

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 10, 1980

The Assembly met at 2:00 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. L.E. JOHNSON (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity introduce to the House, through you, a group of adult upgrading students from Big River. There are nine seated in the Speaker's gallery who are here to observe the procedures of the Chamber. They are accompanied by their teacher, Arlene Ritchie and bus driver, Doug Panter. I will be meeting with them afterwards at 3:00 p.m. in the rotunda, for pictures and some refreshments later on. I hope they enjoy their experience here and I ask everyone to welcome them to the legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly, 15 ladies from the Moose Jaw Progressive Conservative Women's Organization — a very distinguished group in the east gallery. I hope they have a very informative day here in the House. They had lunch down in the cafeteria. We had a vote to see if we could get the best looking MLA to greet them today so I was the one who was elected. I will see you after for coffee. Have a nice day.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw South): — I join the member for Estevan in welcoming the Progressive Conservative ladies from Moose Jaw (I recognize a number of them). I wasn't aware there were that many of them in Moose Jaw, but we're very pleased to welcome them.

QUESTIONS

SGI Agency

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I would like to direct a question to the minister responsible for SGIO. Would the member responsible for SGIO advise this Assembly as to the qualifications of one Frank Buck who, on March 31, received an SGIO agency, and how the individual who was still the secretary of the Crown investment corporation managed to get an SGIO agency?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minster of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as SGIO, in the first place. In the second place, as far as I am aware, Frank Buck has not been given an agency while he's employed by a government organization. If he has resigned his position then he's in a position to get an agency.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the minister. A phone call to the Crown investment corporation today indicated that he was still employed and would indicate that the information you have given this House is not quite correct. Could you then advise this Assembly how Mr. Frank Buck whose qualifications, I believe, consist of the fact he was defeated at least . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. Next question

Saskatchewan Government Office in Ottawa

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — A question to the Attorney General. In view of your announcement yesterday that the Saskatchewan office would be opened in Ottawa this year, to act primarily as a liaison office, would the Attorney General advise the House if this move could be construed as a step toward becoming involved in negotiations with Premier Levesque as: (1) the polls indicate a victory for the PQ in the yes vote, and (2) the federal government is in conflict as most of the members of the federal government are from the province of Quebec?

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the question asks whether or not this is a first move for negotiations with Premier Levesque and the answer to that is no, it is not. The stated intention of the office, as I have indicated in the announcement to the House yesterday, is our perception that given the results of the federal election, now is the opportune time to locate an office in Ottawa in order to have better contact with the federal ministers, better liaison with those federal ministers who relate . . . excuse me I have little difficulty hearing myself with the members heckling, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying to the hon. member, the purpose of the operation is to get a contact with federal ministers and in particular those federal ministers who have portfolios of direct relation to the West, and is not related to the Quebec political situation.

MR. HAM: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Attorney General, has your government discussed a position with respect to negotiating with an independent Quebec and in fact if you have not, why not?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I did not hear the question. It's our fault. I was talking to the Minister of Mineral Resources.

MR. HAM: — You're forgiven, Mr. Attorney General. Has your government discussed a position towards negotiating with an independent Quebec and do you in fact have a strategy?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, as I understand the question, the member wants to know whether or not the government has discussed certain political developments or eventualities in the province of Quebec. The obvious answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that there have been discussions. There's no doubt about that. The government clearly has to be aware of all factors related to the political situation, both within Quebec and outside of Quebec. The second half of the question presupposes certain developments which are yet to take place, namely the referendum vote and the outcome and, accordingly, I will refuse any comment on that on the basis that it is speculative.

MR. HAM: — Would the Attorney General not agree that the announcement of the office could be taken as further example of the failure of confederation?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the announcement of the office can be heralded as a failure of confederation. I think that the political structure seems to have built in some difficulties with respect to regional inputs to the centre — whether that's due to the lack of proportional representation or the political decisions of the electorate of western Canada — for whatever reason there is a difficulty of

getting the western Canadian message across in many circles to Ottawa. Before I take my place, Mr. Speaker, I must acknowledge that the opposition MPs, be they Progressive Conservative or New Democratic Party, fulfil a role of representation but as we know of essence they are in opposition and of essence we think that an office probably adds a different kind of dimension. The answer to the hon. member is, no, this is not the intended stated policy of the government.

SGI Licence Issuance

MR. LANE: — The question to the minister responsible for SGIO. It's going to take spending a lot more than \$65,000 out of province to convince . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have a question?

MR. LANE: — Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: — Would the member place it immediately . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If the member has a question he may move forward with the question now.

MR. LANE: — A question to the minister. On March 31 of this year an insurance licence was issued to one Frank Buck, Frank Buck Agencies Ltd. being the corporate name. That agency has now received an SGI agency. Would the minister explain how this obviously political granting took place and what qualifications Mr. Buck has who was not in the insurance business before?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, the person mentioned applied for a licence with SGI. There was no granting of a licence unless he was resigning his position with the government which I understand he has done. If he's been granted a licence then he is no longer employed with the Crown investments corporation.

MR. LANE: — A supplementary. Would the minister explain as well how Frank Buck Agencies, receiving the licence on March 31 of this year, was able to get the contract for the Hotel Saskatchewan for the new purchasers, which took place on April 1? Would you explain how that took place?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, obviously I have no knowledge of what an individual agency has in terms of insurance contracts — and it's a stupid question!

MR. LANE: — A supplementary. One of the members opposite indicated it was aggressive salesmanship that enabled this to happen. Would the minister admit the sole reason that Frank Buck Agencies received an SGIO agency was because of the political affiliation of Mr. Buck, and that the same reason enabled that individual to get a lucrative contract within one day of setting up business?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, no, I would not.

Payment of Expenses — Trip to Montana

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, the other day you took notice of a question I asked and I thank you for supplying me with a written answer. This is regarding to a trip to the United States, down to Montana with MLAs and civil servants. Can you inform the Assembly why the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are required to pay a portion of such a political

tour?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I reported to the hon. member, since I was having difficulty reporting in the House, that the employees of the transportation agency (in this case Burton and Liggett) travelled to Montana as observers. They travelled to Montana as observers at the request of the transportation agency to bring back information as to what was happening with the U.S. rail system.

The hon. member will recall that during the budget debate I spoke at some length comparing the Canadian rail system and the American rail system, and I used some very positive words in terms of the strengthening of the Canadian rail system versus the American system. That trip assisted us in making that kind of an analysis and therefore the benefit of the trip to Montana.

MR. PICKERING: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not agree that taking civil servants on a partisan political trip beginning on a Friday (which they would in fact be paid for) to the U.S. is an improper thing to ask the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to pay for?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, sending employees of the government to look at the rail system in the United States when there have been a great deal of comparisons made between American and Canadian systems, I think makes a good deal of sense. Sending them on a trip where all that was required, as I indicated to you in my report, was the payment by the government of out-of-pocket expenses, makes it even more beneficial and certainly the results they brought back have been of benefit in our analysis of the Canadian system versus the American system.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Does the Minister of Agriculture not recognize that there is a distinction between, on the one hand a government employee, and on the other hand the NDP? That is the question.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm reporting to the legislature on the basis of the question directed to me by the hon. member for Milestone. That I've done. I reported to the hon. member and I report again to you and to the Assembly that Burton and Liggett of the transportation agency did travel with the MLAs and the MPs as observers to look at the rail system. They reported to the agency. We have been able to use some of their analysis in looking at the comparative system, and I think that's of benefit to our government, and a benefit in terms of dealing with the solutions to our transportation system in western Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Would the minister not admit in every other jurisdiction in Canada that sending one civil servant, at least at partial taxpayers' expense, on what has been admitted by the minister to be a partisan political junket, is highly improper, highly unethical, and I say downright . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I would say no. I would say no to that because certainly from our point of view as the Government of Saskatchewan we are keenly interested in looking at the rail system. It's vital to our bulk commodity movement and the fact we can provide more information in looking at that analysis and doing that analysis, in looking at ways we can strengthen it can only help our situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

University of Regina Psychology Department

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Continuing Education and it has to do with the psychology department at the University of Regina. Mr. Minister, are you aware of the Nelson and Mahrer Commission which investigated the operation of that department?

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the operation of departments within the university does not fall within my jurisdiction. The university is operated under the direction of a board of governors, a board which has full responsibility for management of the universities. As a result of that, I am not aware of any other particular studies and reports that have been done in the University of Regina. I am generally aware that the psychology department has been subjected to some review within the university. I have not received from the university board of governors any report on those reviews.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, as the minister in charge of that department, can you tell me why the recommendations of that committee have not been made available to the department, to yourself, and for that matter, to the public of Saskatchewan?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, unless I am unaware of something, it's my understanding that these reports were commissioned by the university under the university administration and the board of governors. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that they would not have presented those reports to me.

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplemental. What about to the department? I've a few points I want to make, Mr. Speaker, in this supplementary with your permission — about three points and they're all in question form. Mr. Minister, are you aware that the graduate students are recommending to the admission committee that no master of arts students be admitted into this department until it is cleaned up? Are you aware that the students have taken legal action against a professor on the grounds of academic incompetence, and are you aware that the Chinese comic book that I hold up here, 15 pages, is the only required reading in a graduate class for PhD and MA students at the 800 level? Are you aware of these situations in that corrupt department?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated to the hon. member, I am aware that there have been certain concerns and difficulties within the psychology department at the University of Regina. As I have already indicated to the hon. member the management of that university is protected from government direction or control by our legislation and by long-standing traditions. I think the very suggestion that the hon. member makes, that I as minister should arbitrarily move in on that university, suggests the kind of approach that the members opposite would take to our institutions such as a university if they had any opportunity to ever enter into government.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll take a new question.

MR. TAYLOR: — Will you as Minister of Continuing Education undertake a full investigation of this department so that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan can be assured that they are receiving educational value for their dollars, and so that the students in this faculty are receiving . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll take a new question.

Purchase Orders — Sporting Goods Stores (Northern Sask.)

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — I have a question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. I bring to your attention a matter of utmost importance to the people of northern Saskatchewan. The various sporting shops in northern Saskatchewan have brought this matter to my attention and it relates to the economic development branch of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan issuing purchase orders to these sporting goods shops. They in turn supply the goods, then have to submit a form for repayment from your department. It has been brought to my attention that the repayment is being held up as much as six months. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you are aware of this and if so, what action are you planning to take to alleviate this particular problem?

HON. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — I am not aware of the specific situation the hon. member raises, which specific sporting goods shops and which locations. If he would bring details of the problem to me or send them to me, I would be pleased to look into it to see what the problem is, then provide him as well as the owners of the shops, with an explanation.

Provincial Library System

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for the Provincial Library. In view of the fact that an increasing number of municipalities in the province are choosing to opt out of the provincial library system, what steps are you as minister prepared to take to ensure that the provincial library system is able to continue an important service to rural Saskatchewan, at a cost which does not force small urban and rural municipalities out of the system?

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for asking that question and giving me the opportunity to boast about what we have been doing about that problem. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, we have set up under the direct auspices of the provincial librarian a committee to study the legislation. I think there are some legislative and structural problems within the regional library system which need correcting and lead in an indirect way to municipalities' giving notice to leave.

I will say this and sit down. They don't give notice to leave because they actually want out of the regional library system. To give notice to leave is often a way of bringing pressure on the regional library board to reduce its assessment. Therein lies the problem. There is no proper way of setting assessments, I think. The hon. member will be delighted to know that we have a committee set up to work on this and to review the entire provincial library act.

MR. McLEOD: — Supplementary question. Will the minister assure the house today and all the people in the rural municipalities that any action you take, any committees you set up, whatever you do now, will not further erode the regional library structure in the province?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would be delighted to give that assurance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will take the minister of . . .

MR. SMISHEK: — Fine you can go, if he wants to ask a question. I am trying to answer a question.

MR. SPEAKER: — The minister does not need to relinquish his spot; I recognized him first. I saw him first. If he wants to proceed, he should proceed.

Salary of Provincial Auditor

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs(Urban)): — Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the hon. member for Kindersley asked a question in respect of the provincial auditor. In part his question was, why do we have the cabinet setting the salary for the provincial auditor without having to refer the salary structure to the Assembly?

Mr. Speaker, I took notice of the question so that I could check the records specifically for fear that I might be accused of trying to mislead the House. I have checked the records so that the hon. member and the members opposite have the full answer. I want, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the Hansard of May 10, 1978, page 2641. We find the following, Mr. Speaker. This is Mr. Thatcher, the member for Thunder Creek saying:

You put him through (referring to the provincial auditor) the degradation of having his salary go through the legislature as a separate bill. This is the only salary subject to correction; he is the only employee whom I have seen that I recall going through the Assembly for a salary increase.

Mr. Speaker, I answered the hon. member this way:

He knows full well that this has been the practice because the auditor, being responsible to the legislature, that the legislature decides on the salary of the auditor.

The hon. member for Thunder Creek carried on saying:

Tell me why the provincial auditor has to be treated in this fashion . . . (and he carried on . . .

Mr. Speaker, in cutting the answer somewhat short . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kindersley is entitled to an answer and I would hope that his colleagues would stop interfering.

I carried on and said first of all in the case of the comptroller's office, the comptroller is an employee of the Department of Finance, whereas the auditor is not an employee of the Department of Finance. I went on further and said, it is possible the time has come for us to look at a different procedure of setting his salary. Certainly, up until now, there has been no criticism at all in the way this has been done - that is, since the province became a province and I suppose since the position of the Office of the Auditor was established. That has been the way we have been doing it. Perhaps there is a different way of doing it, and this is probably worthwhile exploring.

Mr. Speaker, last year we considered the matter raised by the hon. member for Thunder Creek. I discussed the matter with the hon. member for Thunder Creek. In April of last

year I told him we would be prepared to consider an amendment to The Department of Finance Act and to have the salary set by order in council. The hon. member for Thunder Creek told me he would discuss the matter with his caucus. Later on he told me to proceed with the legislative amendment which we did introduce.

When you look at the records, Mr. Speaker, we will find that on May 2, 1979 when I introduced the bill to have the salary set by order in council, none of the members opposite objected.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I ask the minister, in future to tailor his answer to the rules of the question period. The answers, as with the questions, should be as brief as possible and not be an argument. I detect the minister is in fact debating the issues and I can't allow him to proceed.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary on that, Mr. Speaker. Is it not true, Mr. Minister, that there was a suggestion as well from this side of the House that salary be tied to a senior deputy minister's salary so it would rise with the deputy minister's salary?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I have checked the record. There is no indication whatsoever that is the case. I can assure the member while the hon. member for Thunder Creek did raise the question, we did discuss the possibility and we couldn't come up with a proposal from either me or from him of who it might be. I told him if he had a specific proposal I would be prepared to consider it. We then decided to make the amendment to set the salary by order in council and that was acceptable. Mr. Speaker, may I also assure the hon. member we are open on the matter to give further consideration to the question.

MR. ANDREW: — One further question arising out of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Crown Petroleum and Natural Gas Rights Sale

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce to this legislature and to the people of Saskatchewan the results of the first Crown petroleum and natural gas rights sale to be held this year, 1980. These sales, Mr. Speaker, have been held in Saskatchewan for over 25 years and the sale held on Tuesday of this week was an all-time record. Bids totalling \$22.5 million were accepted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — These, Mr. Speaker, surpassed by a wide margin the previous record of \$12.0 million established for a single sale in 1978, even though in this sale a smaller number of acres was disposed of. It is well known that the land sale interest in prices is one of the best indications of oil industry interest in an area, and to paraphrase a popular line in Saskatchewan this year — even the oil industry is helping to Celebrate Saskatchewan. Almost 50 companies, Mr. Speaker, participated in the sale of rights to explore and develop oil and natural gas in this province — new companies to Saskatchewan and old, small companies and large, local companies and ones from elsewhere. Interest is at an all-time high and is spread all over the oil and gas bearing

regions in Saskatchewan.

I would, Mr. Speaker, like to briefly mention a few of the highlights. Four exploration permits were sold. The highest price paid was \$1,061,000 by Keith Ford Land Services on behalf of an undisclosed client of clients for a permit in the heavy oil region of the west-central Saskatchewan town of Landis. Eleven drilling reservations were sold. Four of these were for over \$1 million each. The top price was \$1,719,000 paid by the partners of Gulf Oil-Petro-Canada for a drilling reservation in the Tramping Lake East area. Bids for 69 leases sold totalled \$10.6 million. The team of Canada City Services and yes, for the benefit of the member opposite, SaskOil paid \$1,244 million for a 640 acre lease adjacent to a new pool that is developing south of Wilkie, a price of almost \$2,000 per acre. Two other high bids were in the Steelman area in the southeast and in the Success area in the southwest.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that this government has created a business climate that the oil industry finds productive and attractive while, Mr. Speaker, still maximizing the benefits to the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — I wonder would the minister permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: — Pardon me. The member must proceed with his statement.

MR. LARTER: — I am interested to know, Mr. Minister, if part of the 200 wells that SaskOil has indicated they are going to participate in this year is in this land purchase and how much of this \$22 million in sales SaskOil is going to take part in? I do commend you for the sale but I can assure you the climate still has not been created where it is lucrative for the companies to come back on a real extensive drilling program.

Point of Privilege

CBC News Transcripts and Leader-Post Reports

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Under orders of the day I rise on a matter of privilege. I regret that I have not given to the Speaker or to the House written notice of the privilege. I ask your permission, Sir, to waive the privilege. I shall state my privilege as follows and I want to say very quickly in the only sense of debate that I'd not raise the privilege with any sense of further antagonism or heightening of debate, but I do believe it's a matter which, if I'm correct, has to be redressed.

I would like to table for the House copies of what I believe to be are a CBC radio transcript on the 6 a.m. news of April 10, 1980. I should also like to table a copy of the Leader-Post, page 3 of this morning, April 10, 1980. This relates, Mr. Speaker, to the words, as quoted, of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. I refer now to the Leader-Post article, referring to the matter of yesterday in the committee of finance. I quote:

Never in the years that I have been in the House have I seen a Chairman deliberately in estimates take away the opposition's questioning and pursuit of lines of questioning of a cabinet minister to give government members a chance to defend themselves or attempt to get themselves out of a bad

predicament. Estimates have always been for the opposition to hold the government to account. Opposition members have a right to pursue lines of questioning. We were cut off on numerous occasions today and I've never seen a more shameful, partisan display by a Chairman in my years in the House.

And later in another capacity the quote says:

The individual should at least have enough brains to disqualify himself as Deputy Speaker when he was the Chairman of committee of finance. I just can't believe the individual would be foolish enough to wear two hats and be judge and jury at the same time.

On the CBC radio script, my privilege relates in essence to the same words that I've said but to the following quote by reporter, Mr. Vernon Good:

Mr. Lane said he was also amazed that Mr. Allen took the Chair as Deputy Speaker to rule on an issue which he himself had raised. He said he couldn't believe he was foolish enough to wear two hats. Just last week the Tory member for Thunder Creek, Colin Thatcher, was named and suspended for casting aspersions on the Speaker. Mr. Lane said the PCs had been right in their reaction in those incidents. He said the record shows Mr. Thatcher made an unqualified withdrawal of his remarks and as for himself, he was responding to partisanship in the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I say that according to the rules of parliament, I read now from Erskine May (and I'll sit down on this) a quote on page 152, Breaches of Privilege and Contempts:

On 26 February 1701, the House of Commons resolved that to print or publish . . .

May I stop here from the quote to say publish in my judgment is publish by virtue of discussion or reporting of incidences in the House through the press.

On 26 February 1701, the House of Commons resolved that to print or publish any libels reflecting upon any member of the House (and I would stress this to the members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Qu'Appelle) for or relating to his service therein, was a high violation of the rights and privileges of the House (a). "Written imputations, as affecting a Member of Parliament, may amount to breach of privilege, without, perhaps, being libels at common law" (b), but to constitute a breach of privilege a libel upon a Member must concern the character or conduct of the Member in that capacity.

And I say the words in the context in which I read them which say, there is a shameful partisan display by a committee chairman, is a reflection on the hon. member qua his capacity as Chairman and as a member of this House. Further I allege that the words as reported by Mr. Vernon Good that "the record shows Mr. Thatcher made an unqualified withdrawal of his remarks and as for himself he was responding to partisanship in the Chair" is susceptible to the direct interpretation of casting reflection on you, Sir, the Chair, and if not through you, certainly if the word was meant in another context, on the Chair, namely while the member for Rosemont was acting in his capacity as Chairman

on the committee of finance. I state my privilege to be that.

MR. SPEAKER: — The matter of privilege is always a very serious matter and as such it deserves serious consideration by the Chair. I want to avail myself of the opportunity of examining the evidence that has been submitted by the Attorney General with regard to this question. Therefore I will reserve my judgment and hope to appraise the House of my opinion on the matter as early as possible.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, when you are considering, I will for clarification withdraw without any equivocation any words that are meant as a slur against yourself. Preface: I would ask Mr. Speaker to consider when he is talking about a libel against a member as referred to the House Leader, that the defence to a libel against any individual is truth and I think the Attorney General will agree in absolute truth. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to take into account Hansard of April 4, 1979 wherein the hon. member, Mr. Allen was in the Chair in committee of finance, and the following discussion took place, Mr. Thatcher thanking Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank goodness that there is somebody who is impartial in this Assembly.

And Mr. Allen said:

I'm not a bit impartial.

Take into account the statement that Mr. Allen made at that time in his position in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. If it has any relationship to the particular case of privilege the Attorney General has put forward . . . Order. This is a very serious occasion and bickering at the Chair with contemptuous chatter, which is vacuous to say the best, doesn't help this situation. I want to say to the members again, clearly, if it bears any relationship to this particular point of privilege that's raised by the Attorney General, I will consider it. Otherwise it will not be part of the case or part of the decision.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, on that point of privilege I was just looking through the Debates and Proceedings and I want to bring to your attention that this legislature did not sit April 4 and I would like the member to clarify where he is relating to that.

MR. LANE: — One, nine, seven, nine (1979).

MR. SPEAKER: — All right. I think we've had enough on this now. Government motions?

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Video and Audio Taping of Crown Corporations Committee Proceedings

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — moved, seconded by the member for Regina-Wascana (Mr. C.O. White):

That the matter of the video and audio taping of the proceedings of the Crown corporations committee be referred to the special committee on rules and procedures for a report thereon with all convenient speed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I shall be presenting a motion which in effect reflects the intention of the Crown corporations committee relating to the matter of television and audio taping of the proceedings of the Crown corporations committee. May I say at the outset that the reason I am introducing this motion, Mr. Speaker, I think the record will show was because the Chairman of Crown corporations who would have normally moved this was not granted leave on the day he attempted to raise the issue, by the Progressive Conservative opposition. As a consequence he was forced to consider putting this on as a notice of motion but on further examination of the record it is revealed that he already does have a motion on the order paper and therefore could not put a second motion in his own name.

Given the degree of attention which apparently has arisen to this issue in some quarters, it was felt by members on this side of the House that the best way to pursue this matter, as quickly as possible, would be to introduce it by way of a government motion, thus, the introduction of this in my capacity as House Leader.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to make is that members on this side of the House have no intention of adjourning the debate on this particular resolution today, or for that matter, on any day. We are willing and prepared, after the debate takes place, for as long as it should take place, to have the subject matter of the issue referred to the special interparliamentary, interparty committee for resolution, and as the item indicates in the motion “for a report thereon with all convenient speed” — that’s how the motion will read. If, however, members of the opposition choose to adjourn the debate, we shall not oppose their right to adjourn. We won’t support it but we will not oppose it. We will leave the matter of further adjournments on this issue to them. I simply want to indicate that in our view, we are ready to deal with it in this regard.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I must make a comment, if I can in my capacity as House Leader as well, about what I believe is developing surrounding the terms of this motion with respect to the way this House does business (if I can word it that way).

I think members will all know that we have set up, as a legislature, an interparty committee on rules and procedures. In reality this is a continuation, or a continuum, of a committee which was established a year ago or so. I don’t think this is a misrepresentation when I say that the intended (forget about the actual terms of reference, although I think they embrace everything as well) development of this committee was to provide a forum in a non-partisan atmosphere for review of rules, committees, a question of television, the question of tapings and the like, in the House and outside the House. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think the rules prohibit me from commenting more directly on any of the minutes and decisions taken by the committee, but I think it’s correct for me to say and not improper to allude to the fact that the question of televisions within the committees and within the Assembly is a matter under current discussion that I think is one factor which simply cannot be disputed.

Mr. Speaker, I frankly, and I say this with as much conviction as I can muster, believed (and I suppose I still believe although my conviction has been somewhat tattered) that the rules committee was the place where individuals could proceed on that basis. I find, accordingly, that the development of the introduction of the private members bill today, unilaterally, by the hon. member for Wilkie (first reading), betrays somewhat (I don’t want to overstate

it) the trust of the committee, or what I believe was the committee's efforts to legitimately sit down and work out suggested changes. We have not done anything yet other than to report on an interim basis to the House, Mr. Speaker, on the questions of radio taping of question period and other outstanding matters before the House to work out. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I do think we should try to get back on to the track of getting the members of the House to deal with this issue where I believe it should properly be dealt with, namely through the rules committee and then through a report to this House, a debate on the report of the committee, adoption, rejection, or amendment of the report, and then allow the orderly flow of these matters.

The fourth point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is related not to some degree on what I believe has been a very important collateral issue raised by this whole incident which sparks the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I would argue that there are two issues to which members ought to address themselves at some point or other. One issue is, shall there be video and taping of Crown corporations committee proceedings, or if you will to extend it, video taping and other taping of the proceedings of the House of Commons. I am not going to address myself to that issue today other than to say that many of us believe that the time has come for television to appear under appropriate guidelines and rules agreed on unanimously, hopefully by all the parties and by the press, so there can be an orderly publishing in that sense of the proceedings of this House and of the committees of the House.

That, Mr. Speaker, begs the issue, at least the issue I want to speak on today. There is a second issue which I think is very germane to what is happening here, and gives rise to this motion and that is the mechanism by which this Assembly does its business and changes the rules of the Assembly in order to accommodate the wishes of members.

I received a letter on this particular issue from one Allan Arbuckle, president of the press gallery, who argued the incidences in the Crown corporations committee amounted to a freedom of speech issue. That I think was the way the letter was worded. I have it here in front of me. I will not go into the details of it because I believe the Chairman of the Crown corporations committee has a copy of it. The Leader of the Opposition has a copy of it and I have a copy of it as well.

I think the letter (speaking to the second broad issue) raises a number of questions which are important but far from simple. I want to take this opportunity before I introduce the motion to comment on these questions related to the motion. In my view it is a very much more complex problem than a simple appeal (as a siren calls an appeal that might be) to say that it's a matter simply of freedom of the press and freedom of speech.

I think it is appropriate to ask whether or not the CKCK television camera crew, reporter and crew, acted responsibly in genuine furtherance of the goal of freedom of the press by bringing cameras into the Crown corporations committee without the prior authorization of the committee itself or the rules and procedures committee or I would argue more importantly, Mr. Speaker, of the legislature itself. Freedom of speech, television publications an issue — but the way we go about in a democratic society changing those rules is equally important as freedom of speech.

As all members know Crown corporations is already open to the press and to the public. A verbatim transcript of the debates are published on almost a daily basis. They are

available to the public the day after the committee meets. That is the procedure of the committee. It has been duly sanctioned by the legislature. I should point out that the Saskatchewan Assembly, to my knowledge, is one of the few Canadian jurisdictions to convene a Crown corporations committee, let alone one to which press and public have freedom of access of information. That fact I think, Mr. Speaker, can go unchallenged. The hon. members opposite point to British Columbia. The British Columbia Crown corporations committee had not met since the last part of April 1979 and still has not met to review any of its Crown corporations' operations. I say, without challenge, this legislature has had a history of openness of information and access to that, more than any other legislature in Canada.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, the events leading to Mr. Mantyka's presence (the CKCK television reporter) with camera in hand at the meetings of the Crown corporations committee of last Tuesday to be as follows.

The reporter apparently requested permission of the committee Chairman to televise the committee's debates. The committee Chairman may want to enter into the debate later on himself. My information is that the Chairman agreed to raise the matter with the committee at its next meeting. However, before this matter was raised at the next meeting and the question decided by the committee, the television cameras, with the reporter within the committee room, were on and the recording of the proceedings took place.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I say again, the issue is not whether the cameras should or shouldn't be rolling. The issue here is whether or not we have respect for the way the rules of this institution are changed. That is the issue that is involved here. Mr. Speaker, the issue is whether I have the right, because I do not like a particular rule in a particular committee or of this House, to unilaterally take it upon myself to act in such a way as to obstruct the entire operations of the committee because of the belief of my view.

The issue of freedom of speech, Mr. Speaker, is directly tied into this because we cannot have video taping or other taping of Crown corporations, nor can we have any of the discussions, unless we can agree in an orderly and democratic way to change the rules which are tied on this matter.

The hon. member was out when I told my position on television taping in the House. I said I favored it. My issue now is the mechanism which is being sought here. I believe Mr. White, the Chairman, acted quite properly in ruling that the CKCK cameras should not be allowed to remain in the room. I think, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to all it involved, that there was in some ways a very unfortunate lack of courtesy displayed by a number of members and a number — sorry, not by members but by the media; I withdraw the members — certainly by the media and particularly, if I may say, the CKCK in disregarding Mr. White's request that he have an opportunity to discuss the matter first with the members of the committee and also flying in the face of parliamentary practice here, in Ottawa and at Westminster.

It is accepted principle, Mr. Speaker, everywhere that parliament alone is authorized to determine what debates may be recorded and whether they may be broadcast or telecast. For that very reason only a few months ago TV cameras were refused permission to tape the hearings of a committee of the House.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that members of the press gallery knew, or ought fully well to have known, that the rules committee was debating the very issue of televising of the

legislature and its committees. Indeed, the press gallery itself was invited to make a submission to that committee, one result of which has been the recent agreement of the House to a trial period for a taping for broadcast of question period, committee of finance and committee of the whole

I can only assume all members of the media were aware of that submission and of that committee, and yet some chose to ignore its existence and to intrude into the Crown corporations committee because they felt they did not like the rules such as they were written.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that veteran reporters of the legislature (or otherwise) would be well advised to respect, in my judgment, the rules of this honoured institution. I candidly admit that very often we, as members of this House, (and I take more blame than anybody in this regard), perhaps act in such a way as to not engender the respect of the institution by the press. But the institution is greater than I am or greater than any of the members and it is incumbent upon the members of the press gallery to respect that institution and the way business is done here, as much as it is upon everyone else in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I say the television reports which stem from this motion sensationalize in a one-sided way (and I regret to say this but I say it to the CKCK reporter) sensationalize in a very bad way. In a way they made the arguments for those who would argue that for the sake of a few minutes of so-called good television, the worst suspicions and fears of the abuse of the media and the televising of the proceeding should be taken note of by the members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, we should remember that Saskatchewan was one of the first assemblies anywhere to allow radio broadcasts of the throne speech and budget debate. I am convinced this was a wise decision. I think that television will also be a wise decision. I believe radio broadcasts of the debates in the House helped to make the Saskatchewan voter part of the most politically intelligent and best informed electorate in the nation. It was in this spirit the rules and procedures committee recently recommended that the House allow tapes during question period, committee of finance and committee of the whole to be broadcast on a trial basis. I hope that experiment will prove to be a successful one as well.

The televising of Crown corporations committee, Mr. Speaker, is a different matter because of the obvious nature of the meeting. I think it is only natural that legislators everywhere who have a concern to protect the privileges and dignities of their parliaments and to ensure the public receives an accurate reporting and impression of their debates with a minimum of distortion should have genuine reservations about the use of television in the House. That's a legitimate concern. Maybe the members opposite have come to their conclusion already, quickly, but there are many who have not. I think it is a legitimate concern. Let me explain what I mean by that.

The first problem, as I see it, rests in the adaptation of the committee debates or the legislative debates to the viewer at home. Whereas a newspaper reporter or radio commentator may be able to summarize the complexities of a lengthy parliamentary argument for the reader or listener, the television reporter obviously faces a much more

difficult task. He or she must rely primarily upon images and pictures, in addition to the words. The TV reporter has an advantage and also a distinct disadvantage over his media colleagues.

Speaking directly to a politician in an interview, a well-trained TV reporter will be able to encapsule an issue and show the view precisely how the politician responded, the shock or the pleasure on his face, the confidence or the tell-tale nervousness of his manner, in a way that a radio interviewer or a newspaper reporter simply cannot or will not. But I would argue that it would be much more difficult for a TV reporter to take a long speech in the House, delivered not directly to the camera but to the Assembly as a whole, in a style customary of a Chamber, or of a committee, and then translate that in a way which can be readily grasped by the general public and to distil that speech into two or three minutes of television for the 6:00 p.m. news. How are even our best TV reporters (and I think we've got some good ones) going to be able to do that without unwittingly and unintentionally distorting in some way or other the members' statements in the House?

I think a second question of concern raises a matter of editing of these television proceedings and the taping of them in the Crown corporations committee. It is obvious not all that goes on in the legislature would be of interest to the viewing public at all times. I think of the many hours of procedural debates, motions, amendments and technical and complicated Crown corporations reports and so forth. How can members be assured that the events in the House will be edited in the spirit of impartiality? It's not a question of deliberate bias. We win some and we lose some — all of us do in the reports. Rather, it's a question of the legislature and it's a question as well of the ground rules that the legislature sets upon the publication of its reports. We set the ground rules when we say to the newspaper people up there, and radio people, you can tape question period but on a trial period only. We set the ground rules. We say to them that we want to have a period of complaint of up to 72 hours agreed by everybody. That kind of ground rule with respect to television must equally be applied.

I ask the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, to hearken back to the recently concluded federal election campaign. Do you remember the television advertisements run by a political party, excerpted from out of the House of Commons in slow motion, showing members applauding, and in slow motion characterizing the prime minister — now former prime minister — as he was then, in a sneering, very obvious patronizing, or arrogant position? That commercial was not designed to boost Mr. Trudeau. That taping of television proceedings was abused, and I say that if we want to be able to allow television taping in the committees or in the House, the rules have to be clearly defined in order for them to be fair to us, to the opposition, and to the members of the press gallery, and not to move in on a holus-bolus operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have some concern when I see a report of CKCK-TV, April 2, 6 o'clock and 11 o'clock news. I just want to quote the area because if it gets too long, and my speech is already getting too long. Mr. Mantyka is a reporter on this issue. I know how passionately he feels about it.

Today was the second day that CKCK-TV had been televising the Crown corporations committee of the legislature. Although camera are banned from the Legislative Assembly itself no specific ruling has ever been drawn

up prohibiting TV from committee meetings.

And here's the part that I object to.

The NDP have long opposed televisions in the legislature, partly because their members do not have a strict code of behaviour to follow in the legislature. The fear is cameras can catch the NDP members at an embarrassing moment.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that is subjective opinion and not factual reporting. The conduct of the NDP members on this side of the House, in this House, and on this committee are par none. They will stand up by the conduct of any member of this House at any time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now, Mr. Speaker, one could go on and politically I know what awaits me for this kind of speech. But you know the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I could go on and indicate two minutes. I don't begrudge the handsome face of the hon. member for Moosomin who was on, handsome face of the hon. member for Wilkie who was on, and the very grim face of the Chairman was on for about 40 seconds according to our timing. He was on at the time of kicking out, yes, kicking out the cameras. I could go through this as review, Mr. Speaker, but that's not my intention. My intention of saying this is to say that it is not for CKCK or for anyone of us to unilaterally change the rules unless and until by the time-honored traditions of parliament we all agree to change the rules.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And if we ever embark, Mr. Speaker, on that kind of a situation of unilaterally changing the rules on our own, then indeed the institution of this parliament will be destroyed. Confidence will be destroyed. Members can agree or disagree on television taping in a committee or not in a committee. That's up to them but the issue here before us is the means of achieving that end.

Mr. Speaker, I've taken too much of the House already. I want to introduce the motion and I want to close by saying some will argue, maybe, that there were television cameras allowed at the time of meeting of the privileges committee on the so-called Berntson letter affair. I don't know if they were or weren't. I wasn't there. I ask the hon. members and any of the members of the press who believe they know, to tell me where the television cameras in the Berntson affair were allowed to record and to publish the proceedings of the committee. What took place Mr. Speaker, at Berntson was that television cameras were allowed to pan the members assembling, were asked to move out and moved out at the time of the hearing. That is totally different from the cameras positioning themselves in Crown corporations, recording and publishing the proceedings of the committee. I could be corrected on that; maybe I'm wrong. I candidly confess I do not have a factual document which would support this one way or the other but that is my recollection. And that is far different from, Mr. Speaker, the procedure which took place here with CKCK-TV on Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying we do not intend to adjourn this motion. We will not oppose the opposition if they choose to adjourn the motion. We are anxious, however long the debate will take today, to have the issue referred to the special committee on rules because I still believe, notwithstanding the private member's bill, notwithstanding

what's taken place, that all of us, press included, believe that the institution, the way we do business around here, still can work. And that committee will indeed achieve its objectives. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it's my job to facilitate the decision of the committee and I think it can be facilitated. There's nothing preventing the committee to be called into order quickly, have the issue debated quickly, have the issue decided quickly — nothing preventing the committee from doing that whatsoever other than perhaps (and I hope this is not the case) the intentions, political or otherwise, of some members.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that in entering this debate we will not once more be treated to flaming oratory about the denial of information and freedom of speech and the kinds of things which we've been hearing repetitively on CKCK-TV during the last few days. Of course, if the hon. members choose to do that there's nothing I can do about it. but, I think, Mr. Speaker, we have here a mechanism to do this by the rules of the game — to do it quickly, to do it fairly and efficiently, to do it effectively, to preserve the institution which is parliament, to preserve the institution which is the Crown corporations committee, and to preserve the integrity of all of us. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Smishek . . . actually, I'm sorry, I need direction here. Can I get a private member to second this? I'd like to have the Crown corporations committee Chairman, that's one way of . . . I'll have the Hon. Chairman of the Crown corporations be my seconder because he wanted to move the motion in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, we had today one of the most glaring examples of political paranoia I think anybody has ever seen. The Attorney General, if he ever gets what he thinks is press not doing exactly what he wants, says it's the fault of the press, or it's the fault of the opposition, or it's the fault of somebody else. Never has he stood up and taken the blame for his own actions.

The Attorney General gave a display of inconsistencies that I don't think any members can recall. He says the issue is freedom of speech and that he stood foursquare for freedom of speech. Yet he says the TV cameras and the tape recorders cannot go into Crown corporations. He says he stands for free speech. But a reporter for the Leader-post can't write an article condemning the government or criticizing the government. Some defence of free speech that is! It wasn't one. We see today just blatant political attempt by the House Leader. I suggest the government (as he indicated people wanting to second the motion) is afraid to have television in the Assembly and is afraid to have television in the Crown corporations. That is the issue.

The Attorney General refers to the privileges committee. No hesitation by the government opposite to go in and get a Conservative with all the press trailing behind, and the cameras. That's fine. But when it comes to financial accountability of the government, they're afraid.

I ask the Attorney General what happened when he talks about the rules and how we're to proceed. He very conveniently forgot the request by the government opposite to have the TV cameras in here televising the budget speech — very strange that he forgot that, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General talks about the mechanism — how we deal with the house. He knows full well, and I'm sure the press knows full well, if we talk about the rules we can find rules in Beauchesne's and every other parliamentary lexicon which deals with both sides of every situation. And that's fair and that's proper. We've had

rulings for several hundreds of years, obviously inconsistent and inconsistent to everybody. They they're needed.

The Attorney General himself though, is the epitome of inconsistency today, when on the one hand he cries that we must follow these rules and yet doesn't hesitate to argue two or three sides of the same issue continually in this Assembly.

The Attorney General is exhibiting today his belief in an archaic tradition, that is ruling out television in the Assembly and the Crown corporations committee. The weak justifications are amazing. I'll just run through another one that came to mind. I couldn't believe it because it was so weak. He goes into British Columbia where the Crown corporations committee hasn't sat. That is some defence against having televisions in our Crown corporations committee but that was the touchstone of his argument there. No other province in Canada, dealing with Crown corporations committee, has as a segment of government expenditure a larger effort by Crown corporations than the province of Saskatchewan. It is the biggest percentage of government expenditures and one for which we have no effective way of holding the government to account. The members opposite know it. And, secondly, we have no way of communicating the public that we don't have an effective way of holding the government to account. The limited issues which do come up two years later are of course very rarely communicated to the public.

The Attorney General is archaic in his thinking when he ignores the changes. In the old days in politics at the turn of the century, the successful politician was the silver-tongued orator. We can think of many of those from John A. MacDonald on down who were successful. They stumped across this great land. We then look at the change. In the 1930s, radio became the means of mass communication or one of them. Then we looked at politicians who were successful because they either adjusted to or capitalized on that media, and the obvious one is Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Now, the means of mass communication without doubt is television and the Attorney General wants that stopped for the people of Saskatchewan. I make the offer right now to the government opposite — we're prepared today to have an immediate sitting which will adopt a rule to allow television into the Crown corporations committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Immediately. We had no communication from your whip as to whether you would. Is there some way we can work out a compromise and try it for the balance of the session? Oh sure, there's the answer, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Melville said that he's just afraid of television. He's afraid of the Conservatives sneaking in the back door. That's the whole justification of the government's position. That's what he just said. That is the reason they don't want television. The hon. member for Melville has just let the cat out of the bag, I think. In his own words, they are afraid.

The issue is not freedom of speech. If the issue were freedom of speech, I would hate to be fighting a battle in favor of freedom of speech under the leadership of the Attorney General after that defence today, because it was inconsistent and, frankly, irrelevant. He wants to stop the press from writing bad things against the government. He's criticized the press for that. It's logical, of course, that because he referred to a television ad about the last federal election, that you stop the print medium from using caricatures because they sometimes put politicians in bad light. It's a logical extension of the foolish argument of the Attorney General. He's afraid of distortion. But it certainly didn't bother the Attorney General in this Assembly to distort even the written word

when he accused a former member for Rosetown-Elrose of favoring deterrent fees. Rather inconsistent. It's all right for the Attorney General to distort and twist the written word.

The reason he's afraid of television is that he is such an expert at distortion that he knows it could be used easily against him. He knows better than anybody else, because he's probably the political expert. There's no real answer in the Attorney General's remarks. The attack in the press — I don't think any member took that seriously as being a justification for putting this to the rules committee and not having TV in the Crown corporations. Freedom of speech — you know that's not an issue and in fact the reverse is true. Fear of distortion — not much of an argument. The fact that B.C. doesn't have television, it's Crown corporations committee hasn't met — very specious arguments. So when we strip that 15 or 20 minute speech down to the bare bones there's not much there, is there? There's not much there. In fact we come right back to what I said at the beginning of my remarks: fear of television. The government opposite is afraid of both television and public accountability. We see today, as I say, an example of political paranoia by the Attorney General. What are the real issues? The issue is whether or not we, as elected representatives, are communicating with the voters of this province, and whether or not we, as elected members, are bringing the matters of public accountability and government spending to the greatest number of voters, so that they can make a rational decision when they cast their ballots. Not once was that issue confronted by the Attorney General — not once! I think, Mr. Speaker, that that of itself indicates the rather weak arguments of the Attorney General and the true position of the government opposite, because he's not speaking just for himself.

The fact is that the public deserves televisions, is entitled to television in this Assembly and in the Crown corporations committee. We in the Conservative caucus intend to fight for that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into this debate, particularly given some of the comments made by the member for Qu'Appelle. The member has made very heavy water of the question at stake here. I think he has not been totally direct in referring to the Attorney General's remarks of a few minutes earlier. He makes reference to the comment that the Attorney General is, as I believe he said, afraid of television, does not want television in the Assembly and in the committees.

I asked the hon. member for Regina South because he was sitting here whether or not he would consider listening to the remarks and speeches made in this House by the members on this side. I heard the Attorney General express his personal opinion on that question. He expressed it clearly and openly in this House. He did not attempt to speak for all members of the House but he did express his personal opinion and expressed it clearly for you to hear.

The member for Qu'Appelle has deliberately decided not to listen or hear what the Attorney General said on this question and as a result has given a very emotional speech which in no way addresses the remarks the Attorney General made.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is something very, very important here which must be considered and taken carefully into account. I think at this time it is particularly important we address this issue. The Attorney General has referred to it. It is the

question of rules and procedures and how the rules and procedures are developed and how they change. That, Mr. Speaker, is a question of the fundamental kind of respect for this Assembly and respect for the parliamentary system.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago when I was not a member for this Assembly, I recall some Conservative members being elected to this Assembly. They came into this Assembly and got a lot of coverage for a particular point they made. That point was this. (I believe this went back to around 1975; it is ironic and almost humorous to look back on that now.) They said there was a problem in the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. They said there was no respect for this Assembly. They particularly criticized the then opposition on those grounds. I remember clearly members of the Conservative Party being elected saying there was going to be no more chewing gum in this Assembly, for example. They said there was going to be no more disrespect for the rules and procedures and the laws if you like, of this Assembly. That's what the Conservative Party . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — What has that got to do with TV coverage?

MR. McARTHUR: — I'll tell you what it has to do with what we are saying here. That's what the Conservative Party said no more than three or four years ago. Now what does the member for Qu'Appelle say today, I ask you the member for Regina South? What he says is this: the rules are irrelevant. He says the rules are irrelevant because he says (and he's a lawyer) I can find for every subject one rule which says do this and another rule which says do that. I can find you a different rule for every problem. He says why are talking about rules. Rules have nothing to do with this. We don't believe in rules because . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McARTHUR: — That is exactly what the member for Qu'Appelle said no more than five minutes ago in this Assembly. Now, Mr. Speaker, that tells me a great deal about what has been happening in this Assembly I commented on this last week. We are learning something because here we have the members of the opposition and the leading spokesman on this particular question, which deals with a question of how to proceed on a particular subject of this Assembly, standing up and saying the rules are irrelevant. For every subject you can find at least two and possibly more rules that say something different and contradictory and therefore don't pay any attention to the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say quite sincerely I don't understand how a parliament can function, continue to exist and maintain respect if that is the belief of members of a parliament. It is absolutely clear, Mr. Speaker, we've always believed in parliaments and always operated in parliaments on the basis of rules and procedures, as the Attorney General indicated. The question that is very important (and the hon. members opposite aren't prepared to even talk about it) is, will we proceed according to acceptable and traditional processes of decision-making within an Assembly like this? Will we or won't we?

The hon. members say no, we should not. The hon. members say there is no point in proceeding in that way. Let each and every person determine on his own what his privileges are in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, it would be very helpful for the members opposite, and for all of us who are involved in this Assembly, all members and auxiliary people who are associated with this Assembly, to take some time to study the history

and development of privilege within parliaments, to come to understand what that particular question means.

What it means is this, we are all here with certain kinds of privileges. Those privileges established by tradition and established by precedent, and established by explicit decision-making by assemblies But those privileges provided and guaranteed by law. There are ways you make laws and there are ways you change laws. There are ways you make rules and there are ways you change rules. The question that comes up here is, how do we proceed, Mr. Speaker to make a decision one way or the other on the question of television within these Chambers, or within its committee, or the question of audio taping of proceedings in this Assembly or this committee? How do we proceed to make decisions about that?

Now the hon. members opposite fail to recognize that that is a fundamental principal of a parliament. As a result of failing to recognize that, I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to know how we are going to continue to function effectively as a parliament. They simply must come to grips with this question. Without respect for the rule of law within parliament or the rule of law within society, there is no way of having civilized, productive behaviour, and civilized, productive proceedings. These members I recall campaigned not more than a year and one-half ago, complaining about the breakdown of rules of law. I remember some members of their party trying to make an issue out of that. It shows you what kinds of beliefs these members have, in what they state to the people in terms of their philosophy, because they show absolutely inconsistent behaviour with any of that.

The member for Regina South has indicated this afternoon that he has no willingness whatsoever to consider making decisions according to the established practice by which we establish rules and change rules, and establish privileges and change privileges.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another question that arise here. The member for Qu'Appelle made a great deal of the Attorney General's statements with regard to not only establishing the answer to the question, but how you go about doing it. The member for Qu'Appelle says that is irrelevant; you don't need to worry about the impact of television on the functioning of an assembly or the functioning of a committee. It's not something to worry about. He says the Attorney General is concerned about inhibiting freedom of speech by raising that kind of question.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote to you, and members of the House, something that was on my desk when I arrived here today — and I presume it is on the desk of other members. It comes to us courtesy of the director of news and public information of CKCK television and I thank the director for providing this information to us. I appreciate having received that information. It contains an attachment, and the member for Indian Head-Wolseley might care to take the time to read the attachment rather than throwing out his comments. The article is written by the former speaker of the House of Commons in Ottawa and he describes the particular approach that has developed in Ottawa with respect to the use of cameras.

He talks about a very specific kind of approach that takes place according to a well-established set of rules and procedures and it's called the gavel to gavel coverage as I understand it. And he says this gavel to gavel coverage has avoided dangerous pitfalls — grandstanding for the cameras, editorializing by cameramen and disruption of proceedings by crews of competing technicians. The same policy requires the camera

to be on the speaker or MP who has the floor, even when the action may appear to rest elsewhere and so on.

Now, what's pointed out in this article, is that there are some very, very important decisions and considerations that must be taken into account before you make any decision to unilaterally proceed. The member for Qu'Appelle says it is wrong to be concerned about those kinds of matters. Now I say that is not really worthy of comment other than to point out to you how totally irresponsible the member for Qu'Appelle really is on this question. He has no interest whatsoever in the difficult subject of how you bring in a new medium such as television into the committee and the Assembly. He has no interest in that question whatsoever. All he wishes to do is play pure and blatant politics with this issue to try to grandstand for the press, to try to gain some headlines on this particular issue.

I want to say that I believe the Attorney General has done the right thing. The Attorney General has referred this question to the appropriate committee, the committee that is established to deal with these kinds of questions, the committee that has the capacity and ability to deliberate, not only on the general question but on how you would proceed having made a decision on the general question. I say that's where the matter belongs and I simply say in closing I have every confidence that committee will deal with this matter and deal with it seriously. I have every confidence that as a result of that, we will get a clear and definite answer to this particular question of how we should proceed. And I also want to say in closing that I very, very much hope — whether it be members opposite or members on this side or members of the press gallery or any of us who have privileges within this Assembly — we develop a much higher respect of the rules, the procedures, the questions of privileges and how privileges develop and change. I hope that we learn to take this legislature which is a parliament and the well-established traditions for decision-making within such legislature into account before we act as irrationally as the hon. members opposite have attempted to act on this particular issue.

I remind you of one of the great parliamentarians from Saskatchewan (we've had many) the former prime minister of this country, the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker. Mr. Diefenbaker was a man who firmly held that regardless of the differences of opinion one held (and he held many strong differences of opinion with members of parliament who represented the party that I represent in this provincial legislature) one should respect the rules, the procedures, the privileges and traditions of that parliament.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McARTHUR: — And I say to the hon. members opposite that I believe your behaviour with respect to what I understand happened in the Crown corporations committee will not stand you well in terms of your many supporters who were supporters of the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker. They supported that man for many, many reasons but one of the reasons they supported him was they supported his belief in that kind of thing. I would have many differences with what the gentleman stood for in terms of public policy, and in terms of ideology; but I would stand foursquare with him in his belief that there is no future for the effective functioning of a parliament if you don't have respect for that parliament, for the procedures and rules under which that parliament must function in order to maintain order, and in order to have that parliament effectively do its business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — The matter of this debate, I think, has various dimensions to it. I will tell the members of this House, as a member of the rules committee, and I'll lay out the scenario to you fellows as to just exactly what is going to happen. With your majority you will vote this motion into the rules committee, and the rules committee has a pretty poor record concerning its sitting. Anyway we'll have it with all due haste; and that committee is going to rule — I can tell you right now — TV cameras can come into this House at some future time provided it's under the parliamentary form in Ottawa, and provided it's controlled by Mr. Speaker. That's what the rule is going to be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Stand up and say it! Don't worry about whether we have the proper rules, or we're using this procedure - -that is your position.

The next step in this logical scenario is going to be this — Mr. Attorney General will rise and say, but our legislature sits for such short periods. We're only here for a couple of months, and the cost is enormous. So we better defer that because we're in a time of restraint and a time of tight budget. I can tell you people right now that there will never be a television camera in this House if we follow that procedure. If we follow our procedure we will not see the day in this legislative session or until after another election, or a further election before you see television cameras in here.

Change comes in this type of thing when the pressure calls for change to come, and that's when you're going to see some change. For example this matter has been debated in the committee on rules (and I'm not going to disclose the basis of the debate back and forth) but I ask the people of this Assembly and the people of the media — who heard that debate? Was the press in there? No. Whose going to hear that debate? But we talk about changing the rules and the system to change the rules.

I also sit on another committee in this legislature — the public accounts committee — and what do we have there. What do we have in the public accounts committee? We don't even have the right for any media to come in there. And what is the function on that committee? The function of the public accounts committee is to review the expenditures from the past year of this Assembly. But no, the public accounts should not be open to the media. Nobody hears about it. Nobody hears about that because nobody from the media made it an issue. That's the only way change is going to be effective. Not in one legislature in the Commonwealth does the public accounts committee (where there is one) exclude the media and that is shameful. Are we going to have change? The only way that change will be effected is if there is public pressure brought to bear so that that change will be effected and brought about not through the committee — sure the committee is the vehicle but until the pressure is felt by the members opposite, until the pressure is felt by the members on that side, there will be no change. You talk that way and what we are talking about is a broader issue and I think one of the members brought it up — what we are talking about is the control of the media. You heard the Attorney General and if you cannot read into that statement a suggestion that somehow he has a right to exert some pressure to control the media — he didn't like the way they did this; he didn't like the way they did that — he reverted . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . pardon me?

The member for Regina Lakeview talks about rules and talks about John Diefenbaker, the man in this country who stood up for freedom of speech stronger than any man in the last three decades, who in his bill of rights spoke of freedom of the press and freedom of speech and he makes no mention of it — of the freedom of speech, of a right of a committee or a right of a reporter to walk in and hear the members of this

legislature talking about what the government has done with the money that we allocated to it. That's freedom of speech? That's freedom of the press? Go on! That is the only time that you are going to see change effected. And the only time that change is going to be effected is when we bring this about.

The Attorney General also makes reference to Saskatchewan being the first province to bring in radio broadcasting. So what we have here (if we're honest with ourselves) everyday, every year are a throne speech and a budget speech and we're given radio time. So the whips jockey back and forth — you had three minutes more or two minutes more than you were supposed to, so that I can get my speech from this member or that member out to the folks. That was two decades ago; that was the type of media in place two decades ago. If we think we are in step with modern times we are fooling ourselves. The B.C. legislature, the Alberta legislature, the Manitoba legislature, the Ontario legislature, the Quebec legislature, the Parliament of Canada (and I don't know about the Maritimes) all have television in the Chamber. But no, we're getting to our committee and we're going to get this worked through. We have to work through the rules and procedures. We have a system where we can crack out onto the radio and certain stations would pick it up — the right to hear the budget speech and the throne speech, which are by and large written speeches, stood up and delivered.

What we have to do if we are legislators is to get our message out. The television camera sits in and watches the Saskatoon City Council work or the workings of the Regina City Council but here we sit as a legislature and we say no, no, we can't do it. The legislatures of all other provinces, at least west of Quebec, but no, no, that doesn't matter, we'll work our system through our rules committee. I'll tell you the scenario I've painted on the rules committee is exactly what is going to happen . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . believe in democratic procedures . . .

MR. ANDREW: — Democratic procedures the member for Melville talks about. The member for Melville talks about democratic procedures so that every time you have more members than us. If you were to say the media has no place in the legislature, let's take them all out. . . You would take them all out and say, yes, this is democracy; this is a democratic procedure; we voted for it; there are certain fundamental rights. When we start playing around and I suggest that's what the Attorney General . . . He has had it in his past; he wants to control the media in some way. That's the bottom line.

Many speakers are going to work on this subject and I say to the members opposite, I would like to see one of you have the courage to stand up and speak your own mind and say other than what the Attorney General said. If you have the courage to do that, to demonstrate differences, then I give you odds the committee can resolve this problem. But if not, the committee is going to be controlled by the same man who controls the House.

If we are going to talk about when we are going to have television cameras, there is one man who is going to decide. Let's be honest. I challenge you, members opposite, to stand up and state your position on television in the House and television in committees and on whether the public accounts committee can be open to the media. Your argument is not going to be good enough if you simply say, we have civil servants in there and we can't let you talk to the civil servants. In here the press do that. I would like to see any of you guys stand up and have the courage to state your position on television in this Assembly. Thank you.

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — I want to get into this debate, Mr. Speaker, as one who is interested in television broadcasting of the legislature and who has viewed with interest some television broadcasting of the legislatures across the country and the House of Commons as well. So to the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley who asks, are you in favor or not in favor of television, the answer is yes, I am in favor of television.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — But I think there are some other questions, Mr. Speaker, which might be asked and which I would also want to answer. Do I support the unrestricted use of TV in this House by the media? The answer is no, I do not, as I do not support, and never have supported, nor has this House supported, the unrestricted use of the media in general in this House. I would point out the unrestricted use or abuse of the House, of any member of this House . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — It is my view that this legislature and all parliaments should be governed under a system of rules, a system of laws, as society is governed under a system of laws. It is up to us as legislators to establish those rules.

Another question one might ask is: do I believe in the Ontario or Alberta model of television? The answer is no, I do not.

Another question one might ask: do you believe in the Ottawa system? I think the hon. member for Kindersley raised this point. I say to that one — maybe I do. I think I would be interested in studying that particular system, trying to apply it to Saskatchewan. But that isn't the question I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we are really dealing with this afternoon. How do we come to decisions about what the rules will be, what the laws of the House will be? How do we come to those decisions?

AN HON. MEMBER: — In front of the public.

MR. ALLEN: — O.K. If the argument of the member for Kindersley is that we should come to these decision without reflection by committee, if the argument is that we should decide on television, the form of television, etc., without use of a committee of this House and decide it in this House, fine. If the decision is that we will rule on the size, nature, use of standing committees of this House in this House without recommendations or study by committee, I say fine. If the argument is that public accounts should be open, that the Chairman should have some expanded powers and staff, etc., and that should be done in this House without study reflection by any committee of this House. I say fine. Your argument is not that we should have TV or not have TV. The argument you have given this afternoon is that we should not have a rules committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's right.

MR. ALLEN: — We should not have a rules committee. We should make all these decisions. We should discuss all these things openly. It should take place in this House and no place other than this House. Now, if that's the argument you want to make, I say fine, but I'll tell you it upsets me as a member of that committee. And it should upset you to make that kind of a statement because you know as well as I know, both of us being

serous members of the committee, we've done a lot of work, we've put a lot of study, not only into television but into a whole number of other things.

We are planning on looking and trying to find systems other places in Canada and the Commonwealth where other things have been tried. We want to look at those. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can ever make changes in this House by the method the hon. members opposite suggest because how do we make those decisions? We make those decisions on the basis of rancor. You guys are all wild about TV. It should be in here. Our guys are wild the media had the audacity to go into the Crown corporations committee without permission and I would agree with them they were outrageous to do that.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if we want television, if we want rules changed, it's important those decisions not be made on the basis of a highly charged political argument in this House but made on the basis of a consensus by the opposition and the government. The place to do that is in the rules committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Right.

MR. ALLEN: — You people know the place to change the rules of this House is in the committee. I don't think you people want to make change. I do not believe it is your intention in this debate or in any other debate in this House to make change. It's to make trouble. It's to take a simple issue like should we or should we not have TV (I think many, many people agree we should) and to turn it into a big political debate on whether or not this is an open government or a closed government. That's your argument. So my point and my position is this — this question should go to the rules committee.

I do not agree with the member for Kindersley that any member of that committee will influence me and my decision. I will make my decision on the basis of television giving the arguments that I believe in favor of it to the committee. I have done so in the past. There have been differences of opinion among all members of the committee in both the opposition and the government. I have agreed with members on your side on points. You have agreed with members on our side on points. And other members on both sides have disagreed with us. That's the only way it can work. The only way we can make change to the rules of parliament is by consensus.

If we make change on the basis of a government motion to the rules, what's the argument? The argument is that we have pushed down the opposition. We have taken away the right of the minority in this House. So, every time we do something to make a change that you people disagree with, the argument is that we have taken away your rights as individual members of this legislature. Conversely, when you come up with ideas we don't like and have to vote down here, the argument is that we have in some way taken away your rights as a minority party in this House. So the only way to make change is by this committee — by the rules committee and a report from the rules committee. I think if we were sensible and if we really want to make some useful changes for this House and the people of Saskatchewan, we would support this motion.

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina White): — Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to what the member for Qu'Appelle had to say, pen in hand to write down the essence of any proposal he might make, and I must say I didn't use much ink. The essence of what he had to say was something like this: if there is a rule you dislike, call it archaic and on a moment's notice dump it. that's really the substance of his speech. Can you really run

an institution like the legislature on that basis? I think not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there's a seismograph at the University of Saskatchewan. I'm sure it's almost going off the scale in shock. John Diefenbaker would certainly be rolling around in his grave. He would firmly oppose short-circuiting rules and procedures in a legislature or a parliament. He thought far too much of the institution for that.

Now while I have the opportunity, and I'm seconding this motion, I want to take a few moments to explain to this House what led up to the appearance of a TV camera in Crown corporations committee. At least one of the members opposite mentioned in the committee that he wasn't conversant with the details, and here in brief is what happened. And for the first time I will use Mr. Mantyka's name — it did appear in the letter from the press gallery to you, to Mr. Romanow, and to the Leader of the Opposition, so I will not hesitate to . . . (inaudible) . . . I am just mentioning the name and I am telling you this is the first time I have referred to the person who approached me about TV in the committee.

Mr. Mantyka approached me in the corridor on March 27, after the meeting of the Crown corporations committee. He asked me to seek permission of the Crown corporations committee to bring his TV camera into the committee to film proceedings. He also indicated at the time that he had used a tape recorder in the committee that day and had positioned it close to the speaker. He further indicated, and I think this is important, that there was some question in his mind as to the propriety of having taped the morning's proceedings. The two of us spoke to the Assistant Clerk, and I assured Mr. Mantyka I would raise the matter promptly with the committee. There the matter rested until 9:45 on the morning of Tuesday, April 4 — the time of the next Crown corporations committee meeting. That morning. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . just coming to that. That morning I arrived at room 267 intent on raising the matter with the committee, and raised it promptly. And the records will show I did raise it promptly. But when I arrived at the door I found the TV camera already in there and members of the press corps apparently prepared to use audio equipment as well to record the proceedings for use in broadcasting.

As I've already said, neither Mr. Mantyka nor anyone else informed me equipment was being taken into the room. The first I learned of it was when I entered the doorway that morning.

I'll refrain, Mr. Speaker, from expressing my thoughts about the series of events I've just described. That is, the request is made to obtain permission for something and subsequently the person who has made the request proceeds as if the permission were quite irrelevant. What followed, Mr. Speaker, is well known. The camera and audio-visual equipment remained in the room for roughly a meeting and a half. Then it was removed following a ruling by myself and a vote by the committee. The essence of my statement, if I may sum it up, was the press cannot arrogate to itself the authority to decide when and where audio-visual equipment will be used to record proceedings of the legislature or its creatures. That permission must come through proper channels and from this Assembly.

Now in closing, I want to make one thing clear, Mr. Speaker, I, personally, have no objection whatsoever to the use of TV or audio equipment in Crown corporations committee, or for that matter, in the Assembly. But as chairman of the Crown corporations committee, I must uphold the rules and procedures of the Assembly.

What occurred recently hasn't changed my opinion, though it has made me think about the matter a bit further. Based on the reporting of this one incident over the TV, I have reached this conclusion. The presence of audio-visual equipment in a committee will not necessarily lead to more fair or accurate reporting of the proceedings of that committee. In conclusion, I would urge all members to support this motion and set in process a train of events which, I hope, will lead to the settlement of the matter as quickly as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, just a couple of observations and then, as the member for Regina Rosemont was asking for awhile ago, I'll advance a recommendation that may resolve this little problem. One of my observations, Mr. Speaker, is that the Attorney General would raise the use of tapes from the House of Commons in an election campaign. It was a terrible thing done in that particular instance. But Stan Hovdebo, NDP candidate from Prince Albert, created a brand new set of rules when his maiden speech was run across the constituency time after time after time. But the other observation I would like to make, Mr. Speaker. I was a little preoccupied when the member for Regina Wascana got up to speak so perhaps I didn't accurately get what he said. I just got off the telephone from talking to the Prince Albert press and the name of the member for Shellbrook came up a few times. As I understood, the member for Regina Wascana at the beginning of his remarks indicated he had in fact talked to Mr. Mantyka prior to 9:45 on the morning in question, whatever morning that was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The record will bear one of us out I am sure. If it bears me out, I would just point out the inconsistency on page 151 of Crown corporations verbatim. This is, Mr. Chairman:

I must express my deep regret and disappointment that cameras were brought into this committee without so much as the courtesy of notice to me or any other member . . .

The record will bear one of us out. If it bears you out, I offer my apology in advance . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you very much.

The other thing I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, is just a small observation. I think that is reasonably accurate, based on the standard of the Minster of Health at least. I don't recall hearing one speaker this afternoon say that he was opposed to having television in the Chamber or in the committee, not one. I heard one member say I think we should study it; that was the member for Regina Rosemont. I'll just remind that member — I don't recall for sure whether it was '75 or '76 — a rules and procedures committee was struck for the purpose of studying television in the Chamber, among other things. In this legislature there has been another one struck. In fact we have studied it for five years and we've studied it to death. I think it's time and I agree with you that the committee should make the decision. I think it is unfortunate that it had to come up in this way. It seems to me that the precedent was already set about two or three years ago in another committee which the Minster of Finance might be familiar with - the elections and privileges committee where cameras were flocking in. That was a kind of reverse situation. It was a little easier to understand.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in light of the facts . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Give us those notes so that we can get at it.

MR. BERNTSON: — Notes will help those who can read.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that not one member has suggested that TV should not be in the committees or that TV should not be in the House, I would like our little committee to study the form — I quite frankly follow the House of Commons pattern myself. I think it's a good one. I think we should put it in this Chamber. I think that our committee should make that decision. The precedent has already been set for Crown corporations or for committees. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer an amendment to the motion of the Attorney General that the motion be amended by adding:

and that pending the report of the special committee on rules and procedures that video and audio taping of the proceedings of Crown corporation committee be allowed.

I'll move that seconded by the member for Rosthern.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I think the motion made by the member for Souris-Cannington will solve the problem of the immediate . . . It will allow the committee to do its job, and in fact, may even speed up the committee to give us an answer. As the member for Souris-Cannington suggested there was this committee that started in 1975 or 1976 to look at that question. No answer. It wasn't resolved. We're suggesting now with our amendment that maybe you can resolve the problem. Meanwhile we have a precedent, the privileges and election committee, which is a committee where the cameras were allowed in. Obviously that means there is a precedent.

In the speech of the Chairman of Crown corporations or whatever you would like to call it, on April 2, he came in and made comments about his opinions on whether or not to leave the camera in Crown corporations. In his statement he indicated there was no rule saying they couldn't be there but no rule saying they could be there. So the only thing you can go by is precedent. There is no precedent in Crown corporations; we all agree to that. There is a rule in this House that says they are not allowed in the House. There is a rule saying no press is allowed in public account. There is a rule. There is no rule on Crown corporations so you must look to other committees to see if there is a rule or precedent. The Minister of Labour knows what precedent means because a lot of union contracts are decided on precedent and practice. Now, the moment you allow a precedent or a practice to change you have a new precedent and a new practice.

The privileges and elections committee allowed a change to take place; we have a new set of rules. Obviously the television camera came in and was photographing. Now what is awfully interesting here is that many of you remember we had a throne speech a short while ago and the Attorney General was being very concerned about circumventing the committee. So was the member for Rosemont but neither one of them were concerned when they came to the opposition and said, would you allow the television cameras in here for the budget speech? We understood. We were approached to allow the television cameras, I believe it was by Mr. Speaker, through our member for Souris-Cannington. He suggested the answer. If I remember correctly our caucus answer was — if you allow them to stay for everything. We didn't get an answer. The cameras were not here. But you weren't worried about the committee that you're so worried about now when you wanted the television camera in here for your budget.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Perhaps it's not a point of order but I . . . The hon. member, I believe, has accused or said that I and some other member

from this side of the House approached him or the Leader of the Opposition about budget taping. I clearly deny that. I never had any conversations with him or the member on this at all. Maybe Mr. Speaker had some, but he ought not to be then saying to the Speaker that you are wanting your budget televised because that puts the Chair in a partisan position. I don't know whether it's a point of order or not, but I have been trying to raise the innuendo and implication which is attached to the speech. I think the member is as confused on this as he is on almost everything when he talks on this topic.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member has set the record straight as he sees it and I don't intend to enter this debate. I will ask the member for Rosthern to continue.

MR. KATZMAN: — The interesting thing, of course, which I was referring to when the Attorney General stood to his feet, is my recollection that there was a request to our side to allow the camera. If the Attorney General wants to say he didn't ask it, so be it. But the request came to us. The request also indicated that your side of the House had agreed. We put a condition — let it stay here. It seems to me nobody agreed to that condition; we didn't have the camera. That's a fact. That's what happened. So once again there's another time the committee was about to be ignored.

What we are saying now with our amendment is very simple. The precedent is there. Let the camera continue; let the audio visual continue, and then maybe your committee will sit down and do as requested by the motion, with all speed, and get an answer to all the rules and so forth which are required with these cameras, or audio visual equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General earlier in his comments and convoluted logic, suggested you could have it this way and have it that way; the CKCK television thing was not the way he liked it, and so forth. He made reference to television commercials during the election. The member for Souris-Cannington reminded him - in the Saskatoon area we kept seeing television shots, during commercials, of a member for the NDP suggesting you support this man, showing him in the House of Commons. I didn't hear the Attorney General condemn that. But he condemned other portions of commercials used. But that's normal, the Attorney General likes to pick and choose what is best for him — not stay on the issues and the facts.

We will see how serious the Attorney General really is when he says I personally agree with the cameras, or I have some concerns. We will see how he votes on this amended motion which allows the cameras in. Then we make sure (because we have an experience to look at) what rules are required to make sure it is done right. He wasn't concerned when the cameras went in during the Berntson affairs. He is concerned now because we are scrutinizing the budget of the government.

It is interesting to note, for the first time we have the verbatim in Crown corporations committee. We can see what a minister says and what a minister doesn't say. This morning, once again, the public will see what the minister says. It would have been interesting to note today that in the Crown corporations committee there would seem to be a disagreement between one cabinet minister and another cabinet minister. That may have been reported. But the camera wasn't there. Hopefully the written press will report it. I am sure the press will make their comments. But it will be interesting to listen to the comments of two cabinet ministers disagreeing.

It always reminds me of earlier in the month when there was a question put to the Minister of Highways by the members for Regina South. The Minister of Highways made

a comment and now that comment has come back to haunt him, because you know, the minister suggested at that time . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I realize the debate has been fairly wide-ranging, and I want to try to contain it within the limits which I recognize at this time and that is, in the Chamber not rediscussing issues already settled in the Chamber in this session. I think each question period, at the end of the question period is closed. It cannot be reopened again. Therefore I think the member is stretching the rule a bit if I allow him to continue to discuss what went on in a question period at some time in this session.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up my comments by saying it is the right of the citizens to be able to see how their government operates, how the money is spent; it is their right to be allowed by any means that are available for them to see minister explain each situation. The thing is to allow the public access. That's what it is all about.

Years ago the newspaper was the only way. Years ago Hansard was the only way. Today we have radio. We have had that for several years and a lot of people get the information of what this House does this way. There is another media now called the television tube and that is what we are discussing. I know when the lights are in here that shiny head over there on the other side will cause many problems for the technicians, but they can overcome even problems like yourself . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I like that comment. At least when they use a wide lens camera they can see something worthwhile looking at, not when they look at you.

Mr. Speaker, we will see, before the day is over I assume, if that government is serious, or if they just talk around in circles. Our amendment makes the decision now but says the committee has the final say on how it should happen. While they are making up their minds there will be an experiment going on within one committee and there they will get some experience to look at. So basically, if you are saying, no, you're not going to vote in favor of the amendment, then you are scared to allow the cameras in. You are delaying, not us; you are delaying because you do not want the cameras in. You will take your sweet time as far as the committee is concerned, as you have all along. Where are we? We are back to the government majority deciding what goes. Let's see if you guys have the intestinal fortitude to go with this amendment, to stand up for what you said earlier. Call that committee in, get it working and you may have results within days.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest all members should support the amendment, and then support the amended motion because that's the best thing for the citizens of this province, the best way for people get the information.

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment we have before us, I think it is another clear indication of the bankruptcy of those opposite. When I look at the hon. member for Souris-Cannington (who I think is not a bad fellow really, and I can't understand why he would be dragged into a situation like that) and realize I sit on a committee with him, along with the member for Kindersley — the special committee on the review of rules and procedures of the Legislature Assembly — and realise he is deliberately trying to by-pass any decision-making mechanism we have within that committee, it makes me wonder just what type of a game he and other members are trying to play.

I think we well accept the fact that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle doesn't believe in law and order, never has, never will. When we look at the law going on in this House at this particular time, we realize there is no recognition of the word whatsoever by that

member and some others on the opposite side When we look at the order that's going on in this House, Mr. Speaker, at this time there is very little order whatsoever in so far as recognizing what the function of the committee that's struck for this specific purpose is all about.

I think when we stop for a moment and think of what the amendment is talking about and we listen to those opposite talk about how they have had television in committee, there is absolutely no difference here, Mr. Speaker, with what's happened in the Ottawa scene. The cameras do go into the committees and take pictures prior to the commencement of those committees, but they do not televise the committees at the Ottawa scene unless it's changed most recently. Nothing strange about that whatsoever. I'm sure those members opposite who are attempting to use that as an argument know they are completely naïve to think for a moment that is not the way it's happening in the Ottawa scene, and that's why it should happen here in so far as the televising is concerned.

The other point the Attorney General made in so far as the use of television is concerned was the slowing down of the cameras — the complete abuse of those pictures that were taken at the Ottawa scene. Nothing wrong with taking pictures. Nothing wrong with using the cameras in their entirety, but not abusing those particular pictures when they are taken.

I'm also positive, Mr. Speaker, and I'll be urging my colleagues to abolish the committee that's struck. The special committee on the review of rules and procedure in my opinion may as well be abolished because it's not going to serve any useful purpose if those people on that side of the House believe they can introduce motions and private members' bills that are really the function of the committee struck for that purpose. I think they should be ashamed of themselves, Mr. Speaker, on that side of the House, spending taxpayers' money going across the country trying to review the rules and procedures of various jurisdictions and coming back now and trying to by-pass the committee completely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — The hon. member for Souris-Cannington knows full well that one of the terms the committee agreed to was to consider the televising of proceedings of the Assembly and/or committees. And I think the hon. member said not too long ago he would wage a little bet with me, Mr. Speaker — and I know we can't bet any significant amount in this House — that that was not in the minutes. He full well knows that was in the minutes, including the committee's. It's strange indeed that his memory is so short.

The other point I'd like to raise very briefly, Mr. Speaker, now that I see that the hon. member for Kindersley is back in — he raised his age-old cry, let's have openness in the public accounts. He's consistently talking about this. He's consistently writing papers on it. I would like to just make a few remarks and refer to a paper here written by a renowned individual who knows something about reform and the legislative process, C.E.S. Franks. This has to do with the Saskatchewan public accounts committee. I will quote, Mr. Speaker:

I would like to consider one aspect of the most newsworthy of all committees, the standing committee of public accounts. This committee ought to meet in camera with press coverage delayed until the end of its investigation when a full verbatim transcript would be published along with

that committee's report. At present, with press coverage of all proceedings, members grandstand too much, investigation lacks direction as each member attempts to appeal to the press rather than continue an orderly inquiry and the committee is far too partisan. The Saskatchewan public accounts committee meets in camera and this procedure is one of the main reasons for its success. This reform, I realize, is not likely to be welcomed either by the press or by members of the committee, both of whom find the sensational aspects of its work appealing. But many years of observation have convinced me that the sort of premature and lurid exposure the committees now receive impedes intensive and productive investigation and in the final analysis handicaps parliament's ability to control the public purse.

For the benefit of the hon. member for Kindersley, I think he should pay attention to some of the reports that come from other parts of this country in so far as public accounts are concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, a point that really bothers me is when we consider for one moment that the press gallery, the official representative from the press gallery did meet with two people from our special rules committee to discuss whether or not there should be transcripts or voicereports taken. That was moved by the committee and those negotiations were carried out successfully. And now to see the press by-pass even their negotiating committee, by-pass a press gallery and go directly beyond them is something that is not recognized in so far as true collective bargaining is concerned. I am really amazed when I see CKCK news reports coming out and on a news report the letter which was furnished to us which, of course, we appreciate. But I am really surprised that CKCK does not go through the legal process of what their press gallery is all about. At least at the Ottawa level once again, the news media there does go through their press gallery and they have representatives who deal legitimately with the parties at that particular level.

I think it's very, very unfortunate when we see the press in Saskatchewan going on their merry way by themselves and not trying to negotiate the way it should be done and that is through the recognized press gallery. And I would sincerely hope they would recognize the fact that they should do that type of negotiating and not use the PCs as their front men in so far as trying to get what they want — illegally I might say. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that if we look at the entry program now and if we look at what the rules committee has said, there's not a question in the world that is going to be negotiated and it will be looked at by the rules committee if in fact the rules committee remains in existence.

As I said at the beginning, I am completely in favor of abolishing the review committee. I think it serves no useful purpose. The members opposite are going to be pawns of the press and the press are using them in whatever way they possibly can, in such a way they'll by-pass a recognized committee. I think it's abuse of parliamentary procedure and abuse of any recognition of what this legislature is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the amendment. I will be supporting the motion.

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to comment briefly on the question under consideration. My position is that I support television in the House and I would like to see it come as quickly as possible. I have reservations about

the use of television in committee and I think that is a matter which would deserve special discussion. I'm in favor of all committees of this House being open and that would include the public accounts committee. It's my view that should be open, but as I say I have serious questions about whether television should be allowed in the committees.

I'd like to just comment for a moment on the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Rosthern. If I understood him correctly, and I may be mistaken, but if I understood him correctly, I believe that his argument was that somehow a precedent was being set, in fact, had already been set as a result of television cameras having entered the committee. I must say I find that a very strange argument and an argument I cannot accept, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the television cameras were operating in the committee without the permission of the committee having been obtained. Therefore, it seems to me, in fact no precedent has been set at all.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, he's made light of some of the problems that are clearly associated with having televisions in the House and in committees. I see absolutely no relationship or comparison at all between the ... He made the point, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, the Attorney General was complaining about tapes being used in a situation which the Attorney General thought was inappropriate, and at the same time the member for Rosthern was pointing out that he felt the Attorney General had found no fault with the use of television tapes during the federal election by the federal member for Prince Albert.

I would like to point out to members of the House, Mr. Speaker, these are two very, very different situations. The example given by the Attorney General is a clear example of the misuse of television because in that particular example, Mr. Speaker, as I understood the Attorney General, the television had been used in such a way that the film was being seen by viewers in slow motion which made it quite inappropriate. On the other hand, it's quite normal practice, I would point out to the member for Rosthern, for members of parliament to take clips of their speeches and show them on television. That's done regularly by a number of members. So the two examples have absolutely no relationship at all.

I would just like to close my remarks by stating I think it's quite proper that this House follow the procedures and traditions of parliament by referring this matter to the rules and procedures committee. I think this committee allows more complete input from all members of the House and particularly from members of the opposition. I think the nature of the issue to be discussed and the fact that there is clearly a divergence of views by members from both parties on both sides of the House makes it again a matter that's appropriate to first be discussed in the rules and procedures committee.

I think, then, after discussion over the next few months, if it's clear that the rules and procedures committee is not getting anywhere on the matter of television, I would tend to be much more sympathetic to an initiative by members on either side of the House to have the matter debated in the House. But at this point, I think the logical process to follow is the rules and procedures committee. Only if that logical process breaks down, would I then be more sympathetic to consideration of a bill or debate in the House itself. So I would urge all members to follow the proper procedures and traditions of the House at this point, to support the referral of this matter to the rules and procedures committee. I very much hope, Mr. Speaker, the rules and procedures committee will recommend in favor of the use of television in the House. Thank you.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — It is definitely with pleasure that I rise today to speak on the Attorney General's motion:

That the matter of the video and audio taping of the proceedings of the Crown corporations committee be referred to the special committee on rules and procedures for a report thereon with all convenient speed.

The motion is certainly one I have looked forward to having in the legislature for discussion. I must admit a lot of my arguments were exhausted in Crown corporations meetings where I did not feel the matter should have been discussed.

The Attorney General in making his comments with reference to the motion he introduced suggested the whole matter was currently under discussion. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is rather obvious it is not a good argument, in fact, not even a fair argument in the sense that the decision is one which has to be made reasonably quickly. He has used the comments in his own reply to his motion, "with all convenient speed." The system now as it exists with the subject of television in the legislature or in committees is not currently under discussion, to use the Attorney General's words. He suggests the whole matter should be referred to the rules and procedures committee. We on this side of the House don't disagree with that. We feel that is a good place for the legislature to refer the matter to and for the decision ultimately to be made by.

What seems to be evident to me this afternoon, what the opposition is concerned with, is how soon is "with all convenient speed"? We are concerned with that, with respect to the right of the public to know what happens in the legislature and its various committees.

The Attorney General refers to a letter of a member of the press with reference to freedom of speech. Certainly at times we wonder if freedom of speech is being infringed by this government. I think we have good reason from time to time to feel that way. Subsequently, it is good reason for us on this side of the House to want television in the legislature and, of course, in its various committees.

When arguments are furthered with reference to crown corporations meetings, that it is open to members of the media for their subsequent reporting to the public, that a verbatim record is available, one still has to remember that although that is available (I don't deny that to the public) it is not something the public makes use of — maybe they should. That has to be taken into consideration. If we are sincere about getting our message and the workings of this legislature to the public, then we have to be realistic and look at the particular aspect that verbatim records are not requested by the public to any great extent. Generally speaking the public looks for an easy access to news. Television today is about the easiest access to news and the happenings in our province and in our country. I think we should not be looking at television in such a pessimistic way but looking at television in a very optimistic way. We should be saying here is a medium by which we can put the workings of the legislature to the public, let them see the debates which take place in the legislature, let them see the debates which take place in Crown corporations and other committees of the legislature. I think it is a wonderful medium available to us. I think it is certainly something we should take the opportunity of making full use of.

The Attorney General also claims the issue is a procedural claims the issue is a procedural and not so much whether the government is going to proceed to be an open government or whether or

not members of the government want television or they don't. He makes the argument that it's a procedural argument. Well I, I suppose for one, on this side of the House might agree with the Attorney General to some extent that it is a procedural argument. I can't help but go back to some of the arguments I had furthered on the whole matter before the Crown corporations meetings; there was a precedent set and, therefore, that is the reason why we would see that television should be continued in Crown corporation meetings until such time as we use the procedures committee, to bring down a ruling on it. I felt at the time that since there was no rule in existence, then we were not compelled in any way to abide by any ruling which didn't exist. So the Attorney General might be right in that, I suppose what I am doing, in all fairness and being sincere in my arguments, is reversing the argument of the Attorney General I suppose more to favor our arguments than it is to further his and that it is, in part, a procedural argument.

Now, I certainly, Mr. Speaker, would have to take exception of the Attorney General accusing the media of bias and discriminating against the government members. He used the example of me and the member for Wilkie and the member for Regina, the Chairman of our Crown corporation committee. If I read the Attorney General right, what I heard him saying was that CKCK television was taking longer pictures of the member for Wilkie and myself, the member for Moosomin, than they were of the Chairman. Well, I don't think that was the case at all, I think, in fact, what was the case is the television crew was taking pictures related to subject material and not to who looked the best or what angle they particularly may have had on that individual member. And that's the basis by which the reporting seemed to have been taken as far as I was concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but feel this government is afraid to have television in this legislature. They are afraid to have television in our various committees. I just have to feel that way, Mr. Speaker. If there was any reason at all furthered by this government for me to think differently then I would. I don't think they want to have the public see what happens in this legislature. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, they would like the people of Saskatchewan to see them defending themselves against charges we have made on a variety of subjects. I certainly don't think they would want the people of northern Saskatchewan to see the discussions that were taking place in this Assembly with respect to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan estimates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we reflect back to the Attorney General's argument about it being a procedural matter. You know, one has to ask oneself, what procedure was used by this government to request — not from the rules and procedures committee but from the opposition — whether or not they should have television to cover the budget address. They asked for permission and our reply was well, certainly, if we have equal time. And then, no, that was it; it was all over. So, Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to believe this government doesn't want television in here. If they did then they would not be making such strong objections. The Attorney General would not be crying about how good the pictures were of the member for Wilkie as opposed to one of his members. He would not be chastising the media for bias. He would not be doing any of those things, Mr. Speaker.

I think the argument that we use television in Crown corporation meetings is likely in fact a better reason for television to be there than maybe in the legislature itself. Certainly with a government that places so much emphasis on its family of Crown corporations, a government that has such a tremendous investment of taxpayers' dollars in Crown corporations . . . Crown corporations, in fact, are responsible for 95

per cent of the province's debt. Discussion in Crown corporations become quite bitter from time to time, not so much from opposition but from government members. I can see that argument being made by the government members that they don't want television in crown corporations and they don't want it in the legislature.

I predict that this government will argue more strongly against television in Crown corporations. If we were to make any ground at all with respect to televising the proceedings of the legislature and its various committees, we would likely get it in the legislature long before we had it in Crown corporations or any of the committees for that matter.

The subject of the position of the opposition being prepared to have an immediate meeting of the rules committee as early as say, tomorrow, to bring down a decision Monday or Tuesday seems like a fair offer. And of course, Mr. Speaker, if this government does not respond to that argument we have to go back to the same old scenario that the government is afraid to let the public have access to the procedures of the legislature and its committees.

Now certainly the Attorney General's arguments are hypocritical arguments. In the debates that transpired this afternoon I see that he made a number of arguments from his seat and you could see the inconsistencies there. He didn't argue the question of whether or not cameras were being used in privileges and elections at an earlier point in time in our proceedings. He didn't argue that very strongly because he knows that was in fact the case. He also furthered arguments that the media would have difficulty with television cameras in projecting a true picture of what was happening in the legislature in an unbiased way.

Those were some of his arguments. The Attorney General would be aware of the system used in the House of Commons. It is not operated by any particular television station. It is operated by the House of Commons. That system could be employed here, or we could be flexible and adapt to a different type of system. Certainly we are open to any suggestions.

But, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the point I want to make with reference to the Attorney General is that his arguments are hypocritical. They are not solid and strong arguments which the Attorney General has made in past years. I must acknowledge that he hasn't made any strong arguments this year. But I can imagine, for example, if I were a camera man attempting to get a picture of, say, the member for Pelly, I would end up with a still picture. I can imagine attempting to get a picture of the Government Whip and ending up with nothing but a shot of his tonsils.

Speaking of the Government Whip, I can't help but reflect on him just a for a moment. I see how empty this government is, and I see the Government Whip has run out of catcalls. I believe I used one with reference to the Minister of the Environment — that we would require a wide-angle camera to get a picture of the Minister of the Environment. Then I see today that the Government Whip uses that on the member for Rosthern. I think when the Government Whip is starting to use my catcalls only 20 minutes along in the discussion they are rather deplete of ideas.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I think in looking at the problems that cameramen may have in the legislature . . . One could imagine a cameraman attempting to get a picture of the member for Prince Albert with his eyes open; attempting to get pictures of the hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood, the Minister of Agriculture for the province of

Saskatchewan; attempting to get those pictures and put it all together and make your points. Mr. Speaker, those are some of the difficulties that the various television cameramen would definitely have in attempting to cover the proceedings of the legislature or its various committees.

The member for Regina Rosemont again uses inconsistent arguments. He says we should be referring all these matters through the proper procedures — the rules and procedures committee. But again, when you ask him, when you holler across and ask him what procedure he used to request television in the Legislative Assembly for covering the budget, he has no answer. The Attorney General has no answer with reference to the privileges and elections committee. Their arguments are hollow.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to this Assembly that the committee has a precedent. It's been set. Therefore there is no rule that says they can't be there. I think it was unfair that they were removed from the committee in the first place since there was no rule and given the fact that there was an existing precedent set.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, that there is a problem in rural development in Saskatchewan and the Minister of Agriculture knows that. He knows there's an opportunity through television to carry the proceedings of this legislature to rural Saskatchewan notwithstanding the fact that there's not a lot of it left with the loss of some 8,000 family farms. For what's left out there, let's get the proceedings of this legislature and its various committees to rural Saskatchewan as well as to the city folk.

Mr. Speaker, I say the public has a right to view the proceedings of this legislature. The public, Mr. Speaker, has a right to view the proceedings of its various committees. They have a right to information and the Attorney General should very strongly consider reversing his decision in reference to freedom of speech. Let's see him stand up and stand up foursquare behind freedom of speech and allow television; order a rules and procedures committee to bring down a decision quickly, like Monday; and let's get television in. Let's get it into the legislature or let's get it into committees.

I think, Mr. Speaker, at this point I would call 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.