say that I do not disagree with much of what the hon. member for Bengough-Milestone (Mr. Pickering) has said. We do have a large number of museums. That is both a resource and I think it's fair to say a bit of a concern in that they impose some strains on the department and the government. You mentioned the study which we were doing — that's true. We have been doing a study of recreation in the province and the province's role and we do not have a copy of the report and I would not anticipate it before midsummer. I'll certainly make it available to the members of the House when it's in final form. It's intended that it will be a public document and certainly I'll try and see that the members of the House get it before the general public do or at least contemporaneous.

I was just wondering if there are any other areas that . . . I share the member's concern in the area of heritage as well. That's been an area of special interest to me, both with respect to preservation of historical artifacts and buildings and we have been working on that. Someone once said that there is no preservation program like a recession to preserve old buildings and artifacts because nobody touches them and there is nothing like an economic boom to destroy heritage buildings and artifacts and that's very true. And we are, Mr. Chairman, in a time of economic expansion and so much of our heritage is threatened. It's been something of a concern to us and we have been struggling with it.

I also share the member's interest in preserving our heritage in the ethnic cultural centre. I thought the Unity report issued by the federal government contained what I thought was an excellent commentary on ethnic cultural heritage. In a sense encouraging people to preserve their cultural and their ethnic culture, it's a little like encouraging people to preserve their individuality and just as a society made up of individuals is stronger than a society made up of faceless people who are all similar in view. So, I think a country made up of a mosaic is a stronger society than a country made up by a melting pot.

I think I've covered most of the points that you raised. I'll sit down and let you ask some specific questions.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Minister, I think it was back in 1972, there was a program brought into being called the Energy Grants program regarding subsidizing energy costs to recreation facilities up to 25 per cent of the total costs and later on, perhaps \$60 per month for an artificial ice centre was 25 per cent at one time but with the increasing costs over the years it's certainly a long way from covering it now. Some of these power bills are up — for one plant operations — to \$600 or \$700 per month. My question is, why weren't these carried out as specified in the program when it was started at 25 per cent, going up with the cost?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I think, Mr. Chairman, there were two reasons why, two quite unconnected reasons, we bailed out of that program. Initially, I think, once having got into it, it occurred to us that it was not a very good program. Rather than subsidizing energy costs which doesn't particularly encourage conservation and all governments, no matter what your view of the energy crisis may be, today have to conserve energy and encourage societies to conserve energy. I think having begun the program, we

realized that it was not perhaps the best way to proceed. Rather than subsidizing energy costs and so, I think, encouraging wastes, what we should have done (I think we realized this sometime later) was to encourage conservation and thus, rather than subsidizing the cost of heating a rink, we should have been encouraging communities to insulate rinks and insulate underneath the ice, and so on and so forth. For that reason, I think, we thought it not a very happy program. It was never, as you pointed out, expanded to meet rising energy costs.

This year, we got into revenue sharing in full swing. We are trying to reduce the number of individual grants the municipalities get. That's part and parcel of the revenue sharing program. This year, we took the opportunity to do away with the program altogether. As I said, it was not a very good . . . I think, we thought of not a happy program once we got into it. This was an excellent opportunity to get out of it. Even if it had of been a good program, it would of made sense to get out of it now that we're into revenue sharing and we are reducing the number of conditional grants. So for both of those reasons, because it was inconsistent for revenue sharing and because it didn't particularly encourage conservation, we got out of the program.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Well, you mentioned insulating under the ice. I don't see where that is going to help save any specific amount of energy. The fact is, especially in the rural (I'm talking almost specifically out in the rural), the people are having trouble keeping up with their power bills. I think if the demand meter was taken out of these facilities, especially in the small towns where they don't have the population to support them . . . either that or you're going to have to put something else in here to subsidize them because there is just no way they can keep up. This has been brought to my attention throughout, not only my constituency, but in many parts of the province. You don't have any program in the foreseeable future that is going to help in this area?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There is no specific program aimed at subsidizing energy costs. One simple answer to your question is no. In a much larger sense, the answer to your question is yes though because it's been rolled into revenue sharing. They have much more money under revenue sharing than they would have otherwise. So in a sense, the answer is yes. It's now part of revenue sharing. That is consistent with the whole revenue sharing program.

I might just comment on the hon. member's statement with respect to the ice. Many rinks now are putting 0 and R 12, R 14 insulation under the ice and it will save up to 30 per cent of your cooling costs for the artificial ice. So it's one of the innovations I've seen only in the last year or two. It's very recent some rinks are doing this. It made a very considerable difference. When the ice comes out in the spring, you'll find underneath the ice, the ground isn't frozen. In some of the older rinks, the ground may be frozen down 15 or 20 feet. They are, of course, paid to do that so it is quite a saving in insulating underneath the ice. But to get back to your main point, the energy costs — I think I can say we are now into the revenue sharing. I don't think we intend to get into again any specific subsidy of energy costs.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Minister, I guess I will have to agree with you that putting insulation there does and would help a lot. I imagine this would probably be the case where they have cement bases, more so than just a gravel or sand base.

Regarding what I call sort of a dismal finish in the Canada Winter Games in the last two trips which Saskatchewan has made, have you set up any program to check throughout the province to see what actually would help to make our finish come at least in the top

three in the future?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I regret that I was absent from the House every time the member asked those questions. Once I was just back . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You were avoiding them!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, I wasn't avoiding them. I just couldn't be in the House at the time the questions were asked. I think it is fair to say we don't view that as our mandate. We don't view light sport as our mandate and I say that not in any sense being disparaging to what is known as the light sport — the training of athletes for national or international, or even regional competitions. It is really not our role. That is the role of the sport governing bodies, provincially and nationally. In a sense I think it is fair to say that the federal government views that as their role — the preparation and training of athletes for light sport.

Our mandate has always been to maximize participation, not to maximize excellence in competitions.

Just to deal very briefly with the winter games, I don't think the winter games were any great tragedy. The competitions are not weighted according to population. Thus, there is no way that Saskatchewan, or Prince Edward Island can compete with Quebec and Ontario. We just don't have the population. They have eight or nine times our population. We have the sixth largest population in Canada and we came sixth. Now we felt we should have stood a little better, and I think it is fair to say that we are expected we would. We all expected we might stand fourth, or fifth, rather. We didn't, but we ranked according to our population; we are the sixth largest province and we stood sixth. That's no great tragedy. There's no reason to be overly proud of our showing, but there is no reason to be particularly ashamed of it either.

The answer to your question is, no, that's really not our mandate and we have resisted getting into that. Our role is to maximize participation in sport and amateur sport and to maximize opportunity, not to develop excellence in the sport. So the answer to your question is no and I don't think we intend to get into that. That really is someone else's responsibility.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Minister, have you given any consideration (I think this would be a good idea and you can give me your comments on it) to hosting an athletic conference which would be attended by coaches, trainers and athletes themselves and would include other coaches and such from other parts of Canada, so we could go over their programs and compare them to ours?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No we haven't. I'm informed there is nothing really wrong with the idea as such, except that each individual sport governing body brings in its own experts and officials. I think that's probably the way we would leave it. We would leave it the responsibility of the sport governing body to bring in the sort of help they need. They probably know best.

I think it's fair to say, and this is a strange comment for someone on this side to make to someone from that side, but there are limits to what the government can and should be doing in many aspects of life today, and one of them is in sports. There are real limits to the sorts of things we should be taking responsibility for. I think it's fair to say that we don't see ourselves as being responsible, in a direct way, for whatever place we manage

to finish up in the winter games; that's really someone else's responsibility.

**MR. PICKERING:** — I believe another area we as a government must look at is the training facilities we have because our climate is not conducive to year-round training. Perhaps we as legislators could help alleviate this situation through grants or scholarships. Do you think this would maybe help our place of finish in the winter games?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Undoubtedly, Mr. Chairman, it would. Undoubtedly, facilities are a key element in the training of athletes and in the participation. I think it's fair to say that a fair amount has been done in recent times in Saskatchewan. Perhaps it may not have had time yet to show up in where we finish.

I refer the member to such spectacular training facilities as the field house in Saskatoon, or for that matter the Lawson Pool in Regina, both products of regional games, of interprovincial games.

But I think, more important, I'd refer the member to the Recreation and Cultural Facilities Grant program, which has resulted in a vast regeneration of our recreation facilities throughout the province, and it has meant that many areas have exchanged bad or non-existent facilities for some very good facilities.

So I think a fair amount has been done and we've poured a fair amount of treasure into the area of facilities. It may not have had time to show up yet but I'm convinced it will, given a few years.

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Minister, I was wondering, are there any grants your department had in the previous year, which you have cut out? Do you have all the same grants or have you deleted any from your program?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, there are a number and I'll give them to you. One of the grants we cut out was the local histories grant. In a sense, we cut out the program because it was too small to be of any effect and the problem had gotten to be immense. The number of communities and individuals that are writing their community's or their local history is just staggering. We had previously grants of \$16,000 which was simply being spread too thinly to be of any use. We still provide consultative services and I think that's what is important. But we no longer have the \$16,000 for providing local histories grants.

We eliminated the community cultural project grant. I think it's fair to say we want to evaluate that program and determine its effectiveness. There is some question as to whether or not that program was really meeting and encouraging community cultural activities. I guess that's what I'm saying. If you want to do something new, you've got to cut out something old and this is one that we are re-evaluating.

We've had some lengthy discussions on the energy assistance grant. The fourth one that we cut out was the \$21,000 grants going to regional sport competition grants. This is for the regional games. This was cut out again because I think we thought it unnecessary. The regional games are well established and they're off and running. We cut it out simply because we didn't think it was needed. They can fund themselves and many of them make money. Many of those regional games wind up with money in the pot. We cut out this grant and I've received no flack from anyone about it and I think I

won't simply because I think it was probably a grant which has outlived its usefulness.

Also, I'm reminded (it isn't here directly in front of me because it wasn't part of our blue book last year) that last year we had what was called SWIG (Students Working in Government) program. Hon. members who were here last year will recall that we spent three-quarters of our time, Mr. Chairman, talking about the SWIG program. We were subjected to a great deal of criticism from the opposition and a spirited defence from yours truly. However, as the end result, the program was cut out. The SWIG program was a program which employed students in government. The criticisms made by the opposition were that it was a very expensive program. It didn't, as did the YES (Youth Employment Services) program, subsidize employment by municipalities and others. This was a program whereby we employed people directly in government. It was quite expensive. I think the cost was \$3,000 or \$4,000 per student versus \$600 or \$700 per person for the YES program. So, that was chopped as well and I think, to nobody's consternation. Those are the grants that were cut.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Minister, that's five programs or grants that have been dropped. There are a couple or three of these that perplex me a bit. I don't think all of the blame should fall on your shoulders but one of the other ministers is in charge of Celebrate Saskatchewan which is coming up next year. As I understand Celebrate Saskatchewan we are to be looking back at our heritage. We are to be celebrating our present good fortune and good lives in Saskatchewan. We are supposed to be looking forward with vision. Now, it seems rather strange to me, if these are the criteria to celebrate Saskatchewan in 1980, that the Department of Youth and Culture would drop a local history grant regardless of whether it was a pittance grant or what it was. This just doesn't seem to make sense to me — that one branch of your government is saying look back at your heritage, be proud of where you came from. The other branch is saying, I'm sorry communities, we won't give you a grant to help you do this. That's what you're telling me.

The other thing I heard you say a few minutes ago, Mr. Minister, was something to the extent that you're proud of the cultural mosaic that makes up the province of Saskatchewan. I must say that no one is prouder of that cultural mosaic than I am. But, again, I must wonder why, if you are proud of the cultural mosaic and you're encouraging this, you are cutting out the community cultural program's grant. Are these idle words you're telling me, Mr. Minister? Why are you cutting back on programs when other areas of the government are trying to develop these programs. I'd like a little explanation on this. I'm sure you will be attempting to give me one.

I think I can bring your attention to the winter games, the regional winter games that we both attended at Whitewood. They were very successful. I haven't look into the financial aspects of the Whitewood situation. I would like to find out what their final analysis was. Maybe you know this. If they ended up with a profit, I think fine and dandy. If your statement that regional games are carrying themselves is correct, then I would agree with you. I think these were a very good thing. We're looking in our region to have very interesting ones in our celebrate Saskatchewan year again. If assistance is necessary for these things I think we should be looking at that.

I won't say too much about the energy assistance grant at this time because my colleague from Bengough-Milestone has discussed this. I do think he has said very well the plight. I'm sure many of the members on your side realize the plight that many small communities are in in operating their skating and curling facilities and when you get into artificial ice and so on.

I'll let you answer those ones regarding the local history and community culture.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Again, I say to the hon. members that we provide writing and research workshops through our community college system. We still provide the consultative services. What we don't provide is the money. I might just say it again for the benefit of the member who was interrupted. We provide writing and research workshops through community colleges. We still provide the consultative services. We don't provide the money. I think that is consistent with the theme of Celebrate Saskatchewan. If I may say so, the theme of Celebrate Saskatchewan has been that we are not spending a lot of money on a lot of programs. The aim of Celebrate Saskatchewan is encouraging people to do something for themselves.

Our review of celebrations elsewhere in Canada and in the U.S. in a bi-centennial celebration where every state had their own program showed it wasn't what the state government or the national government did that people remember afterwards and made an impression on their lives. What made an impression on their lives is what they did for themselves. So throughout Celebrate Saskatchewan, that program seeks to encourage people to do something for themselves and not to have governments do something for them. Thus, Celebrate Saskatchewan, in costs and dollars, is spending less than we spent in 1955 on the Golden Jubilee. That's a fact. It's just a low budget program.

It's our view of how a successful celebration ought to run — by being a low budget program. So I think that's my comment with respect to the local history grant. We'll give them the assistance they need in setting it up, organizing their writing, and so on and so forth. But the money they have got to find themselves. As I say, our general overall impression of these programs has been, it's those things which they do for themselves which are so meaningful.

I just attended an unveiling of a local history. I'm not sure whose riding it is and I forget the name of the community. It was about 30 or 40 miles west of Estevan. I just forget the name of the community. We didn't give them a nickel for it. They had the most beautiful history I have ever seen. It's in the Estevan constituency, as a matter of interest. They unveiled the most beautiful history I have ever seen. They had 300 people out in the community of, I'd say, 300 people. It packed the hall and they were so proud of this. But they weren't proud because the thing looked good. It did. But I don't think many people there had seen a lot of other books. They were proud because they had done it themselves. They had sold 2,000 books and they had got out and they had got all the histories in. They had done it themselves and that is why those people were so proud of their accomplishment because they had done it themselves. I think that is the way many of these local community projects ought to be. They ought to do it themselves and they would be a lot prouder of it.

Community cultural projects — I said to the hon. member that we are not sure of the effectiveness of what we're doing. It is not that we are any less enthusiastic in pursuing the goal of culture at a community level and the community developing its own cultural activities. It's just that I think we were not convinced that what we were doing was effective. My discussion with recreation boards and with our field staff convinced me there was need to be concerned because this was often the program that seemed to be hardest to sell and hardest to get people going on. We're reviewing it during this year. I would hope another year we can come back with a program in the area which is perhaps more effective than the one we had. So that's really my comment on the

community cultural program. We're cutting it for this year but it is being reviewed and I hope we're back another year with a program which is more effective than that one.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Thank you for your words. I agree with your concept of encouraging people to take initiative at the local level. I still must say though that I think some of your grant programs do help them a bit in this regard and I wonder that cutting them off may stifle this, but if you're reviewing your program, we'll take a year and look at this and see what you can come up with.

Saskatchewan Sport Trust Fund — does this fall under your jurisdiction? It's my understanding that really, this is geared to fund organizations at the provincial level. I kind of question this because just going with what you've said and saying also that I agree with this, that really, where it is done is at the local level. Maybe sometimes when you get up to the provincial level other factors come into effect there and this money is actually coming from almost every community in Saskatchewan. Having myself just been working for a boy scout group in our area where at the provincial level they could get help, but the need was at the local level, I wonder if you shouldn't be taking a look at this thing and maybe putting it under study and having some of the funds available at the local level where I think a great deal of your need probably is.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to keep the House waiting. The community organizations do make a good deal of money out of the lotteries. We're now talking about lottery dollars for the benefit of anyone who wasn't aware of that. The system we have in Saskatchewan is, if I may say so, a model for all of Canada. We have a system which probably works better than any other system in Canada.

Indeed I was interested that the Manitoba government commissioned a study to review their lotteries and they had a mess. With all deference to the government which set it up (and it wasn't the present government), it was a mess. They commissioned a study; the study went on for a year or so and what they recommended was surprisingly like Saskatchewan's system. In a sense, we have licensed this group to handle this, SaskSport to handle the lotteries. What they do is they allow the community groups to sell the tickets and there's almost as much money in the tickets as there is in the trust fund. Some community groups have done extremely well in selling tickets. There are 250 distributors and then there are as many retailers as the distributors want to set up. The sale of tickets netted the distributors \$1.5 million. The sale of tickets netted the retailers an additional \$1.5 million, for a total of \$3 million. The trust fund only paid out \$1.7 million.

So you can see that those groups did very well off the sale of those tickets. So the community groups made their money off the sale of the tickets. The trust fund, it is true by and large, provides money only to provincial organizations. That's wholly true in the area of sport. In sport they deal entirely with the sport governing bodies and that's the way the sport's people I think want it. There is no quarrel even by local sport's people that that's the way it should be handled. That's by and large true in the cultural area although not entirely. There are some exceptions to that. I can think for one of the . . . (inaudible). . . , the Globe Theatre, for instance, as I recall it gets a grant and that's not a provincial organization but it's a professional art performing body.

But, by and large, I think that's the answer to the member. The communities make their money off the sale of tickets and they do very well. Unlike other provinces, we do not

allow professional sellers. I think we are the only province except perhaps British Columbia which has a system like that. We are the only group which limits the sale of tickets to the community groups. In some provinces they deal almost entirely with professional sellers. That's part of the genius of our system is that we don't sell the tickets and neither does anyone else for their own province. The trust fund is given out to the province-wide organizations, that's true. I think the main reason for that is simply that it's the only system we can manage. If you try giving out money to all the groups, you get an unmanageable level of demands and you just cannot meet the demands of people who want lottery money because they think it's free money. It's not raised by taxes so, therefore, it can be used for any purpose no matter how frivolous and you just are met with an endless number of demands. To try and set up a system which is manageable, and many systems are not manageable, we have limited by and large our right to professional organizations. But it's true the groups make a lot of money out of these tickets as well.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I noticed, and I may have missed it in your estimates, I don't see anything concerning SaskSport trust fund. Is it possible that we can get this information as to what pay outs were given to what groups, Mr. Minister? You told me there was \$1.7 million went out of the trust fund, you know; can we get the information of where that went to and how much?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The SaskSport is required each year to file an annual report and that's a public document. We'll certainly — we may not table a copy because I don't know if we've got one with us — but we'll certainly send the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley a copy and anyone else who wants one. That's a public document.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Thank you, I look forward to receiving that.

Your grant formulas for your director grant program and your community recreation support program — have these changed? The amount of grant (you know we're living in inflationary times), are you upping these grants each year? For example, a director. What may have been a grant three years ago that could have taken care of 50 per cent of his salary, I would guess probably at this time might be only 30 per cent. Have you been keeping these grants up with the inflationary increase?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — We have maintained a system which pays a fixed percentage of the community recreation director's salary. So, in a sense, that is indexed to inflation. As the director's salary goes up, so does this to a maximum of \$300 per month. So I suppose in a sense if they've got a full time director on, they run into that ceiling long before they pay his full salary. We do in addition pay a community recreation support grant. This has not been changed in dollar amounts. I think the reason for that is that the number of recreation boards has been increasing and while we've been putting more money into the pot, we've had to spread it over more recreation boards. I think the defence I would offer of this again is that this is a department which seeks to maximize opportunity. We're not, in a sense, providing these services directly. We're attempting to set up a system which encourages communities to get into the area of recreation by setting up a board and hiring a director and so forth. If it's evident that that is going on throughout the province, as it is because the number of boards and directors has increased fairly dramatically, then I think perhaps there is no need for us to pay a fixed percentage so long as the ball is rolling and the communities are doing this. There's perhaps no need for us to pay a fixed percentage of the cost of recreation.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — A question pertaining to this, the fixed ceiling of \$300, of course, is

just what I was pointing out. What \$300 was three years ago to a recreational director salary is a different piece of cake than what it is this year. You say the number of recreational directors is increasing. I would be interested to know what that increase was in the last year if you have that figure handy for me?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I've been informed that during the last year, five more communities have hired recreation directors.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I have another series of questions (you don't have to supply me with the information right now if you don't have it at your fingertips, I rest assured you will give it to me) concerning the Centre of the Arts in Regina. The area in which I am interested is the pictures that are in the rotunda, the art.

These are the questions: How often are these pictures changed? Are you taking this opportunity to get the art from many of our artists throughout Saskatchewan and are you giving them a public showing there? Do you purchase them? If you do purchase them, I'd like to know who selects them. Is it your department or do you have a committee set up? If you have bought them, I would like to know what your average price is, maybe the high and low, if you have been buying them. Those are some of the questions I have. I would like to know about the pictures in the Centre of the Arts. Added to this (the Centre of the Arts is the one I frequent) do you have other areas and buildings through Saskatchewan like the Centennial Auditorium that you are purchasing or getting pictures for?

The other question while we are talking about pictures — I know that you have travelling displays that go out through the province. I congratulate you on this. I would like to know how the pictures are selected, how the artists are selected because in all fairness, some of the ones I have seen I question how they got there. I would just like you to supply a bit of information on that.

Some of my colleagues have other questions and I will just point out that I was looking back at your report of 1977-78. I won't go through all the subvotes but I do notice that in many of these there has been a substantial reduction. For example, take sport and recreation, subvote 5 which now is \$500,000 and in 1978 it was \$1 million. The cultural and multicultural support that we have talked about earlier which is \$472,000 in 1979-80 was over \$1 million in 1977-78. I see some drastic cuts in some of your subvotes. Would you respond to those questions?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It might have been better had you asked the questions one at a time, because I am not sure I remember them all. Let me deal with one or two of the ones I do remember and you might have to ask some of them again.

I think we would like to answer you in writing on the pictures in the Centre of the Arts. I can respond in a general way now by saying that some time ago, I think when the Centre of the Arts was set up in Regina, they canvassed the citizens for donations and so a fund developed call the citizens' furnishings fund, as I remember the name of the fund. That fund is used to buy those pictures.

I can get the information you want and give it to you in writing about how they're changed and how much they cost. I don't know that, and never inquired about it because it wasn't coming from public revenue. But I am quite certain the Centre of the Arts would be happy to supply that information to you. I'll ask them about that.

The pictures that you see going around the province I think you are referring to the talent program, the visual talent program. That program operates on a biannual basis. Every second year we have that program. I think that's how the program operates. I'm not sure at this point in time what questions you asked about that, other than what it was. That's the program, the visual arts program. You asked about a number of grants as well.

This year there was a modest rearrangements of the blue book. We have some chuckling around here; it may have been more than modest. Grants were pulled out of the individual votes and put in subvote 17. That's why some may appear to have gone down. We pulled the grants out of other areas and put them in subvote 17.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Those travelling pictures, they're not purchased or anything? They enter that, do they and they're judged? These travelling art shows, this talent program, that's by competition is it? Those aren't purchased pictures, those are just entered in a competition?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, it's a jury of judges at the regional level that decides what goes out.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — One other small question for one of my colleagues. Is there some assistance that communities can get if they want to upgrade their sports grounds, their recreational grounds? Is there something? Could you name the program?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, there is through the recreational cultural facilities program; that's the program by which they upgrade recreational facilities.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Minister, I would like to get back to the topic of the regional winter games. I understand you cut out the \$1,200 grants to hold a winter game. What happens in the case of bad weather? I know in the Maple Creek area we used to hold a winter carnival but in our area snow comes and goes so fast that we finally had to drop it. Is there a mechanism left if say a winter game is wiped out because of bad weather that they can apply for some grant? This \$1,200 is actually a cushion. You stated earlier that they seem to be carrying themselves. I think you would agree the reason they do carry themselves is because of the army of volunteers that run the things.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There is no such program, any emergency assurance fund, I guess one might call it. I'm informed that it hasn't been a very prevalent problem. Last year it obviously wouldn't be prevalent because of the severity of the winter. Last year all but one of the regional games made money.

I think I can assure the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that if we had a real disaster in some area we would look at it and find a system. It hasn't been a, frankly, widespread problem. We don't have a program set up specifically to deal with it.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — With reference to the community recreation support grants which cover towns of 2,000 or less, \$500 is the only grant as I understand it which goes directly to the community and it works out to a lot less than what it was five years ago. You haven't kept pace with inflation with a lot of your grants. Is there any reason why, other than cutbacks?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, I answered the question a moment ago, but I will repeat it for the benefit of the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan).

We have increased the total amount being spent on the program but the number of recreation boards has increased and thus they have a constant amount. I think my answer to it was that this is a program which is rolling along pretty well and the communities are able to do something on their own, as they appear to be, because the number of recreation boards now is very extensive — it's well over 700. I recall some time ago being available at the time of the setting up of the 700th board, and that was almost a year ago. The program is going on. I think as long as the communities are able to handle the programs we don't see any particular responsibility to pay for it. I think that's the best answer I can give you. The program is working on its own and they probably don't really need us.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — I would like to get into another area now, Mr. Minister, with reference to private collections concerning heritage or historical artifacts. Is there any legislation or is there any thought of introducing legislation which will protect these Saskatchewan artifacts from being transferred out of the country?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, it is under consideration. The answer to your question is no and yes. No, there is no such program at the moment; yes, it is under consideration. We don't quite have the matter finalized to the point where I could give you a great deal of detail because we are not sure ourselves what we are doing. But we are aware of the problem and we have a number of alternatives, I think it is fair to say, a number of alternative mechanisms which might deal with the problem which I admit exists. We are losing part of our heritage by attrition.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Minister, I was told from the time I was a child never to accept any wooden nickels. But I notice you have acquired a collection, known as the Tannahill collection, of trade tokens, which consists of wooden money. My question is, who did the appraisal of this collection and what comparables were used?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The Tannahill collection was acquired about five years ago. I am informed that the appraisal was done within the department.

**MR. PICKERING:** — By whom?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The individual at that time, I am informed, was an individual by the name of Donald Graham.

**MR. PICKERING:** — What are his qualifications?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That's right, one of the best. I'm informed he had extensive experience in evaluation. His formal qualification was a master's degree in history. He's been gone for some time, so it's not an easy question to answer.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Well, did he also appraise Mary Week's manuscripts of historical writing which were purchased for \$5,000?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm informed that that was done on the recommendation of the provincial archives.

May 2, 1979

**MR. PICKERING:** — Just one further question regarding these. The Fred Light collection of firearms and native artifacts for the purchase of \$45,265 — who did this appraisal, the same person?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The appraisal for that was done by the Canadian Conservation Institute.

**MR. LANE:** — You're talking tokens like some of your . . .

**MR. PICKERING:** — Just a minute now. Where is this Fred Light collection displayed?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — At Battleford.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Is there a specific reason why it is in Battleford?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm informed it's thought to be the best place to store it. It's the only real place we have to store that collection at the moment.

**MR. PICKERING:** — I'm advised here that he sold his collection of historical artifacts to the Saskatchewan government on the condition that they remain in his home town. Is that not true?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm informed that that was a request made by Mr. Light. That was not a binding condition. It was not a binding condition that it remain in his own home town.

**MR. PICKERING:** — I'd just like to move into the visual arts donations, Mr. Minister. In the 1973-74 annual report it states that 23 works of art were accepted, and during 1974-75, in the annual report, there were 59 works of art accepted. Fifty-eight of these were in the Western Development Museum and one in the MacKenzie Art Gallery.

In the 1976-77 annual report, it says that a total of 83 works of art had been accepted up to date. I suggest that if you add 59 and 23, it only comes to 82, I'm wondering where the other work of art is; is it hanging out to dry or . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Tell him about our collection of 17 fossils in here.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There was a case of the missing work. I think I'll have to supply that information in writing. I don't seem to have that information at my fingertips as to where that one went. I'll answer you in writing.

**MR. LANE:** — The government seems to have been embarking on an interesting acquisition policy of art and has had a major increase. I take a look at a brochure put out by the government of the Moose Jaw Art Museum recent acquisitions with a glowing foreward by Gordon T. Snyder, MLA, Moose Jaw South constituency, Minister of Labour. He accepts 58 paintings generously donated to the people of Saskatchewan by Dr. V. Gomes, Dr. M. Little of Weyburn, 'which will greatly enhance the cultural atmosphere of the community. The Government of Saskatchewan is deeply indebted to these two gentlemen for making such an art collection available to the people of the province'.

Now, my question is, did the department take any paintings that came up in the so-called art dealer's trial and if so how many were they donated and if so further, who did the appraisals of the ones that the department acquired?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The matter of what they claim as an income tax deduction, which was the subject of the trial, is not a provincial responsibility. We have a committee which reviews donations to the Crown for artistic merit and that is an outside committee and that was done and we accepted them on that basis. If they claim more than those pictures are worth on their income tax, that's not with all due respect a provincial concern. That's a matter between them and the income tax department and that's precisely what it became — it became an affair between them and the income tax department.

**MR. LANE:** — Of course, that wasn't my question. My question is, what was the valuation that you placed upon them? The pictures that you acquired, the paintings that you acquired — who did the valuations?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I have to say to the member that we don't do that. We evaluate them for their artistic merit and if they're garbage we don't want them, if they're good pictures, we do. But we do not place a value on them. We do not say that x picture is worth \$10,000 and that's what you ought to claim on your income tax form or that's your donation. We do not place a valuation on pictures we receive. That's not part of our concern. The monetary value which may be assumed at the time we receive them is really not part of the concern when we receive them. We evaluate them only as to artistic merit.

**MR. LANE:** — I have a copy of a letter — and first of all let me tell you that that is not fully accurate because the department has in fact discussed with at least one alleged expert at the University of Regina the valuation of the paintings acquired and I think if you check with your officials you'll find that to be correct — I have a copy of a letter from a Dickson H. Bailey, special assistant to the Premier to a Mr. Joseph Olah, who may be known to some of you. Mr. Dickson Bailey may be known to some of you cabinet ministers as well due to some degree of prominence in your party opposite . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know. Take that up in Saskatoon. That's where the press stories were.

In dealing with these offers the Department of Culture and Youth — I'm quoting about paintings offered to the department — dealing with these offers the Department of Culture and Youth has been placed in a bind. They have just now been able to determine the details on the pictures in question and are looking for a person who is competent in dealing with works of minor European painters. In their effort to find a person with this expertise who was also willing to take the responsibility of assessing the works on behalf of the province, the Department of Culture and Youth has been forced to go outside the province.

Somebody must be doing the assessing for you. Who did the assessing?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I say to the hon. member with all due respect that you are not listening to what I am saying. What I said is that we assess them but as to artistic merit; that's what Mr. Bailey was referring to. As a matter of interest, he's not employed in the Department of Culture and Youth. He's not on my personal staff. He's on the Premier's staff. An appropriate place, I think, for the question, would have been the Premier's estimates. Let me say that there is nothing wrong with his letter. We do not assess paintings. You are right; we do not assess paintings on the basis of monetary value which should be claimed by them as an income tax deduction. We assess them as to artistic merit and that's all. That's what Mr. Bailey was saying in this letter, I think.

**MR. LANE:** — Let me ask you. Who did your assessment of the artistic merit of the paintings that you acquired from those officials involved in the so-called art dealer's trial? How many paintings involved were acquired by the government?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm informed there was some sort of understanding with those historians. They are art historians. I'm informed there was some sort of understanding that the names would not be revealed if they agreed to do the assessments. I will say this to the hon. member, that providing they have no objections, I'll be prepared to give you their names. I would want to check with them first. I gather there was some sort of understanding that their names would not be made public. I'm not quite clear as to why that undertaking was given or why it was asked, but I'm informed that someone here believes we may have to check with them before we give you their names.

**MR. LANE:** — I would certainly like to know: (1) what the so-called understanding was; whether it was in writing? If anybody is sitting out there afraid to give an assessment on the paintings that the government has acquired for their so-called artistic merit, it is certainly a questionable practice. I mean if you're going to hold these out as, what are the words, 'greatly enhanced the cultural aspect of the community', says that famous art appreciator, the Minister of Labour. Surely the people that you are relying upon are quite prepared to stand up and be counted too. I'm assuming they got paid; there's certainly some benefit accruing to them. I would like to know as well, the lists of the paintings that these historical experts, or whatever they are — and I still haven't seen any tie to the artistic merit in your answer — but I would like to know the lists of the paintings, when they were acquired by the government, where they are located, by whom were they donated and the rating by the experts that you have hired. In other words, what did they say in the particular painting that made it of some value or some significant interest?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I can give the hon. member all of that, all that he just asked.

**MR. LANE:** — Would you also, as well, let us know the qualifications of the experts and then I would like to know as well the origins of the paintings.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, I'm informed there's no problem with that either.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Great.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, I would just like to ask you about a discrepancy in your report. On page 16 or your report you indicate that the grant of \$331,650 is provided to offset some of the operating expenses in the Western Development Museum board, but on page 25 at the bottom of your report you indicate a grant of \$406,650. Why the difference?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There was a special warrant in mid-year of \$150,000 intended to cover I think some capital expenses and some operating expenses. I think all hon. members will be aware that there was a restructuring of the board last year, hiring of a new director and they began to put the house in order. By and large I think they have, but they discovered mid-way through that they were simply short of money and so a special warrant was given. That's why the discrepancy.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, you mention \$150,000 as a special warrant but that difference is \$65,000 or \$75,000. There's a difference in the two . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I would like to stand Culture and Youth and move to Provincial Secretary.

**PROVINCIAL SECRETARY  
VOTE 30**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. Is the committee ready to proceed? The Provincial Secretary, page 82, vote 30 — will the minister introduce his support staff please?

**HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — I have with me Mr. Leo Beaudry, the deputy provincial secretary.

**ITEM 1**

**MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks I have put together here.

I think the time has come when the estimates before this House, mainly the Department of the Provincial Secretary, should be scrutinized very thoroughly. Over the years, Mr. Speaker, research has indicated to me that when this department comes up in estimates for scrutiny it is passed over so quickly, thus indicating it is of very little importance.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that this department has been used over the years, for many years, as the bucket shop for many of the NDP activities. The older members will know what I am talking about. Some of you backbenchers will not know; just ask the older members and you will know what I am talking about.

We will get through if you let me go, otherwise we won't get through in three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that this department has been used over the many years as the bucket shop for many of the NDP activities, be it the hiring of high-priced political hacks or what has been unveiled of late, the covering up of corporations owned by the CCF-NDP parties.

I would remind this Assembly that this is the department where first the present Premier was placed when he was brought to this province from his native Nova Scotia.

The records of this department, when it was involved with the securities commission, perused some great public corporations, such as commercial cemeteries, commonwealth trust, etc., which fleeced the public, in other words, gave them a licence to steal.

In 1957, with the stroke of the pen, it allowed so-called club insurance assets to be turned over to a Saskatchewan family to form what later became known as Family Life Insurance Company, which after building on its original windfall, became a federally chartered life insurance company and, of course, now is located in the free enterprise province of Alberta, leaving the town of St. Victor a ghost town.

I am sure the Premier, if he were here, could explain to me all about the commercial cemetery fiasco. As the records in the securities commission may indicate he was part of that body when these companies were authorized to operate fleecing many people in

May 2, 1979

the North Battleford, Moose Jaw, Moosomin and Weyburn areas. Now to get directly to the estimates for the department of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be naming some names of people that I call hacks. But I want it known now that I have no personalities involved here; more power to them. I am only bringing the department . . . no personalities, no people, just the department. I want that understood. I want it on the record. Go back about 8 years when the Liberals were in power and compare '71-'72 with today's operations. The total budget in '71-'72 was \$165,591; the details of the amount paid of which there is no itemized accounting comes to \$256,395.08 for the fiscal year '77-'78. Of course, Mr. Chairman, those members opposite will say you can't compare those years with '76-'77 or '77-'78 because a protocol office has been added to the department.

In addition to administration there's another healthy cost item called executive administration. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this is a real dandy, efficient operation. I think the public when given the details of the unitemized part of the expenditures plus the explanation we can attain otherwise if we are lucky, may come to the conclusion that perhaps a lot of these high priced political hacks who have found a home at one time or another in the provincial secretary's department we can and should do without.

In the last couple of years we have noted in the public accounts, the following: Mr. John Burton, defeated NDP MP at \$28,000 a year plus. Mr. Garry Beatty at \$22,000 plus. Brian Coulter at \$21,000 plus, Russel Eaton at \$17,000 plus, John Kinzel at \$34,000 plus. Then there's an unbiased civil servant, Gerald Wilson at \$25,000 plus; I know we mustn't forget about Philip Flory at the lowly \$20,000. I understand Philip comes from up near the area of the one-time provincial secretary, now the minister of health, the hon. honest Ed. But I would add that chaps like Philip being appointed is probably O.K. I feel he gives a good, honest day's work for an honest day's pay and is not too politically arrogant.

I must add, Mr. Chairman, when I was searching the registers of companies for some information he was the gentleman who was there working hard at 8:15 in the morning and doing his job and I commend him. I checked out a lot of the rest of them and they're not doing what that man is doing.

Mr. Chairman, you know, the public accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978 shows some significant changes which I am sure will be fully explained by the hon. members opposite. It shows, for instance, that the two good old faithful Johns, John Burton and John Kinzel, are no longer in the Provincial Secretary's expenditures. But I searched and I searched and I found them in a new book put out this year called, Supplementary Information. By the way, Supplementary Information is in small print on the front of the publication and it should be because the information given is not too much. The government opposite has made sure that where the employees and their salaries are shown there's no indication as to positions held or, more important, by what department they are employed. I'm not saying they're not there someplace but they sure didn't make it easy for me to find and I couldn't find it and I sure hope someone can show me where.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Jack Kinzel, \$34,000!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — If the member for Thunder Creek would just wait until I tell him what his salary is now he'll be much more in an uproar. Now, Mr. Chairman, I did find the two Johns in Supplementary Information. John Burton has moved up to \$37,089.79 for

the year ending March 31, 1978. And poor old John Kinzel has moved up to what he was worrying about here to \$41,844.62 for the period ending March 31, 1978. I couldn't find what he was doing. Perhaps this new job that he has received with the Premier, maybe that's justification for the wages he was getting, maybe that's it, or maybe he's jumped another \$10,000.

And it would appear the devil's advocate, Gerald Wilson, has been taken off strength. He's probably moved to greener pastures in oil-rich Conservative Alberta.

Brian Coulter is still with us at \$14,000. This is a good one; now listen to this very carefully. Brian Coulter is still with us at \$14,901.20 down from the March 31, 1977 figures of \$21,247.63. Now, I've never heard of anybody going down. I sure want an explanation to know why. But, Mr. Chairman, maybe I've got the answer right here. Perhaps the answer is shown in the electioneering costs and March 31, 1979 will again see Brian back up due to the election in 1978. I'm sure someone opposite will explain Brian's cut in salary.

We do have with us in the Department of the Provincial Secretary, a Mr. Leo Beaudry. Now there's a fine gentleman. I was in to see him the other day. He was very co-operative. He took me into his office — just beautiful leads. He was explaining to me how the companies act works. We turned to so many subsections (a) and subsections (b) and subsections (d), I'm sure he didn't even know himself where we were at. I sure didn't. But he didn't prove anything to me.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Jack Kinzel, \$41,000! Ye gods!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — You know, this is a very interesting situation. I just got ahead of myself here. I just forgot one line here. We do have with us in the Department of the Province Secretary, this Mr. Leo Beaudry. You know this is very interesting. The deputy was one of the late Mr. Burton Senior's right hand constituency men when he became Provincial Secretary back in the '50s. It's nice to see he repaid the compliment by having John Burton, son of the late Mr. Burton, in the employ of the Department of the Provincial Secretary. It's a very cosy situation.

Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Secretary's department has always been, with one exception (regardless of what political party was in power), kind to their staff. That exception took place on January 1972 when a little John was given 40 minutes to get so-and-so out of his office. You know, Mr. Chairman, in the letter handed to little John, no reason was given for his dismissal when advising him his services as of 12 noon were no longer required. This got a laugh out of the Provincial Secretary. The only reason which was ever given was noted in a statement to the press and I looked this up too, given by now the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) who was on January 14, the Provincial Secretary. What's said? Little John was politically biased. Mr. Chairman, the salary little John was getting in those days as per the public accounts was around \$9,000 a year. Under the present system little John's salary wouldn't even appear. You don't show anything \$10,000 and under. Oh yes, I should have mentioned that hatchet man who operated out of the Attorney General's office in 1971-72 is still around. Yes. Francis Frank Bogdasavich. I guess you pronounce his name, and he's receiving \$43,000 as of March 31, 1978 but as of March 31, 1972 his home take was only \$6,000 a year. That's quite an increase, even in six years.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure many on the other side of this House aren't at all interested in what I have had to say, but as all facts were taken from your own records, the object of

May 2, 1979

the speech has been hopefully to point out to this House, and especially those in the media who inform the public, that our hon. members opposite are not all nice guys, do-gooders, defenders of the defenceless, etc. as they would have the public believe.

Just recently when I searched the company files in the companies branch of this department, I found that the CCF Publishing and Printing Company Limited was not up-to-date for at least five years.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Was that Service Printing Company?

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Definitely. I suggest to you for many more years this company has not been compelled to follow The Companies Act of the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. THATCHER:** — We want the truth this time, Elwood. Confess!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — When I was searching these departments, Mr. Chairman, I came across some letters. I went straight right through Service Printers. It took me two and a half hours. I was back another day and spent an hour. I was back another day and spent another hour. So I got a pretty good search on these records.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Did you go straight through?

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Yes, I did. Well that's what should be done with this whole CCF Publishing and Printing Company — give them exlax and get rid of them.

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

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — I'm going to read a very interesting little letter here of September 9, 1977. We're talking about breaking The Companies Act. This is the provincial secretary's department. I ask him to take care of this.

We note that your company has not filed a balance sheet. Since your company is a public one, The Companies Act requires that you file a balance sheet with your annual return on or before March 1 of each year. Please forward a copy of your balance sheet by return mail.

This was September 9, 1977. It was supposed to have been filed with that annual return in March. There were never any more notices at all. I did find out that they did file the return in January.

This is the interesting one — another letter I found. I served it to a private company, someone I know very well. They weren't given until September 9, 1977. They were given until April 29, 1977.

**MR. THATCHER:** — No! Shame!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** —

Dear Sir: Before the beginning of this year your company should have remitted the required annual fee of \$30 and on or before March 1 should have filed a form, summary of capital and shares, as required by The Companies Act.

That's pretty well the same letter as they had here but they added this to this one:

Kindly be advised that unless your company remits the form and fee within 14 days from the date hereof the name of your company may be struck off the register of companies. For your convenience a copy of the required form is enclosed.

I know this company very well because it happens to be Muirhead and Sons Limited so I know it very well.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Double standard! One for the NDP and one for the Tories. I bet you weren't doing \$190,000 worth of business either.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Sit down and be quiet!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — My accountant didn't get that in there in 14 days and it was struck off and it cost \$50 to get it back in. But in the seven years that I searched in that file, this never happened once, never happened once. I have done something very nice, yes. I see in 1979, with all my commotion here that they've got the 1979 filed in April, the first time in seven years that they've filed it on time. You have to thank me to get that done. I see that in the file; go check it. In case somebody starts screaming and hollering they don't believe this, I'm going to table this.

Mr. Chairman, the public are very much interested in what has transpired so far in respect to Service Printing Company, a printing operation doing business with the present government. Well 94 of 100 shares shown on the last annual return on file in the companies' branch are owned by the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. This is the article here and we went through this before. I showed it to the press but they weren't interested in this one; they backed away from this one. This is the one that I wanted the press to see. I showed it to them but oh, they backed away; they were interested in the big thick files with some names on. I said that was only secondary but I think we should have a good look at this one. This was filed late too, another one that is filed late. It was filed June 26, 1978 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Chairman, of the 100 common shares the New Democratic Party have 95 shares and the other 5 are the directors of which 2 are civil servants. We'll just table this. There is a little note on the side that started all this commotion. It says on here, written by Mr. Philip Flory, a list of 49,000 preferred shareholders available at the office of the company. Now I went over to that company but I was flatly refused, flatly refused this statement. We sent another man over the next day and he was . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Just take out a membership.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Yes, well I wonder why your name was on this list and then stroked out over the weekend . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . When I added up the total of the 49,000 preferred shares which it said on here, it doesn't come out to that, so you didn't get someone to take your share I'm afraid.

Just so some of the members can have a look at this — I'm sure they've never seen it — we'll table that too.

Now the minister of Environment is so involved here, can he maybe tell me where I left off here?

You know, Mr. Chairman, when I brought this to the attention of this House, the usual procedure was followed by the Premier and the Attorney General which was to con the press and anyone else who may have been a bit interested, into believing that there was nothing wrong with the operations of the New Democratic Party doing business to the tune of thousands of dollars with the government. Nothing wrong. The press even put it in the paper and on the radio that Muirhead's accusation of \$500,000 was a way off. Oh, I wonder if it was? I wonder. Because what I told the press that I had documented evidence of approximately \$200,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's all right, that's all right . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I want to explain this \$500,000 like I did to the press. Oh, I'm not worried about that noose — that's a big noose when it comes down, it may catch a few more.

Just for your own information, on the public accounts, you can turn to your own pages and check it for yourself, page 255 where \$25,000 and some dollars was spent — the government gave the business to Service Printers of amounts I'm going to give you. Page 263, \$13,000; page 272, \$50,888 and the supplementary page that you hide a way back was \$105,730. How, this is what I told the press, \$200,000, but I'm estimating there could be another \$300,000 but it doesn't show anything \$10,000 and under. Now, that's what I said to the press and I want it understood here that I didn't get my facts wrong.

The Premier compared the operation as being the same as doing business with the Royal Bank. Now this is where the Premier . . . I wish he was here to hear this . . . because this is where the Premier put himself down into a hole that he's not going to get out of as far as Service Printers is concerned. I may not be any whiz kid but I know that if you have shares in the Royal Bank of Canada dividends go to the shareholders. But comparing it to Service Printers — what's the matter with you people? Service Printers, the profits, you're spending our tax dollars. The money goes directly to Service Printers which is wholly owned by the CCF Publishing and Printing Company where the profits go directly to the party funds. That is not comparing it to the Royal Bank of Canada. There's where I got my hundreds of phone calls in Saskatchewan. What's the Premier think he's saying — comparing it to the Royal Bank of Canada. He said it on the air.

Mr. Chairman, I would once again point out to the press gallery and this House that those holding shares in the parent company are not my main concern; it never was my main concern. But when the press wanted to look into this matter, it appeared they were only interested in individuals, not the NDP Party who own the controlling shares. I say to you again, if the operation of the CCF-NDP Party doing business under the trade name of Service Printing Company is proper, then I say to you also, what would be wrong if the same group were to form other companies, such as the ABC Tire Company and sell thousands of dollars worth of tires to any central vehicle agency or any other government department or agency.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Don't give them the idea!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Well, they've probably already done it. Or if what you're saying here is legal, why don't you take any five of your hack men and form another company which maybe you've already done in 61 different constituencies. The real sole owners could be the parties and all the money going into the party fund. It's very simple. If one is legal; hundreds are legal! But I wonder how many more you've got?

Mr. Chairman, the companies department of the Department of the Provincial Secretary is a very important branch. This is where all corporations, trade names, and societies get their birth. This is the department which approves licences of all of our main financial institutions and I say to you, if the file of CCF Publishing and Printing Company Limited is any indication of how this department administers the acts for which they are responsible, then we must very carefully question all aspects of this department.

No, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) can't convince me that the operation is perfectly A.O.K. (I don't seem him in here, but he'll hear about it) because he says it's covered in The Legislative Assembly Act. Mr. Chairman, I've been advised by the press and from some members opposite that if I would read section 14(a) of The Legislative Assembly Act, it would prove the innocence of the government — my accusation that the government is guilty of a conflict of interest. So for the members in the Assembly and also the press, I will read the act. It will only take a moment, it's only one paragraph.

Nothing in this act shall extend to or disqualify any person as a member of the Assembly by reason of his being a shareholder or director of an incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Saskatchewan, except that company that undertakes a contract for the building of any public work.

Mr. Chairman, if you noticed, it said nothing about the government taking our tax dollars and doing business with the company owned by a political party in power with the profits going directly to party funds. The Attorney General being a lawyer should know at the best this section may cover the individuals of the party doing business with the government in power, but certainly you cannot stretch this section to justify an NDP Party corporation doing business with the NDP government in power, particularly when profits of such an organization go directly to party funds. Surely, there are no Conservative or Liberal taxpayers, and I'm satisfied some of the NDP members don't believe in this illegal, immoral, and highly questionable funnelling of tax dollars to the party which is not the choice of at least 52 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan.

I contacted a lawyer in this country of Canada, an old, old lawyer with a lot of experience . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, he doesn't live in Saskatchewan, but he's had a lot of experience and this is what he said about this act. He said if this was law, all company acts and all these little subsections or subsection such and such, why do you have court lawyers and courtrooms in Canada? Why? Because this isn't law!

Mr. Chairman, when this session is over and the government does not put a stop to spending money through contracts to service printers, I want it on record in this Assembly that I will be pursuing the legality of the government doing business with a company owned by a political party in power.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend a few minutes on more facts. I hadn't planned on pursuing the question of service printing companies too much during the estimates of this department but, as you know, my research at the Provincial Secretary's department has forced me to make my position very clear and also set the record straight in respect to some of the wishy-washy answers the Premier gave in respect to this matter.

After the Premier's statement in this House that operations such as the Service Printing Company dealings with government were common procedures even in other

May 2, 1979

provinces, I took the statement to be the truth but, nevertheless, I also took the time to contact other provinces.

Mr. Chairman, I found the Premier's statement to be utterly false and indeed without one exception. I took the time and I challenge anyone in this House and the press to phone the Premier's office and every province in Canada, every one! I just didn't do a flip-flop sort of deal; I explained to them, there happens to be 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. Just in case the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) didn't know, the only one I failed to contact was Saskatchewan. I didn't phone Saskatchewan because we already knew about them.

Now, I talked to some of the premiers and in some cases talked to the deputy premiers. I explained the situation, that in the province of Saskatchewan the government spends tax dollars on a company wholly owned by the political party in power. They said they would all check into it and it would go on record. I got phoned back by every one, every last one. It has never been done; never been done except in Saskatchewan. The only one!

I have something very interesting about Manitoba. They phoned back. They said, Service Printers, that rings a bell. They said when the NDP were in power in Manitoba they used to send their printing over to Saskatchewan to get it done. Now they want all this information.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Send it where?

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — To Service Printers.

The Premier (of Manitoba) wasn't too happy when he found this out. He said the taxpayers are going to be very happy when they find this out and relate it to what the NDP did when they were in power — send their tax dollars to Saskatchewan so you would have more power.

**MR. THATCHER:** — How much did you kick back to them? Untendered contracts!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Those persons I contacted all said the same thing. They never heard of such a type of operation in their province and were quite adamant that if they did they were sure the question of conflict of interest would arise. Of course, this type of political pork barrelling was highly immoral and blatantly arrogant. There was no doubt.

You want me to be clear? Just in case somebody wants to phone the Premier's office, we'll table all the numbers. Just in case you want to phone and check this out.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you one thing. In the province of Quebec, it took four calls because of a little problem with the language but we sure had good co-operation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . A civil servant phoned me back and said that he'd been a civil servant in Quebec for 25 years and they have said no such thing has ever happened there . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

That took me a long time, Mr. Chairman, to phone all those places. It cost the Government of Saskatchewan a lot of money. I'm sure I didn't do it on my money . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Chairman, I'm also quite convinced that 52 per cent of the taxpayers of this

province who voted against the NDP in October last certainly don't want their tax dollars funnelled into the coffers of the NDP Party.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that a number of the older members of the CCF-NDP Party, and indeed perhaps many of the persons names as shown on the list of the shareholders, gave their dollars to the CCF Publishing and Printing Company Limited on the basis the object of the company was to print their paper known as the Commonwealth and publications of the party.

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

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Now, this is what this CCF Publishing and Printing Company was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, you're right, you've got it. And I took this list home and I talked to many of the people in my area on that list and they couldn't believe what's happening. But those people on that list happened to be my polling captains in the last election. They sure are, they got their eyes open.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Kinzel at \$41,000?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Yes, but what is he getting now that he's had this new move to the Premier's office?

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of the older members, when the present operation is explained, in respect to Service Printing Company, have opinions similar to mine. If the Premier and the Attorney General can't legally justify this bucket shop operation, they say it's at least morally wrong regardless of what party's in power . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . when you ask your older members, they'll know what the bucket shop is and they'll know what cemetery fiascos are too. There's quite a few of them sitting there that know all about them.

Mr. Chairman, I, for one over the period of the last 20 years or so thought the Premier was, without doubt, of the highest credibility and of course last October was the whole deal. Now, Mr. Chairman, that I have spent a couple of months in this Assembly and found out a few of the day-to-day operations of the hon. members opposite, I'm not so convinced. I will say that the Premier did have me fooled as a voter until I came into this House. The NDP and their heads apparently condone all this as being so fine and proper. Then, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, I propose during my term of tenure in this House my job will be to continue to pursue such operations as the Provincial Secretary's office, companies branch, Service Printing Company, etc., and numerous other operations of the government sitting opposite which, if not illegal, is highly immoral and of questionable integrity.

Mr. Chairman, the man in the street, the average taxpayer or voter, must be more informed and I am prepared to spend all my energies to so inform him so that come the next election the so-called chosen few won't be going around this province convincing the people they all have halos over their heads, particularly the one man large halo type show they put on last October. No, Mr. Chairman, the Premier isn't going to sweep this little bucket shop operation under the mat and get away with it and I'm sure they are of concern to him in view of the erratic or upset attitude he took. I've got to make sure I'm being heard, so I've got to slow down, Paul. Just in case you didn't hear those last, I'm going to repeat. You know, Mr. Chairman, the Premier isn't going to sweep this little bucket shop operation under the mat and get away with it, but I'm sure they are of concern to him view of the erratic or upset attitude he took when I pursued the

May 2, 1979

subject in this House. He's been refusing to answer questions. I'm not alone in this pursuit. A portion of the editorial appearing in the Star-Phoenix is very educational for you folks to read. I'll just take a moment and read a little bit of it here. Maybe some of you read it.

Blakeney Clouds Issue — On straight legal grounds Premier Allan Blakeney may be quite correct in (may, it says) believing that the NDP-owned Service Printing Company should not be barred from obtaining government contracts. However, we would have expected the Premier to have placed greater emphasis on the moral considerations when he discussed the issue in the legislature last week. This is especially true since part of the Premier's non-partisan appeal stems from a conviction he tends to treat many issues on a moral basis rather than on a political basis. The Service Printing Company of Regina undertakes government jobs with no reason to believe other than competitive basis, but because it is owned by the CCF Publishing and Printing Company Limited, whose shareholders are probably 99 per cent active NDP supporters' allegations of conflict of interest have surfaced in the past

We'll just move down to the last part here that you might enjoy a little more.

That answer only clouds the issue. It attempts to show that the CCF Publishing and Printing Company is merely a company like other companies in society. Such is not the case. On one hand we are dealing with the companies whose main goal is the provision of goods and services at a profit and which may have certain political biases in ownership, but whose political biases do not interfere with the provision of those services to the public. On the other hand we have CCF Printing and Publishing whose main and legitimate goal is selling, refining, consolidating a particular political philosophy.

Now, that's what you people are selling through Service Printers.

If there is not, as the Premier emphasizes, a conflict of interest in the company undertaking government contracts, the people would still expect that the company and the party would decide on its own volition not to bid on government contracts. Such a moral stance would serve the party well and further enhance the bipartisan support the Premier has managed to achieve among the electorate. We suspect the Premier himself is not comfortable being forced to defend the situation and the party would do him a great personal service by removing the problem.

I've just got one more little one to read. It's an article — Court Rules Against Petition in Ontario. I'm just going to read one part here.

Current legislation prohibits political activity and permits civil servants to seek election only if they take an unpaid leave of absence.

Take a look at your civil servants that have political activity around here, just take a good look at that. I throw a challenge out to the press. Let's get back to the old days, the system of serious investigative reporting. Let's tell the public the way it really is. Reporting about millions of dollars in potash revenues, resource development, etc., etc., is fine. Statistics is great stuff . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you weren't there.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — He was talking about you.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Let us not overlook the real moral issues that affect every citizen of this province, like legality, integrity, morality and responsibility be it in dollars or cents or safe water for consumption in every hamlet, village, town and city in the province. These are the gut things that those taxpayers and citizens out there want to know about — facts — because that's where it's all at.

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

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, tattered, torn and bloody, I rise. I want to say I have only been a member in this Assembly since 1971 but I recall years previous to that sitting in the gallery and listening to the member for Thunder Creek's (Mr. Thatcher) father do a number on Service Printers. I have never quite heard it done this way.

Mr. Chairman, we've touched on a great many things, very few of which have anything to do with the Provincial Secretary. However, I do want to say to the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead) that the CCF Publishing and Printing Company filed its annual return this year with its list of shareholders as required by law. With respect to the example the member used of another company and comparison with Service Printers or the CCF Publishing and Printing Company the difference was that the one had failed to file its annual return which the Provincial Secretary's department enforces fairly rigidly. The other was a list of shareholders which is not enforced as rigidly. There is a difference there and I think if the member checks he'll find in many provinces you don't even need to file the list of shareholders at all.

I listened with some interest to the beginning part of the member's speech with respect to all of the staff that he had in the Provincial Secretary's department. I suppose if you take a 7 or 8 year period and take all the people who from time to time may have been employed there you can get an impressive list of people. I think with the exception of Mr. Beaudry and Mr. Flory, the only individuals he mentioned who is currently working with the Provincial Secretary's department is Mr. Russ Eaton. Most of the other individuals were part of the Provincial Secretary's department under a separate subvote — the potash secretariat. Their task was to put together the legislation, etc. with respect to Bills 1 and 2 in the potash debate. He wanted to know why Mr. Coulter's salary decreased from, I believe, \$21,000 to \$14,000. That's because Mr. Coulter was only employed for part of the year and the second year he was using. I think with those comments, Mr. Chairman, I will avoid the great temptation which I feel to respond to the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead) to the same lengths to which he made his opening remarks.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — I did have about 15 questions here but I'm just going to ask one so we can save some time and we're going to let it go.

I just want to ask this one question. Do you advertise for these positions or do you just hire the people? Do you advertise in a public paper when you need a position in the Provincial Secretary's department? Did you advertise in a public paper? If you want a position, I've got a list of about 15 here if you want.

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Flory responded to an application when he was first hired.

May 2, 1979

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Could you find the application? Did you say it was advertised? Was it through application? Can that be shown to us some way or other just to prove this one incident? I don't mean tonight. Can this be checked out? We have a good library here. I want to see where this is advertised because people say it hasn't been.

**MR. COWLEY:** — Certainly it can. He was hired into the classified service, Public Service Commission. There were several applicants. He was the one chosen. He was hired through the Public Service Commission. It was advertised with all the other public service jobs that are hired through the Public Service Commission. I am sure we can provide for the member a copy of the advertisement and how many applicants there were. If that's what the member wants, no difficulty at all.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You lost out eh?

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — We just want it. Whenever they can get the information and give it to us that's all we want.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 and 3 agreed.

Provincial Secretary Vote 30 agreed.

**PROVINCIAL SECRETARY  
VOTE 30**

Items 1 to 3 agreed.

Provincial Secretary Supplementary Vote 30 agreed.

**PROVINCIAL SECRETARY  
VOTE 62**

Item 1 agreed.

Provincial Secretary Supplementary Vote 62 agreed.

**CROWN INVESTMENTS CORPORATION OF SASKATCHEWAN  
VOTE 65**

Item 1 agreed.

Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan Vote 65 agreed.

**SASKATCHEWAN MINING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION  
VOTE 62**

**ITEM 1**

**MR. THATCHER:** — \$78,700,000 is still \$78,700,000. Could you very briefly tell us what you are going to do with it?

**HON. E. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — I could be facetious and say spend it, but . . . no, I think, basically, it will be for two things. It will be for our share of the joint venture operation, some 175 that SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) is involved with. There will also be, we anticipate, some significant

expenditures in terms of development at Key Lake. Those are the two major areas that are involved in the \$78 million.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Could you give us some idea what percentage of equity you will have in the project?

**MR. COWLEY:** — In the Key Lake project 50 per cent, so we'll be paying 50 per cent of the costs and in the others it will vary between 10 per cent and 100 per cent — the 100 per cent being some 9 projects of our own. The other 160-some projects, I would estimate, would average about one-third interest.

Item 1 agreed.

Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Vote 62 agreed.

## **CULTURE AND YOUTH VOTE 7**

### **ITEM 1 (Cont'd)**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You indicated that you had added \$150,000 award during the year but that doesn't add up — \$331,000 and \$150,000 do not add up to \$405,000 which is what you show at the back page.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I misunderstood the member's question. I thought you were talking about the last fiscal year. Indeed you were talking about the fiscal year before that. The answer's the same, it was a supplementary award.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The answer is \$406,000. Why would you print the \$331,000?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I gather it was an error in either the printing or the preparation of the report.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, a colleague from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) asked you questions earlier in the evening in respect to the art dealer's trial. Could you tell me if any government employees or civil servants or assistants or executive assistants or whatever were witnesses in that trial?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm informed that the arts co-ordinator of that day was called as a witness.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The who?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The arts co-ordinator.

**MR. LANE:** — First of all, were any of the paintings that the department acquired or the government acquired taken as exhibits? Were any other government documents taken as exhibits in the art dealers' trial?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The answer to the member's question is yes. Some of the paintings and other documents as well were filed as exhibits in the trial.

**MR. LANE:** — Have they been returned to you yet?

May 2, 1979

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The answer to that question is no.

**MR. LANE:** — Were any of the paintings acquired by the department exhibits that were questioned by the Department of National Revenue as to valuations, given the charges?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The answer to that question is yes.

**MR. LANE:** — Would you give us a list of the ones that were? The reason, obviously . . . I'm sure that I and most members would accept the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) as being an art connoisseur. Perhaps these great cultural acquisitions to the province didn't have the same aesthetic value to the Government of Canada and the Department of National Revenue. We would like to see in which areas there was an aesthetic conflict as well as other conflicts in the matter.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, we'll provide that information.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, just one question. I'm reading your report and you mention one work accepted in 1977 as a 15th Century Italian painting. Is that one of the paintings referred to in the art dealers' trial?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It is.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Was there any value placed on that one at the time? Is there one now? Is there quite a large discrepancy? Is it still a very valuable painting?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I continually remind the hon. members opposite that the answer is the same. We do not place values on them.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You can't recall the words you used as to how you appraised them but is the aesthetic value of that painting today the same, in your opinion or in the opinion of the arts board, the same aesthetic value as it was at the time you received it?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes.

**MR. LANE:** — I would like to change the topic, if I may. Let me just tell the hon. member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Engel) that he shouldn't follow government practice and just be buying paintings from anybody that comes along without getting some qualified expert. Secondly don't buy any wooden nickels; look at the acquisition policy of the government office.

I'd like to change the topic and go to the Western Development Museum and the activities of a Mr. George Dyck as chairman or former chairman. Would you first of all explain whether Mr. Dyck is in fact still chairman of the Western Development Museum and if not, when he ended his position, how he ended it, what payments were in fact made to Mr. Dyck and also whether that Mr. George Dyck, chairman or former chairman of the Western Development Museum, is the same George Dyck that was president of CPN (Co-operative Programming Network)?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm not sure of the precise allowance; it was an annual allowance and I'll get the precise amount for you in a moment — \$6,000 per annum comes to mind but I will have that checked in just a moment. That's the amount still paid to the chairman. No, he's no longer chairman; he resigned in April. Yes, it is the same George Dyck . . .

**MR. LANE:** — April of what year?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Of last year.

**MR. LANE:** — Of '78?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, and the answer is yes, it is the same George Dyck who was president of CPN. Again, I'll get you the exact salary in a moment. It's on it's way down.

**MR. LANE:** — I suppose every political party ends up with some of them that everything they touch goes sour. There's an awful lot of controversy in Saskatoon as to the firing of the previous director and I believe, I take a look at the annual report this year and I compare it to previous years. There seems to be a lengthy chairman's report from George Dyck. Normally in the past it's a few platitudes and generalities, but in this particular year, it's a lengthy detailed annual report — I'm doing the annual report 1978 Western Development Museum — rather lengthy discussion of the firing or forced resignation or accepted resignation of the previous director.

One of the justifications given by Mr. Dyck is the so-called Thomas report. Now, first of all, would you tell us who Thomas was and secondly, when an official is treated in that manner would you table the Thomas report?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The report was prepared by Rick Thomas who I gather was an employee of the department at the time the report was prepared. My answer with respect to tabling the report is the same as my predecessor's and this question has been asked year after year. My answer is the same; we won't file the report. The report was not prepared for the Government of Saskatchewan. It was prepared for the Western Development Museum and they have not chosen to release the report so my answer is the same as has been given to you for two previous years.

**MR. LANE:** — What do you mean, they've chosen not to release the report? When did we get the principle before this Assembly and the Department of Finance, that wholly funded or substantially funded agencies, museums or otherwise, paid by the people of this province, that they can deem to give whatever information they please and refuse to give information to the public of this province? When did that principle become accepted in this Assembly?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I remind the member that the Western Development Museum is an autonomous body and they provide an annual report, and that is their responsibility in terms of reporting to the House. They do not have to provide every scrap of paper that is produced internally for the benefit of this House. They're an autonomous body.

**MR. LANE:** — Let me tell you that if you're hanging your hat on that, I'll go to the Western Development Museum myself, and I will go in and I will ask them questions, and I assume that I'm going to get some answers, and some doggone frank answers and specific answers to questions that I'll ask. If I don't get them then I'm going to tell you and warn you that you're the minister responsible for that body and someone is accountable to the people of this province. Either you are the minister responsible and you're going to answer to the public or they are and you tell me who is going to give me the full and complete answers to questions I ask.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I invite the member to go to the Western Development Museum

May 2, 1979

and make your inquiries.

**MR. LANE:** — And am I going to get the answers?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm not providing that information for the same reason I'm not providing the report. You'll have to go and find out.

**MR. LANE:** — The Western Development Museum is going to be pretty embarrassed because I'll tell you about the so-called sham report and why you don't have the courage and why the Western Development Museum or particularly George Dyck don't have the courage to table it because it was full of untrue and shaky allegations, imprecise statements and didn't warrant the actions taken by George Dyck in dealing with the previous director. If one goes to the Canadian Museums Association, which probably has a little more credibility than George Dyck does . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Liberal outfit! Let me tell you, if you want to stand up in this House and defend that . . . Do you want to defend the party actions of that hack, George Dyck. George Dyck has not only destroyed the reputations of some people in Saskatoon but has cost the people of this province anywhere from \$3 million to \$5 million. You should be hanging your head in shame if you want to flag that type of individual around the province.

Let's look at what the Canadian Museums Association says. I'm sure you've seen the letter they've written.

The executive committee acting on behalf of your council wishes to inform all members that while in the opinion of council Mr. Wilson can be faulted for certain errors in judgment during the events surrounding his dismissal, nothing in his behavior has been found to compromise his integrity or to affect his status as an individual member in good standing of the Canadian Museums Association.

Further, the committee wishes to report that lax board procedures and errors in judgment by the chairman and members of the board of the Western Development Museum did lead council to conclude that Gordon Wilson was not in all respects treated justly by the board in this dismissal process.

You've seen that, haven't you? Were you given that statement by the Canadian Museums Association on an investigation of the Western Development Museum?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, it was given to my predecessor; to an office, not to me.

I say to the hon. member that I would be prepared to defend the change in personnel. I have not read the report and I have not read the Thomas report either. Those decisions were all taken before I was there. They were irrevocably taken. I am prepared to defend the change in personnel. I hate to do so publicly. Why? Because I have to discuss a man's reputation long after he's finished.

**MR. LANE:** — Will you supply it to me?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, I would be quite happy to write the member a letter and set out quite candidly what I think was wrong with the administration of the Western Development Museum. I'm quite prepared to do that. I suppose if pressed I am prepared to say it in the House although I am not wild about it because the man is gone. He's been gone for two years. In a sense we're threshing old straw. I would be delighted

to write to you and tell you in writing why I think he was not doing the job that is required of the executive director of the museum.

**MR. LANE:** — You supply it to me in writing. I'd like the further undertaking that you don't read, before you make that letter, the two reports. So that the statement you are giving me — you've indicated that you haven't read the Canadian Museums Association report and the Thomas report. You haven't read them and I'd like the undertaking from the minister that he in fact is going to give me the information which, in his opinion, justifies the dismissal of Gordon Wilson without taking into account those two reports. He seems to indicate that he can do it without regard to the two reports. If you supply me that it will then be my responsibility whether it's public or what happens on it and not yours. I think that's fair.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm quite prepared to read the reports and prepared to respond in writing. I based my observations on what I saw when I took over the responsibility for the museums. What I saw there convinced me that, as I say, the duties of executive director had not been properly discharged. If the member would feel better, I am prepared to read the reports before I reply. I would then reply and give you the information.

**MR. LANE:** — I asked you to reply to me before you've read those reports. The reason being that you said you can justify the decision without regard to the two reports that you haven't read. So, I'm just asking your personal undertaking that you in fact not read them and give me your . . . Because I intend to try and find out from the Western Development Museum a copy of that report. Then I am going to do some comparisons bluntly. Is that all right?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I frankly don't think I am prepared to give that undertaking. I frankly don't think I am prepared to reply in writing, without access to all the information. I don't think I am prepared to do that. I am prepared to give you my reasons in writing but I am not at this point in time prepared to undertake that I won't read the report before I give it to you. I think it's nonsensical, in fairness to the member for Qu'Appelle.

**MR. LANE:** — Well except that you are the one that gave this House and the public the assurance that you were satisfied, not having read those reports, that in fact this matter was properly dealt with, that Gordon Wilson was in fact dismissed for proper reasons without regard to those two reports. Those are your words; those aren't mine.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I am certainly prepared to give the member for Qu'Appelle my observations when I took over as minister and why I think those observations justify a change in personnel. As I say, I am not prepared to reply before I read the reports. It may well happen in any event because it's a fairly voluminous report. I just hate to give that undertaking in the House but I'm certainly prepared to set out in writing my observations about the administration of the museum when I took over. It was on the basis of those observations that I say that a change in the executive director was justified.

**MR. LANE:** — I also want you to tell me the background of Mr. Thomas, his association with the department, his qualifications, his salary range, previous employment, previous history that caused you to hire him. To the best of your knowledge is he still with the department?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No.

**MR. LANE:** — O.K. where, to the best of your knowledge, he went if you have that information when he . . .

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I am prepared to give the hon. member all of that. I was in error when I guessed at Mr. Dyck's per annum allowance. It was \$9,000 and not \$6,000 and he resigned as of March 31, 1978.

**MR. LANE:** — That's not bad remuneration for a volunteer, is it? Now, let's go through this report of Dyck. After we take a look and Dyck says, for example, the business administration did not follow proper accounting procedures; I am quoting from the 1978 annual report again:

This made it difficult for the board to know what was actually happening. Frequent demands by the board for improvement were never satisfactorily resolved by the executive director.

Business administration, to my understanding, was in fact under the jurisdiction of the comptroller. That was his particular function; he was responsible for the business administration. I wonder if the minister could explain when CPN Dyck says that the business administration was inadequate, why he managed, after firing Wilson, to ask the very comptroller responsible for the business administration to take on the position of acting director.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Again, I wonder if the member could tell me from what page he is reading. Again I remind the member you are referring to the activities of an autonomous board. This does not relate to the administration of a department, but of an autonomous board and we don't know precisely who George Dyck asked to take over and who he didn't. I'd be surprised to hear that the board had authorized him to make an offer of employment to the comptroller. There may have been some preliminary discussions about what his future was, but I'd be surprised that he'd been authorized by the board to make an offer of employment. I may be wrong, but I'd be interested in knowing where you're reading from.

**MR. LANE:** — Let me tell you that if you check the files as I have, the offer was in fact made. I'm not too deeply into the report. It's the first page, clause (a).

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Is your authority for believing that Mr. Dyck made an offer of employment to the business directors, I think you've called them, in this report or in some other file. It's somewhere else. I cannot answer the member's question. I am not sure at this point in time if we could supply that information. We could try. I'm not sure what's available to us. We may not have all the sources of information that are available to the hon. member and I'm not sure he wants to make them available. I can undertake to reply to you in writing about why such an offer might have been made. I don't know. It frankly surprises me to learn that an offer of employment was made but I may be wrong.

**MR. LANE:** — I will assure you that in fact such an offer was made. I will assume that I'm going to get the same plea of ignorance on other questions on the particular matter. The minister nods his head in the affirmative.

Let me say that if it is now the policy of the government opposite to allow publicly

funded bodies to hide behind the veil of being autonomous to avoid public scrutiny, then it's a pretty sorry day in this history of this legislature. It's making a sham of the traditions of parliament which is public accountability for money spent. If that's the defence and that's the position being taken by the government opposite, then I say to you we're wasting our time in this Assembly. In fact opposition scrutiny of such publicly funded bodies is being negated by the government opposite. As I say, we are just plain wasting our time if that's going to be the defence. If you can't answer for an individual who on the face of it, on the press reports and everything else, was pretty shabbily dealt with. Your defence right through has been pretty weak. He was in fact shabbily dealt with. If you can't come up with anything other than a plea of ignorance . . . it's a long tradition of the government opposite. We've seen individuals publicly kicked around by the government opposite.

Walter Chester comes to mind on a pretty shabbily handled situation where the weight of government came down on an individual or where political power came down on an individual. They attempt to destroy him publicly and then stand up and try to justify their actions or avoid accountability after. It's not the first time it's happened.

I warn the minister opposite that if that's going to be his practice and the practice of the government opposite, you don't do yourselves credit as a government and you certainly make a mockery of the Assembly.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Let me just say in conclusion that I'm quite prepared to defend the activities of the Western Development Museum in this legislature. I'm quite prepared to defend details of that.

You ask about an episode that occurred quite some time ago. You ask about the controller. I might remind you that a Bob UnRuh left about April 15, 1977. I understand that to be before Mr. Wilson left or about the same time, so I assume that Mr. Dyck did not make the offer of employment to the controller who would have been there during the unhappy episode and who you claim was responsible for the administration. So he must have made the offer of employment to someone else and a new director of administration was hired somewhat recently. So that's why I say I'm not sure I accept with ease your suggestion that an offer of employment was made. If you're prepared to prove that it was, then I'm prepared to answer why, although it's not going to be easy to find out. But I'm not in any sense avoiding legislative responsibility. I'm prepared to answer the questions. I just tell the hon. member that this incident occurred some years ago and it's not easy to get the details of somewhat casual conversations which took place three years ago.

**MR. LANE:** — I think that I can say, so that your mind is clear that Wilson was, in fact, given notice on March 15, that immediately thereafter UnRuh was offered the interim director and that on March 18 . . . now interim director for a lengthy period of time and I didn't say permanent director, I said interim director but that conflicts with the allegation made . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . where's the big difference when the business administration is sharply criticized as the number one item, as one of the reasons for the justification? The business administration is under the charge of the controller. They're sharply criticized here that after the firing of Wilson, he is offered . . . Now, after he saw the operations of the board on March 18, when UnRuh saw what Dyck was doing, he announced his resignation subsequent to the offer made by Dyck. I give you those facts so that you're aware of the date and the order of dates so that you have no confusion as to position.

May 2, 1979

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, I did not hear the member say earlier that he was offered the position of executive director on an interim basis. That's something quite different. There are a variety of reasons for that, one of which was that he was the only other permanent employee on staff at the time. Someone had to be interim director and I suppose he was probably as good as anyone. It is normal in any event when a change takes place at the top that you appoint the next senior person as the interim director until you find someone new. But I say, in any event, he was the only other permanent staff around at the time. He was the only game in town in a sense, so I think it's something quite different to be offered the position of executive director in interim. That I'd believe. I wouldn't believe he had ever been offered it permanently which is what I thought the member was saying.

**MR. LANE:** — Yes, I think that the minister will admit that it's a little strange that when the number one item for criticism . . . when you offer it to the very individual who's in fact responsible for the very thing that you're strongly criticizing, that shouldn't be the usual practice. If you're saying it's the usual practice of your government, let me suggest that you change the practice because in fact it's not really a sound way of doing it.

Would you also advise whether there are any discussions as to settlement of any outstanding salary or compensation claims by any individuals? If so, where does it stand?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, there are no discussions at this point in time, no.

**MR. LANE:** — Where does it stand?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I think a settlement has been reached with Mr. Wilson. I think he's no longer asking for anything.

**MR. PICKERING:** — I just have a couple of quick questions here. Mr. Minister, I would like to have the 1978-79 estimate and actual salaries of your three top officials under each subvote and the 1979-80 estimates.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — You want all these. I prefer to supply these things in writing if that's O.K. I'll supply it in writing then. In fact I have it ready.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Just one more question, Mr. Minister. How much money has your department allocated to the Saskatchewan Archers Association for 1978? Do you have an estimate for 1979?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — For 1978, \$2,600. The decision hasn't been made for this year. I think we would not want to speculate about how much we might give them this year before we see their application form. We wouldn't want to speculate about what we might give them before they apply for the money. If I estimated and we would give them the same amount I'd be surprised if they didn't get an application for the same amount. So I don't think I'm prepared to speculate about what we will do this year. Last year it was \$2,600.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I have a very quick question and perhaps a quick answer. I'll take an example. The gentleman sitting to your right, Bill Clarke — why is the salary being dropped from last year? Is there a reason for that? I thought you had a pretty good man there.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I would certainly agree he's a good man. It comes as quite a surprise to me and an even greater surprise to Mr. Clarke to learn that his salary has been decreased. I gather the estimate for 1979-80 does not include salary increases in accordance with long-standing government tradition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh no, I may have been the first one to supply it in this form. You could add to this whatever figure I suppose you feel appropriate; 7 per cent or 8 per cent for the salary increase. Your guess is probably as good as mine at this point in time. You would have to add to this the salary increase.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 4 agreed.

#### **ITEM 5**

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Minister, I would like to . . . I wonder if you could give me the name of the person that's the head of this department and what his qualifications are?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That's the subject of a great salary decrease. I think that's not a wholly serious question when you ask what his qualifications; they are known to you. That's W. Clarke that's head of it.

Item 5 agreed.

#### **ITEM 6**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, a very quick question on that one again. Does that include the budget for the Museum of Natural History in Regina? If yes, was it cut considerably from last year and can you tell me the amounts? I understand there was considerable cutback on that one.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, that does include the Natural History Museum but not the capital expenditures. No, there was no cutback on the operating side.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Their budget, I believe, shows a decrease in that subvote, in that item. I am wondering if that would be part of it and why the decrease?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, we eliminated certain capital expenditures on the Humphrey House whatever that may be and on the Cannington Manor church we reduced the amount we are going to expend thereon.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — So, I can accept then from you that you have not reduced the operating expenses of the Museum of Natural History?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Chairman, one question on the Cannington Manor church. Can you tell me, does this mean that you are cutting back on the assistance on the refurbishing of this area?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, certainly not, it's just . . . we're just not making the expenditure this year in view of some of the other responsibilities we have. It will be ongoing and we will be at this again another year . . . the ongoing restoration of this area.

Items 6 and 7 agreed.

May 2, 1979

## ITEM 8

**MR. LANE:** — Would the minister advise as to what films were in fact completely prohibited from coming in; you can supply that in writing if you wish . . . I am assuming it's a lengthy list.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I can give you this. The titles make scintillating reading. I will read them for you: Tower of Love; Flossy the Teen-age Nymph, the Wide Open Marriage. The next one sounds like a real zinger, it's called Hot Sex in Bangkok; Pretty Baby — members are aware of that; one called Booby Hatch; In the Realm of the Senses; Deep Jaws; Porn Brokers; Campus Swinger; Candice Candy; Up, and Black Immanual. There you've heard it.

Item 8 agreed.

Items 9 and 10 agreed.

## ITEM 11

**MR. LANE:** — Just a question on the arts board if I can. Who is the director, qualifications, etc?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The director of the arts board is Joy Cohnstaedt. I cannot apparently give you the qualifications and such. You know that she was in the department as a visual arts co-ordinator. I can't give you the other qualifications frankly without some work and perhaps I could supply that in writing.

Item 11 agreed.

Items 12 to 16 agreed.

## ITEM 17

**MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone):** — Mr. Minister, I see there is a \$256,550 decrease here. Could you explain that?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Sorry, we did earlier. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) asked me what grant programs had been cut out. I listed them at that point in time and that's the same crew — local histories, community culture, energy assistance, regional sport competitions. I gather we mentioned earlier as well — a reduction in the heritage site assistance program and that's in there as well for a sum of \$69,000.

Item 17 agreed.

Item 18 agreed.

Culture and Youth, Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 7 agreed.

## CULTURE AND YOUTH PROVINCIAL DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE VOTE 7

Item 1 agreed.

**ITEM 2**

**MR. LANE:** — I wonder if the Minister would advise on both of those items, who are the contractors, tenders, etc., if he would?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The restoration of a territorial administration building, the contractor is Smith Bros. and Wilson, BLM are the architects. What else did you ask, I'm sorry? Tenders? Sorry, what's your question?

**MR. LANE:** — Were the projects tendered and if so . . .

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, the project was tendered by the Department of Government Services, I believe.

**MR. LANE:** — Were the successful bidders the high bidders, low bidder or . . .

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It's out of the low bidders.

Item 2 agreed.

Item 3 agreed.

Culture and Youth - Provincial Development Expenditure - Vote 7 agreed.

**CULTURE AND YOUTH  
ORDINARY EXPENDITURE  
SUPPLEMENTARIES  
VOTE 7**

Items 1 to 5 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

**Culture and Youth  
Provincial Development Expenditure  
Supplementaries  
Vote 7**

Item 1 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

Culture and Youth Vote 7 agreed.

**SASKATCHEWAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION  
VOTE 48**

Item 1 agreed.

Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation Vote 48 agreed.

**INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE  
VOTE 19**

Item 1 agreed.

Industry and Commerce Vote 19 agreed.

**THE SASKATCHEWAN RESEARCH COUNCIL  
VOTE 35**

Item 1 agreed.

May 2, 1979

The Saskatchewan Research Council Vote 35 agreed.

**DEPARTMENT OF TELEPHONES  
VOTE 38**

**ITEM 1**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — A question of the Minister that's handling the estimate. I understand that this budget is slowing coming down for the obvious reason; the private companies are disappearing and that's the reason why it's coming down?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Originally for grants to rural telephone companies.

Item 1 agreed.

Department of Telephones Vote 38 agreed.

**SASKATCHEWAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
VOTE 53**

Item 1 agreed.

Saskatchewan Telecommunications Vote 53 agreed.

**DEPARTMENT OF TELEPHONES  
SUPPLEMENTARIES  
ORDINARY EXPENDITURE  
VOTE 38**

Item 1 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:54 p.m.