

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 21, 1980

AFTERNOON SESSION

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. J. L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me real pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of the House, along with my colleague, Gordon Snyder, the Minister of Labour, a group of students from Gunner's Cove School in Newfoundland. For the benefit of those who are here this afternoon, these students are from the town of Girquet, a small fishing village on the mainland, over 400 miles from Corner Brook, Newfoundland. They are here on behalf of a federal exchange program, Open House Canada. They are visiting Moose Jaw as guests of the Lindale School. Shortly afterwards, the Lindale School students will go to Corner Brook and to their town of Girquet to visit them. Along with these students, Mr. Speaker, they have two chaperones and two teachers from Lindale School. Mr. Skorobohach and Mr. Kaminsky are from Moose Jaw and from Newfoundland we have Mr. Pilgrim and Mr. Tucker. On behalf of the people here, and on behalf of the members of the Assembly, and the people of Saskatchewan, we wish you well. We wish you a good journey and have lots of fun.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks by asking a question. I would like to ask where the students from Vanscoy School are? All right. It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to introduce through you to this House, a group of 60 students from Vanscoy Elementary School, Grades 6 and 7. Your member, the Hon. Elwood Cowley is busy at a meeting right now. He should be able to meet with you a little later on.

Vanscoy Elementary School in the Vanscoy area has a special significance to me, Mr. Speaker, because I was the MLA for that area from 1971 to 1975. It's a good area. I know the boys and girls are exceptionally good, the ones who come from Vanscoy Elementary. I am sure they will be having pictures taken with either their member or some other member, as well as a tour. I believe there will be some drinks or refreshments brought down to them, wherever they meet and with whomever they meet. I am sure they have a good day in Regina and will continue to have a good day here. It is my hope that you have a very safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, 30 Grade 8 students from St. Leo School in Regina. They are seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Gartner. I would ask the members on both sides of the House to join with me in extending warm wishes to the students. I will meet with them in a few minutes, at 2:45 p.m., for refreshments and discussion.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, if I might just ask if there's a group from Tisdale in the gallery? Yes there is. Unfortunately I understand that your member is also

at a meeting. We would also like to welcome all of you. I don't have the information in front of me as to who your teacher is, and who is accompanying you. I know you will enjoy yourselves here in the Legislative Assembly. I know you will pass on the good wishes of all the members to the northern part of Saskatchewan, because those of us who come from the North think it's the best in the West.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on Bill No. 13.

MR. J. W. A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll continue. As I stated before, I was reading a letter and just to finish it:

Sask Tel and the Government of Saskatchewan could argue that the relevant provisions of Bill 13 are of general application as provision to control the interconnect of foreign attachments of all kinds to the telecommunication network of Sask Tel, and that they are not intended to apply only to federal incorporations and regulated cable television undertakings and/or to the TVRO or earth stations, as we call them.

You will, of course, remember that a vague point was at issue in the application in 1973 by 10 cable companies such as Ottawa Cablevision, etc., to the telecommunications committee of the Canadian Transport Commission and directed against Bell Canada's restrictive policy on plant ownership. Although initially unsuccessful, the cable operators' argument finally prevailed in the decision of Bell Canada versus Transvision Incorporated, C.T.C., October 1975.

However it must be remembered the statutory provision applicable in those two cases are different than in the case at hand, because Bell Canada is a federally regulated carrier subject to the provisions of the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act. Without exhausting your patience on a discussion of the finer points of law which may be at issue in Saskatchewan, we would be prepared to expand upon this subject if you wish.

At this time, based on my current understanding of the facts at issue, I would advise that the case for earth station ownership by the federally regulated cable undertakings will be seriously undermined if Saskatchewan's Bill 13 is enacted.

It is difficult to predict the likely outcome of any litigation on which this point would be joined. But on the basis of a preliminary assessment of the issue, I would not place the chances of success by the cable operators of obtaining the court order at higher than 50 per cent.

Please contact me or Allan O'Brien, should you have any further questions regarding this issue.

Yours sincerely, Robert J. Buchan.

Mr. Speaker, when one really starts to realize the implications of the contents of Bill 13, one can really appreciate its restrictive and dangerous nature. The propaganda experts on the other side are so worried about public reaction to Bill 13 that they have prepared a document on it for all Sask Tel employees present and past. In the introduction to this piece of propaganda it states and I quote:

This background information for Sask Tel employees is intended to ensure that our employees fully understand the amendments and our rationale for them. Sask Tel believes that these amendments are necessary to prevent the erosion of Sask Tel's financial base and protect the integrity of our system.

Mr. Speaker, I say it's a sad day when the government must use public servants to spread their propaganda. Obviously, public opinion must be very much against Bill 13 or the government would feel no need to be so defensive.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at how Sask Tel rationalizes Bill 13 to the employees, and I quote from a section headlined, What is Bill 13? I note how they casually described this dangerous piece of legislation to their employees and I quote:

Bill 13 has three distinguishable sections. The first section will permit the establishment of an executive committee of the board of directors. The second section will permit Sask Tel to enter into agreements with others to manufacture, distribute, lease or sell equipment used for telecommunication purposes. The third section has aroused the most interest. It gives the force of law to our existing tariff, which prohibits the attachment of any equipment to any telecommunication line without written permission from Sask Tel, (or now it will be the cabinet). It also prevents retailers from offering telephones and equipment for sale to the public, often misleading the public into believing it is legal to hook up customer-owned equipment.

That, Mr. Speaker, is how Sask Tel describes Bill 13 to its employees. Nowhere do they mention that Bill 13 is a piece of legislation which would give the state virtual control of every aspect of communication in the province today. No, Mr. Speaker, the technocrats of the socialist regime have left that out.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in this same document they go on to rationalize to the employees of Sask Tel why Bill No. 13 is really necessary. What really astounds me is the part called, What are the implications of Bill 13 and in particular for Sask Tel employees. I quote the fear tactics being used by Sask Tel, Mr. Speaker, it reads as follows:

Without end-to-end responsibility it is inevitable that there would be a deterioration of quality of service and ensuing loss of job satisfaction.

Just to take off from there for a minute, Mr. Speaker, they not only try to get to the people of Saskatchewan. What kinds of tactics are those for the employees of Saskatchewan? What kind of a move by a government that says it's working for the people; it's representing the people? Represent them with fear? No . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

There would be considerable frustration and waste of resources created if our subscribers called in a trouble report and after considerable effort we discovered the source of the problem was the telephone they had

purchased.

Without the necessary quality control of the instrument we connect to our system we cannot ensure the reliability of the system. A serious possibility is the loss of revenue that will inevitably result from loss of end-to-end responsibility resulting from interconnect. If that revenue is lost the objectives of the corporation may have to be redefined which would necessitate a re-examination of the work force requirements.

Now, right there, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to stop for a minute. It may be a loss of jobs. That's a great way to handle the Sask Tel employees — fear tactics by an NDP government. With a reduced amount of work available, a corresponding reduction in our work force requirement would result. I wanted to get that in again, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully the people of Sask Tel will know that a Conservative government wouldn't do that to them.

Mr. Speaker, that is a shameless and outrageous scare tactic. It is disgusting that a socialist technocrat would make such a blatant effort in attempting to hoodwink the employees of Sask Tel into loyalty and loyally supporting Bill 13. I say, shame to the Minister of Sask Tel and to the whole government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, when a government resorts to these kinds of tactics, what would they do if they could ever get Bill 13 passed into law? Where would the end come? The end would be the end of freedom for the people of Saskatchewan. That wouldn't be a heritage we would want to pass on to our children. The heritage we want to pass on is a heritage of freedom, Mr. Speaker, not state control of communities.

Mr. Speaker, it is disgraceful when a government would hold the threat of job loss over the heads of their employees as a means of getting support for a piece of legislation. It is absolutely disgusting.

Mr. Speaker, I serve notice to this Assembly that I shall use every method available to me to inform employees of Sask Tel that they need not feel threatened by the propaganda machine of this government.

Bill No. 13 is and has always been part of the socialist design to control communications throughout the whole province and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the course of my remarks I have made every effort to bring out representation from the public on Bill 13 to express the true will, the true feeling of the people of Saskatchewan. This is why I challenge this administration to establish a committee of this legislature to have public hearings on Bill 13.

Why, Mr. Speaker, does this government not want a committee on Bill 13? Because they know that the people of Saskatchewan wouldn't want Bill 13; they would get the message across. But they would have no way to suppress that information.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. J. R. MESSER (Kelsey-Tisdale): — Thank you very much to the member for Wilkie, Mr. Speaker. During my attendance at a Crown investment corporation meeting, I have been told that the member for Nipawin took it upon himself to introduce a group of students from the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale. That being done but not properly, Mr. Speaker, I would like as the member to introduce to the Legislative Assembly a group of

Grade 8 students, I believe 95 in number, 78 from the town of Tisdale and 17 from the town of Crooked River. I believe they are sitting in the east gallery; perhaps several are sitting in the Speaker's gallery as well. They are accompanied by Mr. McNair, the principal of the Tisdale School and a former classmate of mine a few short years ago, as well as Mrs. Irene Schoff, Mr. Terry Finnimore and Mr. Larry McCorriston.

They have had a long drive to the capital city of Regina and no doubt a busy agenda. I will be meeting with them in a few minutes time at 2:30 in Room 218 to answer any questions they may have. I know all members will want to welcome them to the Legislative Assembly and wish them an enjoyable and informative time here and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 13 (Continued)

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, this committee we are asking for — I don't think we are asking for too much. We are asking the government to allow the people of Saskatchewan to express their concerns over this very controversial bill, so that people like the Reverend Lionel Hopkins of the Avalon Alliance Church of Saskatoon might have the opportunity to make a representation such as he did in a letter dated April 23. He wrote to the minister in charge of Sask Tel and I quote:

It is with great concern that I read of the content of Bill No. 13 before the legislature. I believe in a reasonable rate of return on a business venture, but to seek by law that a Crown corporation already in a monopoly position should be able to require customers to rent all extra devices from Sask Tel at their arbitrarily determined rates is an alarming step. Your existing rental rates are simply exorbitant right now.

I hear the Attorney General laughing at the remarks of a minister. I mean, is it a joke that this man wants to be heard in Saskatchewan? A man of the cloth? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's a joke. Now he's telling me that the men of the cloth don't know what they're talking about. I say to you, Mr. Attorney General, they have forgotten more than you'll ever know. I continue on, Mr. Speaker:

In six months to ten months one can get back the money to buy an acoustical machine that one would pay in rent for one from Sask Tel for the same period. What would be your rates with no alternative? I am opposed to legalizing extortion. Why not become competitive and show a servant spirit to the public whose interests Sask Tel is allegedly serving, or has Sask Tel become an end to itself? The argument that revenue from this source is needed to subsidize service to rural areas is masking the issue. I would rather see general rates raised for telephone service where justified but not at the expense of personal freedom. I am shocked and disillusioned that an elected member of the legislature would speak in favour of Bill 13 to the detriment of those who elected him to guard their interests.

The Rev. Hopkins represents the thinking of many people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Take a look at another letter I received. A gentleman by the name of Mr. Wayne Dunn of Big River, Saskatchewan wrote to the editor of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and

I quote:

I would like to voice my disapproval of two recent actions by the Saskatchewan government. First I believe Sask Tel has reached beyond its legal authority by jamming channel 8 on Saskatoon Telecable. Sask Tel had ample opportunity to seek an injunction to stop the broadcasting of the House of Commons' debates. Instead Sask Tel decided to act as judge and jury in a dispute in which they are involved. By doing this they have deprived the people of Saskatoon a new service for which they have paid. It is my understanding that this is a federal responsibility and that Sask Tel is in fact attempting to overrule the Government of Canada. How does a government, which spends millions advertising the benefits we enjoy because of our family of Crown corporations, justify one of these Crown corporations arbitrarily denying the public a valuable new service? This clearly amounts to censorship of the press.

The second matter I am concerned about is the taping of selected news features by the government information service. The fact that a democratic government would do this for months without the public being aware of it is frightening. If the government believes that this act is justified, why was the public not notified when this program began? In both of these instances, the government is infringing on the basic freedoms on which our society depends. I invite others to voice their opinions on this matter.

It is representations like this, Mr. Speaker, which represent the true feelings of the people of Saskatchewan. At the opening of my remarks, I stated that throughout history it has been proven that those who suppress individual liberty and freedom, soon fall victim to their own ways. Bill No. 13 is a piece of legislation which will take away the basic freedom of everyone in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 13 is a deliberate attempt to simply legislate away two of the most important CRTC decisions in the last five years — the recent CNCP interconnect decision and the prior decision allowing interconnective answering machines and the like. Both decisions were extremely popular in the industry, everywhere except with those groups who had a vested interest in the telephone companies. For example, the CNCP interconnect decision was supported by 27 individual companies and 15 associates representing thousands of users of telecommunication services in Canada. There was absolutely no support for the telephone company position except by the telephone company associations.

Mr. Speaker, the CRTC, an independent body, checked and then rejected almost everything the telephone company said, and yet the minister in charge of Sask Tel is now repealing all the rejected statements.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 13 is a major intrusion into what is clearly a federal responsibility, namely national telecommunications. It is the worst possible time to introduce such a piece of legislation because it will, no doubt, create a constitutional squabble.

Mr. Speaker, I have to distract from my speech for a minute. After the referendum vote last night, what will the Premier of Saskatchewan give away in the upcoming constitutional debates? What will he give away to have absolute control of telecommunications in the province of Saskatchewan? I just wonder. Would it be that we will become a bilingual province? Is that what he will give away? Is that what he will give away, Mr. Speaker, so the Government of Saskatchewan can control all telecommunications, all media in the province? Mr. Speaker, the CNCP interconnect decision was supported by 27 individual companies. Now that isn't just one, Mr.

Speaker; that's 27. To have this province engage in a power grab, in open defiance of federal rights at this time, is absolute lunacy. Mr. Speaker, Bill No 13 has absolutely no support among the users of the system. If Bill No. 13 isn't being introduced for the users, then I ask you, who is it being introduced for? As CNCP Jim McDaniel has noted everywhere the telephone companies have been in competition with other companies, the rates have gone down dramatically; everywhere they had a monopoly, the rates went up. For example, Sask Tel increased its data communication rate 30 per cent last year. I didn't notice the 30 per cent decrease in my telephone bill.

Mr. Speaker, during CRTC hearings Bell Canada made a claim identical to the Sask Tel claim that business customers were being overcharged in order to subsidize residential customers.

AN. HON. MEMBER: — Tax the old ladies. They don't even like babies.

MR. GARNER: — Bell Canada was asked and was unable to prove that it was losing money on residential rates. Until proof is given in Saskatchewan, we have to assume that Sask Tel's claim is false also.

Mr. Speaker, far from their claimed intention to support a wide variety of products from a wide variety of suppliers, the experience in the telephone industry is that of minimal selection until you get to exorbitant rates and using as suppliers mainly those that it has a vested interest in.

In the United States anti-trust actions are now being taken against the Bell-Western Electric monopoly. Similarly, Sask Tel has a buddy-buddy relationship with Northern Electric which Bell Canada has 40 per cent ownership of. For example, Northern Electric just got the fibre optics contract. Last year Northern Electric was made the sole supplier for Sask Tel telephones, even though a few years before there was a widely publicized case where Canadians were being charged several dollars more for Canadian-built telephones than were Americans for Canadian-built telephones. Mr. Speaker, there never was much of a telephone company selection of products at reasonable prices until the Carter phone decision in the US and the CRTC decision in Canada created competition in this area.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what Bill No. 13 will do here in Saskatchewan? I should like to point out that there are three main routes for future personal information exchange. They are two-way cable TV systems, satellites and telephone data network systems. Sask Tel acquired the cable TV system several years ago, delaying cable television introduction by two years and incidentally thereby taking away one of the major routes without any public comment on whether they should have it. The telephone companies then acquired satellite control by getting the Liberal cabinet to reserve CRTC decisions, thus allowing Telesat Canada to join the trans-Canada telephone system — a reversal now recognized everywhere but in the telephone companies as a major mistake.

Mr. Speaker, if Bill No. 13 is passed then the intent will be to give Sask Tel control of these three major future information exchange networks. What is more, the implications will be national since CNCP will no longer be able to apply all of its services nationally — one of the key selling points to the new data networks — thereby losing a major competitive advantage and leading to a possible telephone company monopoly again.

Mr. Speaker, what really startles me is that the minister in charge of Sask Tel is probably not aware of all the implications of Bill No. 13 himself. I am curious that the minister is following the word of the technocrats in Sask Tel. It bothers me, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the minister, understanding as I do the implications of Bill No. 13.

In reviewing Bill No. 13, I have noted the following in making comparisons with the Alberta and Manitoba telephones acts. Starting with the Alberta Telephones Act, the similarities are as follows: subsection 28(1) after amending has the same restrictions on non-AGT equipment installed that would lead to an AGT monopoly. However, this act is probably invalidated by the two CRTC interconnect decisions. The difference with the Alberta Telephones Act, Mr. Speaker, is that Alberta's act was passed in 1971, well before the two CRTC interconnect decisions. Saskatchewan's Bill No. 13 was introduced after the two decisions with full knowledge of what was in the decisions. Hence, Alberta's act would likely simply be invalidated by the CRTC decisions while Saskatchewan's Bill No. 13 would be a direct constitutional challenge to the CRTC.

Furthermore, Alberta's act does not include the Bill No. 13 section 44(3) which restricts the advertising and sale of hardware. Alberta's act has no seizure provisions and no provisions to suspend the service of either the buyer or seller of the hardware for up to three months. And now, Mr. Speaker, I have to compliment the government. We don't have that anymore. They did listen to the opposition on that one and maybe, just maybe, one more step and this will go along well. Bill No. 13, Mr. Speaker, bans all attachments while Alberta's act bans only attachments capable of transmitting or receiving messages. Hence, Bill No. 13 has a much broader definition, although this difference won't matter much since the attachments being discussed all receive and transmit messages.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, Alberta's act prevents connection to telecommunication equipment while Bill No. 13 prevents connection to telecommunication lines. The difference depends on the Bill No. 13 definition of telecommunication lines.

Turning to the Manitoba Telephones Act, Mr. Speaker. I should like to point out that section 43 of the Manitoba act has no similarity to Bill No. 13, covering only devices which would damage the Manitoba telephone system. Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba act makes interconnect illegal if in the opinion of the commission the device is damaging. Hence there is a possible similarity if the commission applied this clause in a ridiculously broad manner.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the new section 44(1), the government stand needs to be clarified. The May 2, page 17 Leader-Post article is about the possibility of non Sask Tel acoustically coupled terminals which promise to be the main source of interconnect.

Section 44(1) bans the terminals only if telephone handsets come under the definition of any part of the telecommunication line. Section, 44(1) has an extremely broad definition of attachment.

In sections 44(2) and 44(3), Mr. Speaker, the phrase 'attach or connect to' has an extremely broad definition, not even defining whether the connection need be permanent to apply. The phrase 'or used in conjunction with the telecommunication line' is even worse, Mr. Speaker. Taking sections 44(1) through to 44(4) together, the adhesive back pen holder on my upstairs' telephone is an illegal attachment, Mr. Speaker. Sask Tel may seize it and cut off my telephone service and that of the department store from which it was purchased or of a real estate firm which gave me a similar one, for a period of not more than three months. But now thankfully we don't have that anymore. Mr. Speaker, the ridiculousness of section 44(3) can truly be appreciated only by making a list of products whose advertising and sales are already banned, such as military hardware, narcotics, pornography, liquor, and products violating patent or copyright laws. Section 44(3) should also be eliminated on the basis of a complete lack of enforceability on either the advertising or sales restriction. Most of the restricted products are manufactured outside the province; direct purchase from either the manufacturer or an outside supplier, for example Toronto, cannot be prevented. This is additionally complicated by the very wide geographical base of the electronics telecommunications industry. Even hobbyists frequently deal with California firms, and the back pages of every electronics or telecommunications magazine are filled with product lists from companies all over the continent and beyond. The province can't prevent anyone from helping a customer in directly ordering a product and then charging a consulting fee. An advertiser may advertise in the U.S.A. with the signal fed back into Saskatchewan over cable TV. The government has found out that it can't delete cable advertising. The U.S. networks consider taking the program without the commercials as broadcast piracy and are quite prepared to jam the signal rather than establish a precedent.

The CRTC banned deletion of cable advertisements when the signal into southern Ontario was about to be jammed. The government cannot ban advertisements in national publications such as Canadian Business, the Financial Post, or the Financial Times of Canada. Similarly, they can't ban national catalogues such as the Radio Shack catalogue which contains numerous items that will be illegal under Bill 13. Bill 13 bans only the attachments being advertised. It is still possible to use generic terms to advertise many of these different attachments, Mr. Speaker, much like a restaurant being unable to advertise that it serves specific brands of liquor but it can advertise that it serves liquor.

Mr. Speaker, section 44(3) should definitely be dropped because of its total unenforceability combined with the dictatorial powers contained in it. Subsection 44(4) should also be dropped. The definitions in 44(1) and 44(2) should be tightened considerably.

Mr. Speaker, a statement of Sask Tel's rights and restrictions should be issued such as the following: telecommunications represents an increasingly vital cornerstone to Canada's economic success, particularly because of the vast distances between points in different provinces and territories. It is clearly an area of federal responsibility under the CRTC. Sask Tel must accept the CRTC decisions and can't try to legislate them away. Sask Tel has no right to a monopoly in any area unless it is either granted by the CRTC, or earned in the market place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Sask Tel must be viewed as a collection of a number of utilities, telephones, data communications, feeding cable TV subscribers, connecting headends to cable TV stations, etc. Although each of these utilities may share common resources (people equipment and buildings), for efficiency they represent separate services. Sask Tel cannot use one as an enforcement against the user of another. For example, the CRTC interconnect decisions prevented telephone companies from using their telephone monopoly to create a data communications monopoly. A second example is that Sask Tel has no right to jam the signal leaving Saskatoon Telecable on the basis of the signal entering Saskatoon Telecable. Sask Tel must revert to the courts or the CRTC if it has any complaints about possible breach of contract or possible illegal use of a satellite receiving antenna.

Sask Tel has the right to expect that equipment being connected to its network is compatible with the network; that is, that it meets telephone company standards for the telephone company's equipment. Mr. Speaker, they have the right to demand that proof of compatibility be given prior to interconnection — proof for the entire product line rather than each individual attachment. They have the right to disconnect incompatible equipment and the right to collect for damages from incompatible equipment via the courts. Sask Tel has the right to demand that proof of competence of the installers be given prior to any electrical connection to or modification of Sask Tel equipment. However, Sask Tel has no right to demand the installation of couplers, which were \$2 worth of electronic parts rented out for about \$10 a month, providing the equipment is already compatible.

Mr. Speaker, I should for the record like to remind those on the opposite side of the House of the Canadian Bill of Rights authorized by the real champion of freedom, the Rt. Hon. John G. Diefenbaker. Mr. Speaker, for the members opposite, the Canadian Bill of Rights is an Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions; affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law; and being desirous of enshrining these principles and the human rights and fundamental freedoms derived from them in a Bill of Rights which shall reflect the respect of parliament for its constitutional authority and which shall ensure the protection of these rights and freedoms in Canada; therefore, Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada enacts as follows.

Mr. Speaker, I hopefully don't have to read the Canadian Bill of Rights to the members opposite. They realize what is contained in it. Hopefully this government has received the message from the people of Saskatchewan. I will not be supporting this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D. W. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to have the opportunity again to speak on a bill which I think is a bill designed specifically for the protection of the citizens of Saskatchewan and not for the protection of big

business in Toronto or Ottawa.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, this whole controversy has been what one might term a tempest in a teapot. The issue has been distorted by those who do not understand the facts, such as the member for Wilkie. And there's little question — when I listened to him today very carefully — he did not know the facts of the bill. He barely talked about Bill No. 13. He talked about jamming of the cable which has nothing to do with Bill No. 13. He talked about just everything with regard to human rights and civil liberties and you name it, but he forgot to talk about Bill No. 13 and what protection it gives to the rate-averaging system for the people of Saskatchewan. That's what he forgot to talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I just want, for the record, to indicate a few more points concerning the necessity of this bill. First of all, Bill No. 13 is really nothing new at all. This control over the network has been in Sask Tel's tariffs since before 1928 and surely the member for Wilkie should have known that. All he had to do was look in a telephone book. Every telephone company in Canada has similar controls, either through its tariff, or by legislation. The member for Wilkie didn't realize that either.

Alberta and Manitoba have similar legislation, in spite of the fact the member for Wilkie tried to tell us today that this legislation in some way is different, when in fact the wording is basically the same and will do exactly what we are doing here — try to protect the subscribers in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta from gouging by private enterprise. That's what it's doing.

Mr. Speaker, the concern is not the private, leased lines which do not affect the switched network. It is the switched network itself that we are trying to protect, and I think it must be protected if we want to do the job and we have to do for the rural subscribers, particularly, of this province.

What are the reasons for this control? Well, one is to avoid fragmentation so that universal access can be maintained for voice and achieved in other services. We must have compatibility among terminals. The member talked about compatibility, but he talked about compatibility not knowing what he was talking about. He doesn't know what compatibility means with regard to the switched network.

Mr. Speaker, what is true for voice is true for any other message form — printed word, photos, drawings, teletype, facsimile data, etc. Let me just explain one little item to the member. Let me give you an example of a telewriter for the deaf. The telewriter services for the deaf in this province is a good example of a non-voice service which the member talks against. He doesn't want non-voice service. Just talking about telephones, in this case the standardization of the telephone instrument to monitor its compatibility with the typewriter, with the telewriter, and the telewriter itself, has assured the deaf in this province universal access; Mr. Speaker, universal access from any telephone in the province.

Without such control, and without Bill No. 13, this compatibility could not be assured, and I think it should be for our people who are handicapped. This is what we mean when we say we want to protect the switched network for access by everyone, and every message form. Our motto is efficiency of the medium to serve the freedom of the message from all people, not just big business users.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot a person can say about this bill. I do want to make a few

comments about some of the things the member for Wilkie said the other day. Once again, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I tried to explain our intent for the bill in a logical and common sense way. I know that is hard for the opposition to understand because we have seen, and have seen on many occasions, the lack of common sense displayed by the members opposite, and I must say, particularly the member for Wilkie.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition to this bill is very predictable because we know who the white-gowned freedom fighters opposite are, and whom they are for. We know that. They speak for themselves and they spoke today again for themselves. Do the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, oppose this bill because they're concerned for the people of Saskatchewan, as owners of Sask Tel? No, they don't. Of course, they don't. There is no question whom they are looking after.

We see another example of whom the Progressive Conservatives watch out for. The Tories, Mr. Speaker, are only interested in protecting environment which favours their big business friends. They are not concerned about all the residents in Saskatchewan. The hon. member for Wilkie has tried to arouse suspicion and fear of restricted freedom and a big-brother attitude. Mr. Speaker, we have heard it all before. The people of this province are knowledgeable enough to see through this blatant, disgusting type of politics. Mr. Speaker, I think these tactics are an insult to the people of Saskatchewan, and the intelligence they have. I think it's a shame to hear the opposition today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — If anything, Mr. Speaker, we are extending freedom to our subscribers by protecting our network from fragmentation into more financially attractive markets. This legislation will allow us to continue to rate average, to provide more customers with service and to improve services to our existing customers. If the member for Wilkie thinks this is wrong, he is turning his back on his own constituency. If we cannot protect our network and our market is fragmented, our revenues will decline, our costs will increase and with that will come increased costs to our subscribers and a decrease of services. Is that what the opposition wants?

Mr. Speaker, is the opposition asking us to increase our costs and decrease our services? If that's what they are saying they should be voting against this bill; it will be clear to the people in the country that they don't want new services, that they don't want improved services such as burying the cable in Wilkie constituency. That's not what they want. They want us to reduce our revenues and increase costs to all the subscribers. That's what they want. That's what they will get if they vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is exactly what the Devine Conservatives are saying. Since when have the Tories ever had a social conscience about the residents of this province? All they want to do is stay pals, palsie-walsie, with their big business friends.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a short article which appeared in the Regina Leader-Post on Friday, May 9, 1980. Let me read the article to you. Of course, the article is from a person in Toronto, a sales director. I quote:

A telecommunications bill before the Saskatchewan legislature would enable that province to exert unfair pressure on companies outside Saskatchewan, says James McDaniel, sales director of CNCP Telecom-

munications.

In a speech Thursday to the Canadian Business Equipment Manufacturers' Association, he said Bill 13 would prohibit any equipment from being attached to Saskatchewan Telecommunications Corporations' system without the corporation's written permission. (Again wrong, but he nevertheless says it).

The Saskatchewan legislature would give the provincial government power to exert pressure on companies to locate their offices in Saskatchewan he said.

Isn't it shame that we might have some pressure on them to locate an office in Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent example which shows where the Tories stand on this issue. It shows exactly where the Tories stand on this issue. They want companies as . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I listened carefully to the member for Wilkie. I was able to hear the member for Wilkie all the time he was speaking. I want to be able to hear the Minister of Telephones all the time he is speaking too. I would ask the members to keep the noise down in the House so I can hear the member who is speaking.

MR. CODY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying when I sat down, I think it is an excellent example and shows where the Tories stand on this issue. They want companies such as CNCP to come to Saskatchewan to interconnect so that they can cream-skim profitable segments of our market and leave the rural areas to Sask Tel. That's exactly what Jim McDaniel says we would do. That's exactly what CNCP will be doing. There's no question in my mind.

Mr. Speaker, they would cream-skim profitable segments of our market and leave the rural and, I might add, unprofitable areas such as Wilkie, or Riceton in the member for Qu'Appelle's constituency, for Sask Tel to serve. The only way to continue to provide those services is to protect our basic network and the concept of rate averaging. I don't think the Tories should be let off the hook on this one. I don't believe we should let them off because it shouldn't be necessary to allow them to look at this part of Saskatchewan and have them pay more so their private enterprise friends such as CNCP can have a tremendous advantage.

Mr. Speaker, the CRTC decision that allowed CNCP interconnection with Bell Canada was opposed by all three prairie provincial governments and that includes Tory Alberta. I can tell the hon. gentlemen I talked to Neil Webber, the associate minister of telephones in Alberta in the last couple of weeks about decisions the CRTC has made and about decisions the DOC is making and he is foursquare behind the decision for jamming the cable in Saskatoon. He know that the same thing could happen in Alberta.

I can tell you I talked as recently as three months ago to the former minister of telephones in Manitoba, Ed McGill, and he said the very same thing. The three prairie governments at the communications ministers' conference stood foursquare against interconnection. And the members opposite say interconnection is necessary so their private enterprise friends can have some financial gain at the expense of the rural subscribers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the federal cabinet of the day had the opportunity to reverse that decision but chose to allow the decision for interconnect to go ahead. And, Mr. Speaker, what was that government? It was none other than a Tory government; the very short-lived Tory government of Joe Clark and his Conservatives which again is evidence of the Tory social conscience. Obviously the Tories in Saskatchewan have no social conscience, not nearly as much of a social conscience as those in Alberta and those in Manitoba. There's little question about that.

Mr. Speaker, are the Tories genuinely opposed to the principles of this bill or are they using this as a cheap, low-grade political tool to grab the odd headline? I think it's pretty obvious that the Tories don't oppose this bill in principle. How can they face their constituents if they do? How can the member for Wilkie go back home and tell his friends, because of the stand I took on Bill 13, I have taken a stand directly against you? How can he do that? If I were the member for Wilkie, I wouldn't go back home to my constituency until this bill was passed and all of them decided to vote for it because he will be laughed out of the place, if not run out of the place.

Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with is the concept of universality. This is a very important point because particularly in Saskatchewan where we have a very sparsely populated province, it becomes more and more important. Universal access should be known by everyone here because this is the same basis we have for medicare in this province. I wonder, do the Tories oppose universal access to medicare as well? They probably do; we know they do. They oppose it just like they oppose universal access to telephones. Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that the Conservatives opposite are using this issue as a cheap political scam to try and attract headlines for political gains.

They are going to get their headlines all right, but not the headlines they bargained for. I think the people of this province will find out whose interests these Tories support. I think their record clearly indicates the Tories favour large multinational concerns and totally disregard the interest of Saskatchewan residents.

Mr. Speaker, this cheap political game playing by the opposition may be proven I think as well. The very same legislation, as I said before, is now in existence in Alberta and in Manitoba. I wonder, is the opposition willing to table all their briefs and submissions opposing the legislation of these respective governments, or have they ever made representation to those respective governments? I'll bet they haven't. If the members opposite have not done so, I think it will show that they are truly playing games for political expediency.

Another very interesting point was that the member read into the record certain letters and briefs which he received from various organizations or people. It's a very funny thing if it wasn't just for cheap political purposes, but I didn't get the same kinds of letters. Why didn't I get those letters? I got a number of letters and I answered every one of them. I got a number of requests and I answered every request I got. That isn't all. Any organization which wanted a meeting with me got a meeting with me. The member indicated that the Credit Union Central in this province is totally opposed to Bill 13. I can tell you right now, that is simply not true.

I had a meeting in this very building with the people from Sask Pool, from the co-operators, Credit Union Central, and from all of the other central co-operatives, and I can tell you that the differences which we had were ironed out. They were the ones who asked us to put into regulation the things which we could attach or not attach.

The member says we took this upon ourselves to say that we wanted to take the regulations so cabinet could make the decisions and not the technical people at Sask Tel.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we were being responsive to people who asked us to be responsive. That was the co-operatives. The ham operators asked us for a meeting. We had a meeting. We gave them 100 per cent assurance that anything they wanted to do with regard to emergencies would be done, the same as it's done today in the tariff. And yet the member for Wilkie gets up and says those are not the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time the opposition in this House told some of the facts and not only a few of the half-truths and untruths he was telling us today.

Mr. Speaker, if the opposition votes against this bill they are voting against universal access to the telecommunications industry in Saskatchewan. At the same time they are telling the employees of Sask Tel, those dedicated men and women that he talked about before, that I was threatening them with their very jobs. Mr. Speaker, they are telling them that somehow they are not capable of meeting the telecommunications needs of the people of this province, or are they telling them that under a Conservative government their jobs may well be in jeopardy. Because we know the Tories support the idea of fragmenting the market. They support the idea of fragmenting our market to their big business friends. And that's what it's all about. There's no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, we have had representations, as I indicated a moment before, from many a person and from some organizations. We have dealt with all of those representations and we have given them the answers they were looking for.

I want to say before I sit down that I think it's a sorry day for the people of Saskatchewan when we see an opposition who say they are concerned about rates, who say they are concerned because they think we should have a utilities board to look after rates, and at the same time are prepared to vote against a bill like this which would disallow interconnection with CNCP (who would be skimming off large profits and putting it onto the backs of the people of Saskatchewan). I think it's a sorry day when we see a political party under a leader who purports to be in favour of trying to do something for the people of Saskatchewan and then turns right around and what does he do? He will have his own people vote against a bill which will, in fact, protect the subscribers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this bill here will be a good bill for the people of Saskatchewan, and I'm more than happy to give it second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 34

Blakeney	Shillington	Cody
Pepper	MacMurchy	Koskie
Allen	Mostoway	Lusney
Bowerman	Banda	Prebble
Smishek	Kaeding	Long

Romanow
Messer
Snyder
Kramer
Baker
Skoberg
Gross

Kowalchuk
Feschuk
Byers
Vickar
Rolfes
Cowley

Johnson
Engel
Poniatowski
Lingenfelter
White
Solomon

NAYS — 13

Thatcher
Birkbeck
Lane
Taylor
Rousseau

Pickering
Garner
Muirhead
Katzman

Andrew
McLeod
Collver
Ham

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — CULTURE AND YOUTH - VOTE 7

Item 1 (continued)

MR. G. M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Minister, I began by looking at the estimates of culture and youth this afternoon considering the community cultural grant. I know it is on page 16 of your annual report, but there is a notation there which indicates in the year 1978-79 there was a 20 per cent increase. Is it your experience now that is increasing? Do you anticipate a greater demand for expenditures in that area in this Celebrate Saskatchewan year?

HON. E. B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth): — I would advise the hon. member (and I am sure I don't have to) that the annual report deals with the 1978-79 year. The cultural grants were abolished last year and haven't been in effect for over a year.

MR. McLEOD: — That's basically why I asked the question. I would ask you, Mr. Minister, why, when we are leading into a year when we are celebrating the heritage and many cultures of the province and so on, could you possibly, as a department, abolish a grant such as the community cultural grants, when in 1978-79 (the last year they were in existence) there was a 20 per cent increase in demand for them? Certainly we have all the different cultures and people within this province. Why would you have abolished that? We will leave it at that for now.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, about the propriety of discussing action which was taken in the last budget year. Nevertheless, let me respond in this fashion by saying that we felt it to be less necessary because of Celebrate Saskatchewan and because of the money coming out of that corporation for these self-same activities. But the real answer to your question is, the whole matter is under review in the cultural policy secretariat. We will be awaiting their recommendations. They may recommend this be reinstated. I would suspect (although I don't know because I don't know what they are recommending) they would recommend support to community cultural activities but perhaps in a different form than this takes. The shorter answer is that the matter is under review by the cultural policy secretariat and we are awaiting their report.

MR. McLEOD: — That is basically my concern — that it is under review. I don't disagree that Celebrate Saskatchewan activities can be taking up some of the slack in this area this year. My concern (and the concern of a lot of people in the communities in the cultural areas) is that Celebrate Saskatchewan in itself and by its very nature will hopefully reawaken this cultural feeling within some of these groups. Hopefully you would bring something in to replace that, or along that line, in the future and into next year. So that was a concern which I had.

On page 18 of your annual report — historic parks — you discussed these parks and I would ask you, Mr. Minister, if you have any plans for further restorations, or any which are under way at the present time? I would also like to know of any plans you have for historic parks to be built in this coming year?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There are no immediate plans to establish any new historic parks. What we're doing is simply maintenance, or as it's called by the public service, stabilization. The reason for this is that we are in the process of drawing up a master plan for historic parks. We want to prioritize our reference. Our resources are limited. I'm sure you people approve of that in some senses. We want to be in a position to prioritize the available funds given to the department. We are, therefore, drawing up a master plan. We expect that in a couple of years we may go on from there to develop some new historic parks.

An additional reason for doing nothing but maintenance is the work we anticipate, if it ever gets out of this legislature, with respect to The Heritage Act . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you. That's a nice assurance to have. The officials all appreciate it as much as I do. That is going to require a fair amount of manpower and I suspect some money as well to put into effect; our resources are going to be stretched then as it is. The answer to your question is no, not now. We are working on the master plan board.

MR. McLEOD: — I notice you said within a couple of years; this master plan work can go on forever really. But I would ask you when do you expect this? Can you give us a date when you feel you'll have this master plan?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Two years is our own goal.

MR. McLEOD: — I have a question from my own constituency concerning Fort Pitt. Are there any plans in your department for restoration and further development at Fort Pitt?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, not at the moment.

MR. McLEOD: — I have a question regarding the recreational cultural facilities, the capital grant program, and it's certainly one that comes up every year in here. The hon. member for Bengough-Milestone I know mentioned this before, as have others on this side of the House. Certainly with that program, the money made available to communities for the development and the building of recreational facilities and the capital expenditure involved there, almost all of the municipalities have difficulty with the operational costs. We've made recommendations about that in the past; we'll continue to make recommendations that you consider making representation from your department to the minister responsible for SPC and others not to put in demand meters and help with the cost of operation, especially the high power rates and so on, in

those areas. Have you done anything in that area and will you be looking at that?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Let me answer it in this way by saying that we have not. It was the basic philosophy and the basic thrust of this government that we would get out of conditional grants. I think we have yet to see if we can make that work, and if we can actually make that stick. But that was our effort, to get out of conditional grants into revenue sharing through one grant. They may spend it on their skating rinks. They may spend it wherever they want; that's a local decision, not ours. We had hoped to do away with the proliferation of specialized grants for operating of curling rinks and this and that. As I say, we have yet to see if we can make that work. We may not be able to. The matter is under review, but our basic aim is to not introduce any more specialized grants.

MR. McLEOD: — I agree with the idea of getting away from that, but I would ask you once again to make representation (this is a major concern of the municipalities and I'm sure your officials are aware and you've had representation from people), to take demand meters out of the rinks. That's the major cost they have in terms of operating these curling and skating facilities across the province.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm informed by the officials that there is a program within the Department of Municipal Affairs which does provide some assistance for operating expenses for recreational facilities so perhaps you might direct your question as well to the Minister of Urban Affairs when these estimates come up.

MR. D. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — As the Minister of Culture and Youth, responsible for the recreation and the sport in the province, do you think that communities should be burdened with this extra cost for power because of demand meters? What's your thought on this Mr. Minister?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Do you want my personal view? I think generally with respect to energy costs, whether you are talking about automobiles or curling rinks or the temperature within the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, our goals should be not to subsidize energy costs but to assist individuals in communities to conserve energy. And personally, I'm not in favour of reducing the energy costs of communities for their recreation facilities. What I am in favour of doing, and what we are doing, is assisting communities in saving energy within these recreation facilities. We have tried a number of things, a number of things which have worked, and I can list them if you want but you didn't particularly ask for them. Do you want my personal views? No, we shouldn't be subsidizing cheap energy. We should be assisting communities to save energy in recreation facilities as elsewhere and we are doing this.

MR. R. H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Minister, I don't think you understand the demand meter. It doesn't conserve energy; it just increases the cost. That's what the member for Indian Head-Wolseley was asking you, if you were going to subsidize them or take them out. We have been asking this for many years, and many of the small rural communities in Saskatchewan have been asking for it because they can't bear the brunt of the cost of the demand meter in comparison to an ordinary meter.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, I want to be candid and say I don't understand the demand meter. I think the proper place for these questions if I may suggest, Mr. Chairman, is in Crown corporations in SPC. I guess they have already gone through that but I think that's the proper place to ask about demand meters. Frankly I don't know what a

demand meter is. I did understand the thrust of your suggestion was that municipalities would pay a lower cost for the energy they used in their recreation facilities than they do now through some means other than the demand meter. It's that basic principle I'm opposed to. But if you say I don't understand demand meters, you are dead right, I don't understand them.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I asked in this session, in this House, the minister in charge of Sask Power about this, and I didn't get a very favourable reply. But that's why we are asking you as the minister who is in charge and your officials who are in charge of sport in this province. It doesn't seem logical to us on this side to be going out and giving grants to communities for rinks and facilities and so on for which I think they are grateful and then not giving them some ease in operating. I don't hold it against you for not knowing what a demand meter is but would you make representation to the minister in charge of Sask Power because I tell you that in the communities of Saskatchewan this is a concern. And you know the power rates are going up a considerable amount and the demand meters are costing more to operate these facilities. So that is why our line of questioning is to you today — in your responsibility for sport and for recreation this would be a logical suggestion for you to give to your accompanying minister.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I think, Mr. Chairman, I'll just take the member's word that it is logical; as I said I don't understand what demand meters are and it's hard to respond. I think I'll just take the member's word for it and take it up with the minister in charge of SPC and perhaps we'll leave it at that.

MR. TAYLOR: — I noticed today and last night a little inconsistency on the other side of the House and I would just like to draw it to your attention, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Culture and Youth (whom we are questioning now) in discussions about the Crown corporation for Celebrate Saskatchewan indicated (and correct me if I perceive in an incorrect fashion what you said) that by having it under a Crown corporation removed to some extent Celebrate Saskatchewan from the arm of government, or the Executive Council. That's what I interpreted you to say. This afternoon though I heard your colleague, who sits behind you, in debate on Bill No. 13, turn around with a complete flip-flop. I wonder just what the government's position is on this.

He said we took the tariff off on Bill No. 13, removed the tariff, and put it into regulations under the Executive Council to bring it closer to government. Now what is the position of the government over there? Is it that in the Crown corporation it's further away, or do you bring it into the Executive Council? Do you see a contradiction between what you and your colleague are talking about?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, I think not, Mr. Chairman. With regard to Crown corporations and the role Crown corporations may play and their removal from the executive arm of government, the need for all that varies from one Crown corporation to another and from one government to another.

Let me say, with respect to the federal government, almost all Crown corporations are very, very distant from the government. Someone earlier was talking about CNR. CNR to me is virtually identical to CPR. They are very far removed from government. I'm sure they don't see the minister in charge once a year. But that's not true of all Crown corporations and our philosophy with respect to Crown corporations is by and large different.

In this government we take what might be called the opposite view. With respect to

most Crown corporations, we view them as more independent of government than the departments but still basically something which carries out government policy. So I find no quarrel with what the member was saying, that Sask Tel ought to reflect government policy and this government's philosophy. Having said that, I don't see any contradiction in that and what I said: having Celebrate Saskatchewan in a Crown corporation puts it more distant than having it in a line department.

If a program is run by a line department, it seems to me that suggests to the public it's a governmental program. When you put it in a Crown corporation it seems to me to be easier to sell the notion to the people that it is not a government program. It's their program, and we are just providing them with the wherewithal to organize their own celebration.

It's purely a matter of cosmetics. I'm not sure this isn't a tempest in a teapot. I said yesterday I think the program would have come off as well, no better, no worse, if it had been run out of the department. As I say, I'm not sure it's a great issue, but maybe I miss your point.

MR. TAYLOR: — I see a contradiction between you and the other minister, but we won't belabour that this afternoon.

I'm glad to hear you say that the program of Celebrate Saskatchewan could have been as good under your department. I agree with you. I think it would have been a lot cheaper, and I think that would have been a benefit to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Are you prepared to answer questions on Celebrate Saskatchewan? One question then. How many people have been employed under the Celebrate Saskatchewan program? How many new employees have there been since the concept and the Crown corporation was formed? Can you give me that answer, please?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Just the changing of the guard behind me. I'll have to wait for them. There was a total of 20 on staff as of that date.

MR. TAYLOR: — Is that as of now?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It is as of March 31, 1980. I'm told there are two less now.

MR. TAYLOR: — Do you have any contract, any casuals or anything of that nature?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There are some casuals, none on contract.

MR. TAYLOR: — How many are casual?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There are 11.

MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you. I have another question. I understand you had some people called mobile guidance counsellors, who were under the Department of Culture and Youth. I understand some of their jobs are going to be terminated. On contact with schools in Saskatchewan, they say this was a tremendous service. I think you must realize, being the ex-minister of education, that we are short of guidance personnel, especially in rural Saskatchewan. How many of these people will have their jobs terminated? Why would you be cutting a service about which principals have phoned me and told me was really well-received.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It was not because we disagreed with the service they were providing or because the service wasn't necessary; we did it as part of internal reorganization within the government. It was the feeling of the government as a whole and not particularly our department, that this function which relates solely to schools should be carried out by the Department of Education, the department which generally relates to schools. That, in fact, is what will happen.

When the education estimates come up, you can quiz the Minister of Education, but you will find he is setting up a service which will parallel and indeed be a great deal better than what we are providing. One must keep in mind that we had only two on staff. It really wasn't equipped. That was one of the reasons why we decided to move it and set it up on a proper footing.

MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you very much for the explanation. I understand some of these individuals were very acceptable in their jobs. Do you know if they are being considered for transfer into the Department of Education or are they being let go?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am told that one has already left for personal reasons without any pressure being applied by anyone. The other one is being taken care of through the public service commission and we will find employment for him elsewhere. I am not sure he will wind up in the Department of Education, but we will find employment for him elsewhere through the regular channels of the public service commission.

MR. TAYLOR: — I would like to move now to a statement made by one of your officials in an editorial in the Leader-Post some time ago, where he said the idea is to assert some control over our cultural destiny. I believe there is supposed to be a report coming down in July. This official indicated there would be a report coming down in July. I would like you to explain just what type of control you are thinking of exerting over the cultural destiny of the people of Saskatchewan.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't have the editorial before me. Last night I introduced Dr. Vichert to whom, I think, the statement was attributed. We are not, in any sense, attempting to exert any kind of cultural control. What we seek to do is provide an atmosphere in which the culture of Saskatchewan will flourish, build and blossom on its own. We seek to provide a fertile soil for the culture of Saskatchewan to grow. We don't seek to control it in that sense.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, statement is in quotation marks and I quote:

The idea is to assert some control over our cultural destiny.

Now, that doesn't mean a fertile ground to me. That means control over the culture of this province. Let's have a little better explanation than fertile ground for our culture to grow in.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I think, with respect to the statement, I will have to have a copy of the editorial in order to respond.

If you look at it in its context, as I suspected, what Dr. Vichert was talking about was the encouragement of our own culture, our own indigenous culture and an attempt to

prevent that from being overrun and swamped by the all-overpowering culture of our friends and neighbours to the south. That is what he was referring to. He was referring to some protection for our own indigenous culture.

It was certainly not an attempt to influence what culture may grow spontaneously from the Saskatchewan people. It is simply an attempt, as I think the context of the paragraph shows (and I will read it all for you if you want) to talk about protecting that indigenous culture from, as I say, people to the south with whom we are friends. But most people do not want to be a part of their culture.

MR. TAYLOR: — I read the entire article. That is why I sent it to you, to co-operate with you. But still you are not explaining how you are going to control this. I know you're concerned about culture from other areas, but you know, when you start talking about a society's cultural control, that's a pretty loaded type of statement.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, as I say, I suppose I can repeat this ad infinitum but we're not in any sense attempting to control what comes spontaneously out of Saskatchewan society. With respect to how we're going to do it, I can't really answer that until I get the report. I could talk about what other societies have done in Canada and I can talk about what other societies have done in other countries. But I think that may not be very useful because they may or may not be useful and applicable to the Saskatchewan environment. I could give you examples of the kinds of things other societies are doing but that is the only way I could answer the question until I get the report.

MR. TAYLOR: — Will you give me a copy of the report when you get it?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — This is the only honest answer I can give to your question: we have not made a determination that the report shall be public. I expect it will be but we haven't made that decision finally; I can't answer your question until we get the report and make the decision as a caucus and as a cabinet as to whether or not the report will be public.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, I certainly would appreciate having a copy of it. It seems you and I had a little controversy last year over another report from the University of Saskatchewan. Do you remember that one? I wasn't able to get hold of that either, so I wouldn't like this to be your track record. I would like you to be open with these reports, so if this affects the culture of Saskatchewan and you are not trying to control anything, then for goodness sake just let the opposition and the people of Saskatchewan see what your government is planning to do to keep out those very bad vibes from south of the border or wherever they are coming from. I don't see any reason in hiding it and would encourage you to make it public. I would appreciate a copy sent to me and I think the people in Saskatchewan would like to know about it.

We had a discussion the other night on the film *Who Has Seen the Wind*, and the minister from SEDCO said that all he did was put up the money or something, \$300,000. He said it would be more appropriate if we questioned you and you said you would answer questions. Has any money come back from that? Was that just an out-and-out grant to the makers of the film or has the Government of Saskatchewan received any revenue from the film *Who Has Seen the Wind*?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We have received some money. We have not received all of our money. I don't know for sure how much money we have received, if that is your next question. I'll have to let you know in writing as soon as we can get that information.

Apparently we don't have it here.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, if you can't supply it right now, yes, I would be interested in knowing how much money has come back from producing that show. I would like to know how many showings it had, whether it is still being shown and if you have any hope of recouping your money from it. I will accept your giving me a written answer on that. However, my colleague said you were previously warned that we were going to go after this, so we thought maybe we'd have this information today.

What other films are you actively engaged in giving grants to? Are these grants, or what money is this you give to these films?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, we have been actively pursued since *Who Has Seen the Wind* by a seemingly endless number of producers who want assistance and we have said no to them all. We are not in the business of providing grants, taking out shares, or loaning money to people making films. That service is provided very well by the national income tax service which allows tax breaks and, you know, those tax shelters. That system works and works very well. I have an article in my desk that I was reading a couple of days ago on the film industry and how it is operating. There is lots of money going into the film industry and we don't think it is something that we particularly need to try to supplement at this time.

MR. TAYLOR: — So some of these films like *Alien Thunder*, *Slap Shot*, what other ones were there? Well, the new one — *Father Pere Murray* and *the Hounds*. There's no funding, no grants, and no money from the Department of Culture and Youth put into any of those films that are Saskatchewan-type films.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It's true of all of the films you mentioned, except one, and that's *Alien Thunder*. That occurred a long time ago, long before I was minister, and long before *Who Has Seen the Wind*. I believe with respect to *Alien Thunder* that, not a department, but it seems to me SEDCO or the Department of Industry and Commerce did provide them with some assistance to set up the sites. The member for Rosthern is nodding his head and I think that's right. I think we did provide them with some assistance to set up the sites, but that was a long time ago. It was years and years ago.

For the last few years our policy has been that we are not in the business of subsidizing films.

MR. TAYLOR: — Do you know why there was funding for *Who Has Seen the Wind*?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, I know the general philosophy behind it. You want to hear it all? The general philosophy was that the people who were prepared to make the film were prepared to teach Saskatchewan people the art of film making, and they did. They hired local people and taught them how to make films in their various aspects. As well, I think, in the Premier's words, we have a lot of stories to tell and few storytellers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You may have your skeletons in the closet, but the member for Moosomin can speak for himself. Movies are a powerful art form and this was felt to be one way of telling a Saskatchewan story. We did it once as a trial project. We don't particularly intend to repeat it.

I may add that I may be enunciating the opposite policy next year when I get the report of a cultural policy secretariat because I suppose they may urge me to get into films again; I don't know. I haven't seen that yet and I attach that caveat. We're not in the

business now but, again, await any comments which our secretariat may have on that and any comments which we may get from the Saskatchewan people when we release the report, as I hope we do.

MR. TAYLOR: — You mentioned it was to train Saskatchewan people in film making. Do you know if any of these people who were trained are still making films? Are they making them in Saskatchewan or have they moved out of Saskatchewan? Do they continue to pursue that endeavour?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The answer to all your questions is yes. We have had a fair number of people go on to various lines of endeavour in film making. Whatever the merits of the film, our efforts to train people probably justified the \$300,000 we put in it because we got a lot of talent out of it from Saskatchewan.

MR. TAYLOR: — In regard to assistance to books, and I'll cite two in particular for you, what does your department do? One book I'm thinking of is the book that the potash corporation is making available, the pictorial history of Saskatchewan. Was there any kind of a grant there? I understand Dr. Archer is putting together a story from some of the stories he tells for the family of Crown corporations. Is there any assistance for that?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Not from the department but I believe there is some from Celebrate Saskatchewan. The officials are trying to pull that out of the neatly piled paper they have there. Maybe you could just go on to your next question and they will put it out of that mess.

MR. TAYLOR: — There are some groups that are operating in the province, various plays, theatrical groups and so on. I was wondering, if there was any funding for them? I'll list them if you want to, or if you have the answer to the other question, I'll accept the answer and then I'll list these for you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We do provide some. We provide some directly, some indirectly through the arts board. We would have to have the list of the particular groups you have in mind before we could respond specifically to how much they get.

I now have the answer on the literary question you asked. The history of Saskatchewan which you mentioned (Dr. Archer's history of Saskatchewan) is being funded under the Celebrate Saskatchewan umbrella but directly through the archives board, to a total of \$212,390.

The profits from our publicly owned potash company were so extensive they were able to pay the entire cost of the pictorial history of Saskatchewan — another benefit from the potash policy of . . . (inaudible) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — I'll have to ask that question at another time, I suppose. I'd be interest in some of these groups; for example, the play Paper Wheat has been touring for some time. What grants have you been putting into the production of Paper Wheat as it goes around the province of Saskatchewan?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We'll get the answer for you in a moment. There's funding from more than one department. I know that play began when I was minister of co-ops and it was that department which provided them with the first grant. We provided them with

some money from the department for it. But I know the Department of Culture and Youth has simultaneously provided them with money so we'll have to get all of that for you. If you'll go on to your next question, we'll give you that answer.

MR. TAYLOR: — Then the next one is a group known as Left Turns. Do you fund Left Turns in any way, shape or form?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No.

MR. TAYLOR: — What about Regina Dance Works? Did you have money in Regina Dance Works?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The arts board does and again we'll get you that information just as soon as the official comes. The executive director of the arts board is on her way but is not here yet. As soon as she comes down we'll get you the information you asked for.

MR. TAYLOR: — I understand they ran into a bit of financial difficulty and they've taken off with a bit of money. I want to know how much money you had in there and if you have any way to get the money back from them and if you're thinking of any legal action against them?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, you're misinformed, rather honestly I think, by a report in the paper. They have not taken off with any money and have not done anything improper to my knowledge. What they have proposed doing is selling the building they are in and that is a matter between them and the city. The grant came from the recreational cultural facilities program but as members will know with effect to that program, cities allocate the money and they do with it whatever they want. We just give the money to whomever they tell us to. The city gave them the money for the building. They propose selling the building; some people have taken exception to that. I don't because I don't think frankly it's any of our concern. That's a matter between them and the city.

MR. TAYLOR: — All right, so what you're saying is your money there was an unconditional grant to the city of Regina and the action is between them. There is one other group I am interested in. When I first knew them they were called the Modern Dance Workshop or something and I think they've changed their name to the Prairie Dance Lab — creative dance supposedly. Do you fund them?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Prairie Dance Lab — this gets confusing as members can see because you have several agencies behind you, each of whom operate independently. I'm informed the arts board has given them nothing. The Department of Culture and Youth gives them nothing; however, they weren't left completely high and dry because Celebrate Saskatchewan gave them \$2,000. I understand they had a special program which was providing dance and entertainment for senior citizens. It was on the basis of that particular program that they received their \$2,000 grant from Celebrate Saskatchewan.

MR. TAYLOR: — They must be getting money from somewhere else because they've been sneaking around the schools for the last number of years and are not very well received. I understand they went down to the Regina School Board and didn't get a very good reception there. You're sure there's no money coming from your department? Where is it coming from?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I don't think I've introduced Joy Cohnstaedt. I'm not sure she was on the floor last night. She's the director of the Saskatchewan Arts Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — She informs me that according to the best of her knowledge and belief, they have received money from the arts commission of the city of Regina. They may as well, she tells me, have received money from the Department of Education, but nothing from us. So perhaps you can ask the Minister of Education when his estimates are up. He may know more about it.

MR. TAYLOR: — You are planning an answer on paper. Maybe we could speed this up a bit. As you can see I am interested in these groups which you fund, Mr. Minister. Could you supply me with a list of the ones which you have funded and the extent of the funding?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, that will be a lot simpler than this process. We will undertake to do that.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Last evening I was asking the minister about the YES (youth employment services) grants. I had a moment or two to speak with him after the House adjourned. On the YES grant my concern was that you had suggested if they had it the year before, they continued to receive it and you made sure that everyone who applied got it. But I assume there must have been a basis for how they got it — if they weren't in the program the year before could new people qualify because it didn't seem to be an unlimited program.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I may not have made myself clear last night. The communities still have to meet the basic criteria. If they don't meet the criteria then they are out. That's always the case. If they meet that basic criteria and they received a grant last year of \$800 or less, they receive the same thing this year.

MR. KATZMAN: — You are telling me it is an unlimited tap unless I am misunderstanding you. Let's assume there is \$127,000 (as it says here) and you have 127,000 applications, then each one would get \$1?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — If the program actually became that extensive we would obviously have to reconsider. But that's the system. If we have more applications than there are dollars to fund them completely we give them on a pro rata basis. So far we have been able to give them a reasonable grant. Now if we have 127,000 applications we would either have to bomb the program or pump a lot more money into it.

MR. KATZMAN: — You left the opinion last night that one would get \$800. The truth is you try to give the people who apply \$800 but if there are too many applications then everybody is pared down.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, the member is accurate. That is right.

MR. R. L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Mr. Minister, I am interested in your government's position with regard to the forthcoming Olympics in Moscow. The national NDP, as you

know, is the only party in Canada which is supporting the concept that we send our Olympic team to Moscow. I wonder if you are in support of that policy of the federal party?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The members are calling order. It is not necessarily in our jurisdiction, but I will repeat what I said. There is not always complete unanimity between the provincial party and the federal party. We are partners in social progress, but not the same person, if I may put it that way. I stated at the time the Government of Canada announced the Olympic boycott that it accorded with my view of the appropriate action for them to take. It is still my view that it is an appropriate way to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. But obviously the federal party has a different view on it.

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — I want to ask the minister if he has any program under his department which provides funding for historical markers for former schools which have since been removed or dismantled and the property is available for such a marker, if the residents of that particular community would like to put up a marker commemorating a former school on that particular piece of property. I wonder if the department has any provisions in that regard?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The answer to your question is yes, there is such a program. There are criteria which they must meet. The one most groups run afoul of is that the plaque must be interpretive rather than commemorative. But we do have such a program. We do provide communities with plaques. It is their responsibility to erect it and maintain the yard and so on, but the short answer to the member's question is yes.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I would ask this further question of the minister. Do you have any program under your department which would provide for the restoration of historic churches in the province of Saskatchewan? There are a number of historic churches that have been made, of course, from what is now known as very old material, which is starting to deteriorate and requires improvement. I'm just wondering if there are any provisions under your department for that particular aspect?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We do have a grant for historic restoration. The member for Meadow Lake will remember that the first time he and I met was with respect to an agreement we were signing. We have, by and large, excluded churches from eligibility because there are a very large number of them that are all about the same age and all about the same historical importance. It would be just a very large and costly program to provide grants to all of the 70-year-old churches in the province. I'm amazed at how many there are. So the short answer to the member's question is that there is an historical restoration program but by and large churches are excluded unless they are of unusual and extraordinary historical importance.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Does your department have any idea how the church — I'm sorry I can't recall the name of it — in Moosomin was able to receive some government assistance for restoration. Was that from your department or another department? If so, do you know what department it was?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, it was the old Department of Natural Resources. At one point in time, four or five years ago, the Department of Natural Resources had responsibility for the whole area of history, whether it be the Museum of Natural History or this program. I think under that program they gave some grants to churches, and as a result of finding out how many applicants there were going to be for this program we

terminated it.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, I see. I knew there was some assistance at one time, because a number of churches (notwithstanding the one in Moosomin) received some assistance and since that time I have had requests for assistance to improve and upgrade churches which are classified, justifiably, as historical churches. I have one now in the town of Maryfield, and that's the concern. They say Moosomin received assistance to upgrade theirs; we want to upgrade ours now and there's no provision for funding whatsoever. I just wanted to get some clarification on that. I understand your reply to be that once you found the numbers of churches you thought would apply, you thought it would become too expensive and too extensive and therefore cancelled the program. I was looking for an answer for that community and I suppose I have the answer. I suppose it is not completely satisfactory, but nonetheless if the community wants to keep its church in proper condition it is going to have to raise its own funds.

I want to ask one or two questions with regard to museums, in particular Rocanville. I would just use this as an example; possibly you could apply it to other museums. I know there's a need in Moosomin, for example, for a museum, but there doesn't seem to be any real provisions for funding to get a museum of any significance off the ground. I want to give you the scenario with regard to the Rocanville situation. They have a very active group in terms of providing for a museum. They have a good museum. When they started out (like a lot of projects I suppose) they did not realize the successful nature of it. Certainly it has become successful to the extent that the property they have now is just not adequate. They just have a tremendous interest there in their museum. They want to relocate. They have property that will be donated to them by the town, so they are in good standing there. I just want to read you a very short letter which I have from the Rocanville and District Museum Society. It says:

I have enclosed an approximate list of expenses for moving the Rocanville Museum to the new location. I would greatly appreciate if you would look into any available grant that would assist us in our moving endeavour. The reason we are wanting to move is a lack of room at our present location. In our present location we only have two acres with no possibility to expand our land base. (I might add at that point that that's right in the town as you know).

The new location that the town is offering to the museum is approximately 13 acres in size. This will give us a site large enough to expand as new exhibits become available, thus allowing the museum to expand and grow. I believe that any group or association of this sort that does not grow will die. It has come to our attention that there's an aircraft exhibit that will be coming available in a short time and in our present location it would be impossible to consider acquiring this exhibit due to a shortage of room. If we can move to the new location it would give us room to accommodate an exhibit of this size. Contained in this exhibit are approximately five to six aircraft.

I might add there too, Mr. Minister, it's not often that a small town like Rocanville has an opportunity to acquire antique aircraft of this nature. And if they had the property to set them up, it would just make this museum one of the more progressive and forward museums in the province of Saskatchewan and surely enhance the aspirations of that particular town in its future growth. The names of these four planes that they have available or could actually purchase are a Bristol Bollingbroke, a North American Yale, a Westland Lysander and a Tiger Moth.

There will also be a variety of antique aircraft engines mounted on stands ready for display. With an exhibit of this size we would have an exhibit of aircraft larger than the one at Moose Jaw. With an exhibit of this nature I believe we could increase attendance to the point that we could become to a larger extent more self-supporting. I thank you for your assistance.

That's generally the gist of it. Basically what I would like to know is, to what extent can your department assist the Rocanville and District Museum Society in its relocating expenses and the purchase of the aircraft I have mentioned? They have a great array of other museum articles and if they could add these aircraft to it, and the new property of course, certainly it would make the museum a very viable operation. I think, likely in all probability, they would be able to draw enough interest that they could be, maybe not completely self-supporting, but very close to self-supporting.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not sure particularly what assistance that museum is asking for. I recall the museum; I recall going through it when I lived in the area. But I'm not sure exactly what they're asking for. If they're asking for money to assist them in building a building, (it didn't sound like that from your comments; it sounded like most of that would be sort of outdoors, but if that's what they're asking for), they could get money from the recreational cultural facilities grant program. If they're asking for moving expenses and relocation expenses as such, I think we could consider it.

We have a program which is as follows: we provide operating grants of \$200 to \$800 to the museum. As well we have a special project grant, and I suppose this might be classified as a special project. I'm not sure. We have a special project grant of \$1,000. I think what you should do is contact the officials in the department with that letter or contact me to see if we can give them some assistance in their move.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you indicated earlier that you had a grant which didn't cover churches and so forth. Just one question here. Does it cover a town hall which is not in use? The town hall was originally the place where all the plays and all the cultural activities took place. What type of grant is available?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The answer to your question is yes that sort of thing is eligible. The short answer to your question is yes. We would have to know the details of it. I know of one such place and that's in Battleford. Maybe that's the one you are referring to. I don't know. Is there another one somewhere.

MR. KATZMAN: — In Rosthern.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In Rosthern. Well it may be, depending on the circumstances; we would need the details of it. Indeed, before we make any grants we evaluate the particular building to satisfy ourselves about the historical importance of it. The program is limited and there are more requests than there is money. Again, I would make the same comments to you as to the member for Moosomin: get in touch with me or my officials and we'll see if there's any tea in China for the people in Rosthern.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just one more question. Here's what has me confused. When you are receiving a grant in the area which is for their cultural museum, will that affect a second grant for something like a town hall?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Not for the restoration of it, no.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, I don't know if you want to wait until we get to subvote 20 or not under the grants in support of community and regional . . . Is it O.K. if I ask it now? Could you tell me how many grants have been applied for under this program?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There are four programs I am told. There is the community recreation support grant, the community recreation director grant, the regional administration assistance grant, and the regional project grant. I am wondering which one you are referring to? Do you want a list of them all? I can send it to you in writing if that's what you had in mind.

MR. PICKERING: — Down at Oungre they are building a facility in a regional park. Apparently they have applied for a grant and it was rejected because you ran out of money or some such reason. Somebody just phoned me on it. I wonder if you have any information regarding that with you here?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We're into a different department here. But I am informed by my officials that if the facility is in a regional park they are not eligible under the recreational cultural facilities grant program, because they are already eligible for grants under the regional park program. If I understand the member's information accurately, they are not eligible for our program but they are eligible for a program within tourism and renewable resources.

MR. PICKERING: — Well, Mr. Minister, this was just a phone call I received yesterday. The amount of money mentioned was something in the neighbourhood of \$268,000. I don't know what program it was under, whether it was DTRR or culture and youth. I just thought I would bring it to your attention. Perhaps you could check with the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Perhaps the member can give me details in writing and I'll check it. If there was a request for a grant of \$268,000 . . . In any case if you can give me the details of the request, we'll check it out and get more accurate information for the member.

MR. PICKERING: — The gentleman who phoned me said he would be sending information so I will transfer it to your department.

MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I have just one question under item 1. Under your executive administration, other personal services you have an increase of \$38,000. I would like a short explanation of that, please.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am informed the bulk of that increase comes about because of the cultural policy secretariat and the four employees, who are in that particular subvote. I'm informed that part of it comes from a different method of showing temporary services. Apparently they were in a different item last year, and this year they're in this item. But I think, by far and wide, the reason for the change is the cultural policy secretariat.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 11 agreed.

Item 12

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, would the minister be willing to provide me with a

copy of the total amount of money he has given the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts (item 12) in comparison with item 13, the total cost to the Government of Saskatchewan to this point? I realize you'll have to send it over later. From day one, what you have presented to both item 12 and item 13, and remember that the Government of Saskatchewan paid for the construction of the Regina one but not for the construction of the Saskatoon one.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I will attempt to provide the information to the member. There are some wrinkles to that, as you know, because that one is not part of the government. We get consulting services from government services for instance (from Dennis Foley and Company) that we don't get. I will attempt to provide it to the member for the last year. It's not a simple question and it's not a simple answer, but I'll attempt to provide it to the member.

MR. KATZMAN: — I think the minister has touched the real issue; I've been arguing about this in the House for two years. Finally, I have the answer, either by slip or by accident. We've asked what other moneys or assistance the Government of Saskatchewan has provided to the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts, and why they don't give that same assistance to the city of Saskatoon. The city of Saskatoon council has asked that same question repeatedly. You are giving services to the museum (the Regina one), where Saskatoon doesn't get the services and therefore should get the financial assistance. I thank the minister for admitting that is happening. I suggest that Saskatoon absorbs the cost of those additional items within their budgets (to consult, etc.). Dennis Foley is a government employee and therefore it is an additional subsidy from government services. I suggest you equalize that to the city of Saskatoon. That's what it is all about.

Item 12 agreed.

Item 13 agreed.

Item 14

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, on the Western Development Museum, is this the total funding from the Government of Saskatchewan or are they also receiving funds under other programs?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Again, with the proliferation of groups behind me, I am informed that it was not all money they got from the Government of Saskatchewan because they got some from Celebrate Saskatchewan for a special project, the details of which, I'm sorry I am not clear on . . . I am now clear about the details: travelling exhibition of artifacts made in Saskatchewan; the acquiring and restoration of artifacts for museum collections in the province. The total sum is \$51,400.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, do you not give anything under the YES program or one of those programs as well, under other votes?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The answer is yes. They did get money under YES, I guess.

MR. KATZMAN: — What other programs within your vote — because I know when looking at their financial statement occasionally it just goes everywhere from grant to grant to grant — what other grants are coming from your department and where?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I think we will have to take this question under advisement and get back to you. It again is not a simple question and not a simple answer. I am informed, for instance, that in the Moose Jaw museum they have received some money from the recreational and cultural facilities program. So I think we will have to respond to this in writing.

MR. KATZMAN: — I understand there is some federal money which comes in here as well because of the Moose Jaw aviation thing, the grants because they gave you planes? If you can give us a report on the basics?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — To the best of our information we will give you the federal money as well.

Item 14 agreed.

Items 15 to 17 agreed.

Item 18

MR. KATZMAN: — I would also like a breakdown on that one? You can send it over if you want, later.

Item 18 agreed.

Item 19 agreed.

Item 20

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I am not sure. There are no funds for the 1979 Western Canada Summer Games. Well what do I vote it under? That's my concern and that's why I am asking. Do we vote that as subvote 24? It doesn't have a side number beside it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The item there is simply as a matter of information for the members. Last year there was a provision for the Western Canada Summer Games. You will notice the right-hand column shows expenditures last year as opposed to this year. There aren't any this year as there are no Western Canada Summer Games.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I realize there are no funds, but I would like to know if they are planning to give additional funds because of the mess and the problems they are having? I am not sure where I ask it. The minister says no grant to correct the mistakes which were made in the construction in Saskatoon.

MR. TAYLOR: — This may not be the correct place to ask, but we have been asking questions about Celebrate Saskatchewan. Where is the appropriation of money for it?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Item 15, I'm told.

MR. TAYLOR: — Where is the appropriation of moneys for it? Is that the total money going into Celebrate Saskatchewan or are there other departments which are putting money in which we should be questioning.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — For the departments of the government, this is it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, you are looking at \$5,600,000. Is that the total amount from the two years? You had \$2,833,000 last year. Was that for the same reason?

AN HON. MEMBER: — That means over \$5 million, Ned, eh?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Sorry, my attention was distracted when the member asked his question. Do you want the total? \$6.67 million from '78 to March 31 of '81.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Where then is the other million dollars?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In the previous year.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — So the \$2,780,000 is the end of it? There will be no more next year?

Item 20 agreed.

CULTURE AND YOUTH — PROVINCIAL DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE

MR. TAYLOR: — How much is the restoration of Saskatchewan House going to cost in its entirety? Do you know?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well that decision, as the members know, is with government services. I am informed by these officials that they are not sure of the final figure because there are still some decisions to be made with respect to precisely how the restoration will take place. As the members will know, this is not a repair but a restoration; I gather there are still some decisions to be made and therefore no final figure is available from the Department of Government Services.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — On that item, it seems to me that's very poor budgeting on your part from last year. One million dollars budgeted and you are asking now for another \$720,000 that has already been spent. How could you underestimate your budget by so much?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Again, I would say to the member for Regina South to keep in mind this is a restoration, not a repair. It is, therefore, extremely difficult to estimate your cost until you actually get into the program and get going. There are things you don't know. You don't know how much stuff you have to have specially ordered, how much of what you have there can be re-used and is available and so on. Restorations are extremely difficult to estimate with any sort of precision as these figures show.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, that is a pretty lame excuse for answers which I have heard in this House. You know, there are experts who can advise you on what these costs are going to be. To come up last year and say we want \$1 million for restoration — why didn't you ask for the \$2 million then? Why come out this year, after you have spent the money and ask for 75 per cent more than you had estimated?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Chairman, it may be a lame answer. It has the dubious advantage of being the only truthful answer I can give the member. There are experts available and those I have at my disposal are as good as are available in this province. They inform me (I believe, because I have been involved in this from the point of view of

government services as well) you just cannot estimate a restoration because you just don't know what it is going to cost you to repair and replace some of these items and some of these doorknobs and so on which are no longer available and which will have to be specially made. You just simply can't estimate the cost of restoration.

MR. COLLVER: — Just who received that nice, cushy, cost-plus contract under which he is not required to give any estimates or bids to the Government of Saskatchewan? It is obviously a pretty juicy and choice contract. Could you possibly pass that information on to this House?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Smith Bros & Wilson.

MR. COLLVER: — They have a complete cost-plus contract for the restoration of that building?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't know what the member is suggesting. The member knows they don't have a blank cheque. Before there are any increases in cost, they have to be approved by us and we have approved them. It is subject to the control of the department and subject to the control of the Government of Saskatchewan now. But it is not a blank cheque, if that is what you are suggesting; they can't go ahead and spend what they want. They have to get any expenditure approved by us. So I am not sure what the member is trying to suggest.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, the minister will know what a cost-plus contract is all about. At least if he doesn't, he should find out. In a cost-plus contract, of course, the department has to approve the expenditures, but if you are committed to completing the project and those costs are \$1,000 or \$5,000, or \$50,000 or \$500,000, and the company expends it, they receive a percentage of the total they spend. What I want to know is, how do they go about being awarded this cost plus contract? What special expertise does Smith Bros & Wilson have that no one else in the province of Saskatchewan has? What criteria did you use to bring Smith Bros & Wilson in on that?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The member would have to be skilled as an architect as well and bid on that job. The award for the architectural work, which is the key in a restoration, was tendered and BLM received that. On their recommendation, we hired Smith Bros & Wilson because they had done the Territorial Building and had done a very credible job. So it was on the basis of past experience and the recommendation of the architect that Smith Bros & Wilson was chosen. If I may say so, I am sure the members opposite aren't impugning the honesty of the people in Smith Bros & Wilson or their integrity. They are a very honest firm.

MR. COLLVER: — The minister will know or maybe he doesn't know; I had better tell him. I have done business with Smith Bros & Wilson and they are a fine firm. No one is arguing against the integrity of Smith Bros & Wilson. What I am saying is, how did they get this nice . . . The Minister says it is not a blank cheque. I don't think there is a member in this House who would believe that a cost-plus contract with amounts that are unknown to the minister is not a blank cheque because it certainly is. Would the minister inform this Assembly what the override being charged by Smith Bros & Wilson is?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not sure I understand the member's question and I'm not sure I'll have the answer in any event. Again, the project is now under the control of the Department of Government Services. I'm not sure what the member means by the

override. But again, the program is now under the auspices of the Department of Government Services.

MR. COLLVER: — To the minister, for his information, the override is either cost plus 5 per cent or cost plus 10 per cent or cost plus 15 per cent or cost plus 25 per cent. Usually in restoration projects the percentage is much higher because they figure they have a much higher management cost. I would like to know what is the cost-plus figure for that contract?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm informed it's 5 per cent.

MR. COLLVER: — Five per cent. So the minister is saying to this Assembly that he has handed to Smith Bros & Wilson in the last year some \$85,000 clear, not counting their administrative and overhead costs, and there's no end in sight?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Nonsense. There are controls on this project. The Department of Government Services has a clerk of the works on site to protect our interests and I think he is. Again, I say to the members that on a restoration of this sort one simply cannot control costs and do a good job of the restoration. You can control cost but you have to cut corners in the restoration. In other projects we've done this. We believe this building is a very special building to Saskatchewan. We want it restored as authentically as we can and therefore were prepared to put the extra dollars in that it takes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, the minister a minute ago indicated the award of the contract was based on the experience that they received in the Territorial Government Building. I say that's a poor recommendation since they went 100 per cent over their budget. You had an estimate last year of \$200,000 in that one. You're asking now for an additional \$218,000. I don't know where your recommendations could come from in doing that.

Furthermore, you also said you had an architect, BLM I believe, who designed and did the restoration drafts for it. Well, if that's the case then surely with those drawings and those specifications in hand the company doing the work on this would be able to estimate exactly what the cost of it is going to be. I just don't understand your reasoning.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I say to the member with respect to the restoration, there are things you just simply cannot know until you're actually on the job and doing the work. When you start taking a building apart there are things you find that you just don't expect and have no way of knowing in advance. That's why it was done the way it was. It's the only way it could have been done.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I agree, Mr. Chairman, there are some cases or instances in building a restoration where the unknown can come about and we don't know what the cost is going to be, but not 100 per cent or not 75 per cent, not to that extent. The architect who does a job will be able to determine what the building will need. Surely they are not going to be out to that extent. I see from the Government Services Department this year there's another \$800 and some thousand voted for it this year. Now, how much are you out? Of course you can't answer that because it's no longer in your department. But I'd like to know how much they're going to be out now.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not sure what the member's question was because I was

getting additional information. I am told that in addition to increasing costs in what was anticipated, there were some aspects to the program added after the estimate was in. I'm told things for instance such as landscaping were added afterward, not any sort of a cost overrun. It was decided to landscape after that estimate had been done. That's no cost overrun; that's just an addition to the program.

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Minister, maybe I misunderstood you just then. Did I understand you to say you present a budget to this Assembly where you report as to what you are going to spend your money on and then you decided to change it. Is that what you're telling us, and these changes have happened with Smith Bros & Wilson are now showing up as a cost overrun? Now be a little more explicit on exactly what happened, because I think I must have misunderstood you. I don't believe anything happens like this. So be a little more specific.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I can give the member a list. I repeat what I said: part of the increase was an additional cost for things we expected to do. Some part of the cost were additions to the project which were not budgeted for and were simply things we decided to do afterward. For example, we decided to do more extensive landscaping. I am informed that part of the landscaping was anticipated but we decided to enlarge the area of landscaping. That was in the cost overrun. That was an addition to the program which shows up as an addition in the item.

MR. THATCHER: — Well, this is really not all that bad a package to get into, Mr. Minister. I'm sure any contractor loves to run into a cost-plus deal like this one. As a rule many of these cost-plus arrangements, depending on how they are drawn up, can be pretty sweet little arrangements.

Now if I'm not mistaken, Smith Bros & Wilson used to be a Saskatchewan firm. I'm told they are over in the dark economic doldrums of Alberta. That's not a bad proposition for a firm to step into. We're going to do this and we're going to add this, all on a cost-plus basis. That's just a pretty good one. I wonder how many Saskatchewan contractors would have liked to get in on that one.

Mr. Minister, the restoration is wonderful; it's marvellous; the intent behind it is very laudable. I hope you'll pat each and every one of your officials on the back. But your financial handling of this is a disgrace and it's an indictment of everybody who is involved in it. The concept is horrible and abominable. I don't know how many other government contracts are run like this. I hope to God not very many! This thing is a scandal almost — a cost-plus thing, a cost overrun like that.

There is simply no justification for that except lousy, lousy management on the part of somebody in your department. Regardless of who that person may be, you're the guy on top, so the buck stops with you. And therefore, that lousy, horrible, disgraceful management has to go to you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! The member for Thunder Creek is on the floor.

MR. THATCHER: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Goodness sakes, Mr. Minister, the whole business is extremely poor quality financing, as I've indicated. And again I'm going to ask you on behalf of the opposition to give us a little better explanation than you have. We need some specifics on that. A cost overrun like this to an Alberta-based contractor, there is just no tangible or satisfactory excuse which I'm aware of. So I want to hear about it, and I'll yield to you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, if the member wants I can provide a very detailed explanation of the costs. I can't do that on my feet because it's a very detailed response. I'm sure the member does not expect me to stand here and itemize each detail of each expenditure of a \$1 million item. If he does, his concept of estimates is somewhat different than mine. I say as well to the member that you are confusing a repair with a restoration. They are two different problems. I don't like cost-plus contracts any more than you do. When I was minister of government services we didn't have one, and I think that's still the policy. They don't have any cost-plus contracts. But this was the only way this restoration could be carried out, and keep as our prime goal the authenticity of the building.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is there nobody in Saskatchewan who can do it?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Let me get to that in a moment. The only way you can restore a building in an authentic way is on this sort of basis, whereby you decide on each and every item. If you want to put in a new brass hinge — \$2; if you want to try to restore the old one — \$10. Or if it's broken, do you want to replace it at \$40 cost? The brass hinge may be visible in the beginning, but many of those items are not visible until you tear the building apart.

Let me just say a word about Smith Bros and Wilson. I don't know what your concept of a proper relationship between a government and a business is. But I'll tell you what mine is. It does not matter where the head office of the business is, as long as it is Saskatchewan people and as long as they have their offices here as Smith Bros and Wilson do. The person we have related to is a guy by the name of Vic Serdula, who is a Saskatchewan boy and has spent all his years here. So long as the business meets that criterion of operating in Saskatchewan according to our laws, we don't discriminate against them.

Your views of business may be that we should only deal with Saskatchewan businesses, if they have their head office in Alberta, then we don't deal with them. We go to look for someone who is here. That's not our concept of how we should relate to the business community in general. That's not our concept of a proper business climate in this country, the balkanization of a country into individual provinces.

That's one of the reasons we didn't discriminate against Smith Bros and Wilson. We chose them because they had a proven expertise with respect to the restoration of buildings and territorial house. But I say to the member we didn't discriminate against them because of where their head office may be. That is largely irrelevant to our purposes.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, the minister will be aware that there are many renovations and restorations carried out in the province of Saskatchewan, including some at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, that were done by Saskatchewan-based contractors. The fact is that other provinces in Canada, including the province of Alberta (and this has been brought to this Assembly's attention before), provide a little — not much, but a little — cushion for those contractors and organizations which have their base head offices in that province. They provide a little extra cushion for them in order to encourage business within the province.

The minister has suggested here that the Government of Saskatchewan does not want to encourage Saskatchewan-based business. It is not prepared to provide even an

opportunity for Saskatchewan-based companies to build and restore Saskatchewan buildings on a cost-plus cushy basis. Now that, surely, is not calling tenders. That's not going through the process. That's not trying to save the people money. This is a cost-plus basis with other Saskatchewan-based contractors who have done very good work in this province. Why, Mr. Minister, did you or your department or your government decide to go to an outside firm before even giving an opportunity to Saskatchewan-based organizations to at least show you their wares?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I may say to the hon. member that several firms were contacted. None would do the job unless it was on a cost-plus basis because of the nature of the work, as suggested. With respect to the particular contractor we chose, I want to say to the hon. member (and I'm not sure which one it was, whether it was the member for Nipawin or the member sitting behind him), that is not a very common type of restoration. First of all it's a very important building to this province. Next to the Legislative Building, that may be the most valuable building we have in our possession. Secondly, it got into a rather sorry state of repair over the years. I think the last lieutenant-governor moved out of it in the '30s. Frankly, it has not been kept up since. The restoration of that building was a massive job. It was very important to the historical records of this province that the building be restored properly. That is why we went with a known quantity and Smith Bros & Wilson were a known quantity. We had just completed restoring the Territorial Building.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question in the same vein. This government continually patronizes out-of-province people and manufacturers and what have you. It has very, very recently been brought to my attention (as a matter of fact, just this afternoon), that Struthers and Associates who are providing a lot of the Celebrate Saskatchewan promotional material, are acquiring their material from either Toronto or Vancouver. And I would like to know to what extent this promotional material is being produced here in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. That question is out of order. We are dealing with item 1, Restoration of Saskatchewan House. Any questions have to relate to that particular topic.

MR. TAYLOR: — I notice that to date, with the estimate in government services for this year, it will be about \$2.6 million that will be spent on Government House. My colleague has been pointing out the rather poor management. You budgeted for \$1 million and then your supplements come around for another \$720,000. Why was it moved from your department to the Department of Government Services? Has this anything to do with the rather sloppy management within your department?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm told there has been an interdepartmental committee between government services and other departments, including the Department of Culture and Youth. It is now the policy of the government that all heritage buildings over a certain sum, (I gather \$30,000 or some very small sum), all restorations over that sum, will be handled by the Department of Government Services. And it is they who have the expertise in dealing with contractors, not us. It makes good sense.

MR. TAYLOR: — You mean buildings under this heritage act that you're bringing in, which may be restored and so on, will be handled by government services and not by your department?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Only government-owned buildings, and again, our department is

responsible for ensuring the authenticity, so far as is reasonable and practical, of the restoration.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I have a question on it. Earlier you stated that one of the reasons for the increase in the supplementary estimates was the enlargement of the landscaping plans that you had and other things. Just taking that landscaping alone, why would you then proceed with it if you didn't have any authority from this legislature to do it in your original plan? Since when do you go ahead and spend this kind of money. (I don't know how much you spent on that landscaping) without the authority of the legislature? Isn't the reason for these estimates in this legislature to authorize, once you've determined that you're going to do it, not spend it first and then come to ask for it?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't want to treat the members to a lesson in political science and parliamentary democracy, but surely you know the Executive Council has a function as well with respect to authorizing expenditures. An Executive Council does authorize expenditures and change expenditures above and beyond what is authorized by the legislature. That's the only way a parliamentary government can work. That sort of flexibility is needed in this day and age. So, as I say, I don't want to treat the members to a sermon on how a parliamentary system of government works. The cabinet does have that authority.

Item 1 agreed.

Item 2 agreed.

Supplementaries Vote 7 agreed.

PROVINCIAL LIBRARY — ORDINARY EXPENDITURE — VOTE 29

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We're dealing with the Provincial Library and I call on the minister to introduce his officials.

HON. E. B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Sitting on my immediate left is Don Meadows, provincial librarian; on his immediate left is Pat Cavill, the assistant provincial librarian, immediately behind me is Marcel de Laforest, director of administration.

Item 1

MR. G. M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Minister, I would like to know — we'll get right into the crux of what I'm sure the minister anticipates the discussion will be in this estimate — where is the funding provision for the automation project which you're proposing in the Provincial Library?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — As the member knows, and I believe I said it in second reading of the bill, it will come from this year.

MR. McLEOD: — How much money would you be proposing to come from that?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It's \$100,000 this year.

MR. McLEOD: — Plus the \$100,000 which was provided last year, I believe? This

proposed project by the report from Mr. Ball, talks about a funding in the range of \$2 million over a period of time. It seems to me that your intention, as you have indicated, is to move into this project a lot faster than \$100,000 would indicate, for this coming year.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I misunderstood the member's question; I'm sorry. Last year we spent \$100,000. That was the figure I gave them. This year we expect to spend \$200,000. That's what will be vired. The figure I should have given the member was \$200,000 and not \$100,000.

MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Minister, there was a report as early as 1976 by Mr. Richard Smith — a first report on the automation. How much did that report cost at the time?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — \$45,000 it says.

MR. McLEOD: — Were any of his recommendations acted upon subsequent to that report coming to yourself or to the department?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — One of his reports was acted on immediately. The other two formed the basis of the ensuing report which we are now proceeding on.

MR. McLEOD: — Which of his recommendations were acted upon?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — His recommendations for computer services were acted upon immediately.

MR. McLEOD: — I am interested in the new report that you had. What were the qualifications of Mr. Ball for conducting this report?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — He has a Ph.D., as you probably gathered from the designation 'Dr.' He has his Masters in Library Science and he has extensive experience at the University of Regina in computer libraries.

MR. McLEOD: — Just to clarify this in my own mind, I believe I know the answer but was he commissioned? Does he have a firm which was commissioned by the Provincial Library to conduct this report? Or is he employed by the Provincial Library, what is the status there?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, he's on contract.

MR. McLEOD: — On contract as a consultant? Can the minister shed some light on what Mr. Ball was doing just prior to receiving this contract? Was he at the University of Regina just prior to this?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — At the University of Regina.

MR. McLEOD: — Am I to understand then he set up a consulting firm and directly after that received a contract from the Provincial Library to conduct this study? Is that right?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't think he set up a firm as such. He was enticed away by the Provincial Library to do this study, and was put on contract because it was of limited duration. I don't think he set up a firm as such, and I'm not sure he is going into the business of consulting. I understand he intends to return to the university when this is

finished.

MR. McLEOD: — What was the cost of the report and his study to the Provincial Library?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The contract was set up such that he was paid a salary of around \$24,000 a year.

MR. McLEOD: — You set out a contract and you just paid him on the basis of a salary as though he were an employee? Is that what you are saying?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No. It was a contract that lasted two and one-half years, and the total (as I understand it) was \$65,000. That works out to a salary of around \$24,000 a year, if my mathematics is accurate.

MR. McLEOD: — Now that the report is in, is his work with the Provincial Library terminated? Was he only commissioned to do that report; what is his status at the present time?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We have renewed the contract for a six month period, which is up September 1.

MR. McLEOD: — How much?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — \$15,000 for the six months.

MR. McLEOD: — What will he be doing in this next period of time? What is his role now that his report has been submitted?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Advising the technical services people of the Provincial Library, and the libraries in Regina and Saskatoon.

MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Minister, as you know Mr. Turnbull when he was still with your Provincial Library submitted a report entitled The Report of the Project Director for Automation of Saskatchewan Public Libraries. At that time he was the project director. He was then the assistant provincial librarian, am I to understand? He was appointed the project director by Mr. Meadows, who is sitting with you now. I am kind of concerned; I have some concerns which were raised by Mr. Turnbull. I would like you to address those now.

You said in second reading of the other bill, Bill No. 59, that this would be the place to address this. He stated that the basic requirements of libraries have not been identified in the Ball report which he was referring to. He said this would be imperative before any long range plans are put forth. There must be a continuous line of communication set up among the Provincial Library, the two major municipal libraries and the regional libraries. He didn't believe at the time that this was the case. I believe it is not the case at present. Until this is completed, little of a truly comprehensive nature can take place in terms of automation.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I think those lines of communication are now in place. We may argue about whether or not the communications in the past were adequate. I suppose with all the fuss and furor it's evident they weren't adequate. At this point in time I think they are adequate. We have a committee set up now that was just established in the last two weeks. It is composed of one member of the Provincial Library, a representative of the two municipal libraries in Regina and Saskatoon, and one member from each of the

regions. Its function is to advise me on the structure which automation should take and some technical aspects which worry them.

It has become clear in our meetings with the regions that they all agree automation is inevitable and desirable. They are concerned about the structure it takes and some technical aspects. We now have this committee to provide me with a report by September 1. I have given them my assurances we will not proceed with the project in any irrevocable fashion before getting that report. They are largely satisfied with that. Things are now in the hands of this committee. I am waiting for their report and any changes which might be necessary.

MR. McLEOD: — The minister, I know, is trying to assure everyone. My next question would be somewhat along the same lines. Was this committee struck in response to the unrest within the staff? I have asked you this question before. I believe you assured me at that time, in fact in question period in this House, that the unrest in the staff (which I alleged was unrest, you called it an allegation), would be looked after. I believe it hasn't totally been looked after by yourself as minister.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The committee does not really function to address any alleged unrest in the staff. Don't forget the staff are not represented on the committee. The committee represents the regions. It was set up in response to concerns in the regions. It is intended to address those concerns, not to address any unrest which exists within the staff.

MR. McLEOD: — Can you tell me how many municipalities have submitted notices of withdrawal from the regional libraries across the province?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — 54.

MR. McLEOD: — How many had submitted notice of withdrawals at this point in time one year ago?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am told the difference isn't large. My officials aren't sure but they would guestimate it to be between 45 or 50 last year at this time. There have been a few more added and some withdrawn. It seems last year's figure was about 45 to 50.

MR. McLEOD: — My concern here is (I think the minister knows of this concern) with the regional libraries and their stated concern about their role in this total automation process. Certainly, I believe they're not necessarily withdrawing from the regional libraries to put on pressure regarding the funding. I believe that some of them are withdrawing from the system (some of the regional libraries are stating this) because they don't believe that they'll have any worth-while say in the automation process. I agree with the minister it is an inevitable process and a desirable one.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not sure what the member is suggesting. None of the municipalities have alleged to us that they are withdrawing because of the automation system. They're withdrawing for totally different reasons . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Costs, that's right. Because of the withdrawal of the municipalities, which I admit to be a problem, I have commissioned a study and a review on that problem — an internal study and review. It has nothing to do with automation. It's a totally different problem.

MR. McLEOD: — The study you've commissioned, if I understand you correctly, is with a view to solving this problem that the regional libraries have of being a part of the total

library automation system once it becomes automated. Is that right?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, but we're going to get confused here. We have two studies under way, one in-House to deal with our legislation in general and the withdrawal of those municipalities in particular. That has been done in consultation with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) and SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and they're fully informed. That's in-House. The other study is more of a public study. It's a committee as I said made up of representatives of the regions and it is to address the problem which you mentioned — their concern with respect to automation.

MR. McLEOD: — Do you believe that what we have to look at is more provincial funding for the regional libraries to solve the problems with the municipalities opting out?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, I'm not convinced that is the core of the problem. The core of the problem I think is that municipalities get an assessment from the regional library board and it's a kind of like it or lump it situation. They get the assessment. If they don't like it, they can scream and holler but apart from that all they can do to protest is to withdraw. Most of the withdrawals are a form of protest.

It's obviously not a very desirable system. I've asked my officials to consult with the regional libraries, SUMA and SARM to try to find a better system than what we have, which necessitates the municipalities withdrawing if they wish to make their unhappiness known with their assessment. There has to be a better system than that.

MR. McLEOD: — I agree with that. My whole concern in this area, as I believe the minister knows . . . Some of these protests have come from regional libraries withdrawing and from staff people within the Provincial Library.

It's not my intention to prolong this very much longer but I would urge the minister to be a little more open in listening to people involved there. I think the protests are very real and certainly I share with you, I'm sure, the idea that we need the library service throughout the province. I've expressed before in this House that it is an excellent system but it's very important for rural Saskatchewan to have the windows of the world open to them.

So with that, I'll leave this but I would urge you to perhaps listen more carefully to the staff within the libraries because I believe they expressed some concerns which were a lot more than what we've entered into here today. With that, I would leave it, Mr. Minister.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 4 agreed.

Vote 29 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:10 p.m.