

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**May 22, 1980**

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**Report of Special Committee on Regulations**

**ASSISTANT CLERK:** — Mr. Lane, from the special committee on regulations presented the first report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Lane as its chairman and Mr. White as vice chairman, and Mr. T. C. Wakeling, Q.C. of the law firm of McDougall, Ready, Wakeling, as counsel to the committee.

Your committee has examined Saskatchewan Regulations 36/78, 41/78, 223/78, 24/78 and 1/79 to 347/79, a total of 351 regulations, thus completing its scrutiny up to December 31, 1979. Of this total, your committee considered 30 regulations drawn specifically to its attention by counsel, and it sent to the authorities who made the regulations comments on 22 of these regulations, inviting them to submit explanatory memoranda should they see fit. Twenty replies have been received and considered by the committee. Your committee does not wish at this time to draw the special attention of the Assembly to any regulation on the grounds set out in its terms of reference.

Your committee has also had under consideration the Order of Reference dated May 3, 1979, namely the by-laws, rules and regulations of various professional societies tabled as addenda to sessional paper no. 3 of 1979 and sessional paper no. 7 of 1979-80. Your committee reviewed the said by-laws, rules, regulations and amendments to ensure that each had proper legislative authority and was in the public interest, with further information being sought with respect to five of the by-laws. Your committee recommends that the by-laws, regulations and amendments of the professional societies be ratified and confirmed.

Your committee recommends that during the present session of the Assembly, a committee on regulations comprised of nine members should be appointed to continue the work of scrutiny and to consider outstanding memoranda submitted by authorities who have made regulations and by-laws.

**MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved, seconded by Mr. D. F. McArthur (Regina Lakeview):

That the first report of the special committee on regulations be now concurred in.

Motion agreed.

**Report of Selected Standing Committee on Crown Corporations**

**ASSISTANT CLERK:** — Mr. White from the select standing committee on Crown corporations presents the second report of the said committee which is as follows:

Having duly examined the annual reports and financial statements for the last completed fiscal year of the various Crown corporations and related agencies, as referred to it from time to time by the Assembly, your committee has satisfied itself that they reflect the state of the corporations and agencies to which they severally relate, as operated in accordance with government policy. The following corporations were called before the committee: agricultural development corporation; Crown investment corporation; municipal financing; potash corporation; SaskComp; Sask Crop Insurance Corporation; Sask Development Fund; Sask Economic Development Corporation; Sask Forest Products; Sask Fur Marketing Service; Sask Government Insurance; Sask Government Printing; Sask Housing; Sask Minerals; Sask Mining Development Corporation; Sask Oil and Gas; Sask Power; Sask Telecommunications; Saskatchewan Transportation; Saskatchewan Water Supply Board.

In conducting its examination, your committee questioned the responsible ministers, who attended with the chief officers of the respective corporation and agencies, no restrictions being placed upon questions asked within the Order of Reference, save and except questions, the answer to which, in the opinion of the responsible ministers, might disclose information not in the public interest or prejudicial to the commercial positions of the corporation or agency concerned.

Your committee considered and agreed to the following resolutions:

That the agricultural development corporation be called before this Crown corporations committee.

That proper supervision and training be provided to non-profit organizations whenever public funds are being expended by the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation.

This committee recommends to the Assembly that the matter of the transferral of membership in the Crown corporations committee be referred to the special committee on rules and procedures for recommendation together with the transcript of the debate on this matter held in the Crown corporations committee of May 15, 1980.

The committee during its 25 meetings worked diligently in dealing with many important matters relating to Crown corporations of the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. D. G. BANDA (Redberry)** moved, seconded by the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau):

That the second report of the select standing committee on Crown corporations be now concurred in.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — I would ask the hon. member to have someone else second since we voted against the motion yesterday.

**MR. BANDA:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances the member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) will second the motion.

**MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee feel that both the interests of the members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in particular and the public of Saskatchewan in general would be better served if a number of amendments or fundamental changes would occur in the procedure of examination of Saskatchewan Crown corporations and agencies.

1. In respect to the need for greater public insight into the workings of Crown corporations in particular and government in general of which the public of Saskatchewan is the major shareholder, we recommend that television cameras be permitted in committee meetings where they would be allowed to record the proceedings.

2. Recognizing that Crown corporations are a public trust of which a full public review and accountability is to be given and that the rules for non-disclosure (refusal to disclose) applicable to private corporations are not applicable to Crown corporations, we recommend that Crown corporations committee meetings be held intersessionally and, as is the current practice, sessionally.

3. We recommend that individual financial statements and management letters for each Crown corporation be presented, as has been recommended by the provincial auditor, and that these financial statements be made available to the committee before the particular Crown corporation is reviewed.

4. We request that the Crown corporations committee recommend that an independent Crown corporations review committee be established that would review and recommend expenditures and activities for all Crown corporations on an ongoing basis.

5. We recommend that an independent public utilities review committee be established to review all power, gas and telephone rates and rate increases and that this committee be given the power to recommend that rate increases be amended or withdrawn when they appear to the committee to be unjustified.

6. At the first meeting of the Crown corporations committee, a list of all Saskatchewan Crown corporations and agencies must be presented to each committee member.

7. In deciding upon which Crown corporation shall be examined and in what order, upon the expressed verbal request of any three committee members or their substitutes, any Crown corporation may be called before the committee.

8. Any Crown corporation or agency whose financial year ends prior to September 1 of the current year shall place its annual report in the hands of the members of the committee not later than December 1 of the current year or the first sitting day of the House after December 1.

Given the changes recommended above, members on the select standing committee on Crown corporations feel that members of the committee could execute the public trust in a much more informed and effective manner.

**MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Mr. Speaker, I think the suggestions made . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I would suggest to the hon. member that he quit looking for the leadership in his own party, and talking about resignations as leader, and be concerned about his own operations as opposed to those of the Conservative Party . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll tell you something: if the opportunity ever arises (which I don't think it will) I won't lose like the Attorney General did when he ran.

I would just like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members opposite that the changes made and the changes suggested by the Conservative . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! We are not in a leadership race at this time, and I wonder if we could direct our attention to the comments of the member for Qu'Appelle on the Crown corporations report.

**MR. LANE:** — I'm sure that announcement by you, Mr. Speaker, is going to shock a couple of members opposite. I'm sure they may reconsider their position.

I would like to suggest most strongly to the government members opposite that the proposals suggested by the Conservatives are long overdue, and I think are in the best interests of the taxpayers of this province.

I think the statement at the outset that Crown corporations are a public trust and that the rules applicable to private corporations should not be applicable to Crown corporations . . . I don't believe it proper for governments to be talking about 'not in the public interest' and using that as a refusal to give information to the public about Crown corporations. It is not, I believe, a proper nor a fair argument to the people of this province.

The proposals of the Conservative opposition will basically mean the following. First, it will mean true accountability for Crown corporations.

Secondly, that accountability will be seen by all members of the public. It can only serve to increase the confidence of the public of Saskatchewan in the efficient and effective operation of Crown corporations. They are a public trust, as we said at the outset. The government should not fear television cameras in Crown corporations so that the public may view the operations and expenditures of Crown corporations. The government should not fear full financial disclosure by Crown corporations. The government should not fear the tabling of management letters as recommended by the provincial auditor.

I think the real question is, why are these recommendations not already in place? I don't think it does the government opposite good to have a Crown corporations committee (given the growth of the number of Crown corporations) which is at least one year behind in its review, which can be faced with answers that it is 'not in the public interest', and which is faced with a recommendation of the provincial auditor as to management letters and financial statements that are not being given to the public. We do not, I think all members opposite in fairness will agree, have an adequate review of the Crown corporations of this province. I believe that is verified by the statements and the recommendations of the provincial auditor.

The hon. member, the chairman of the Crown Investments Corporation, said 'crap'. I don't think that statement is government policy.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Crap, well that's pretty close.

**MR. LANE:** — I think it discourages the efforts of all members of the Crown corporations from really doing the job which parliament requires and that is the job of full and complete scrutiny of Crown corporations.

I don't believe it is crap, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I think the member for Qu'Appelle has some restrictions on him with regard to the parliamentary nature of his debate. I think that is not a parliamentary term and I don't think the member can continually raise it as a parliamentary term. I would ask him to cease using it in his debate.

**MR. LANE:** — I didn't raise the matter first, but I will cease using it, Mr. Speaker.

The question really is, do we have an adequate and complete review of the expenditures and the operations of Crown corporations? I think the answer is a resounding no, we do not. The question now is, how do we have that full and complete financial review? I believe the recommendations put forth by the Conservative members of that committee will go a long way to ensuring for the people of Saskatchewan a full and complete review of the financial operations of Crown corporations. I believe they are put forth in a serious and reasoned manner; I believe the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to these recommendations and I believe (and I know the Conservative members believe) the implementation of these recommendations will strengthen the Crown corporations themselves. They will strengthen public confidence in the legislature and they will strengthen the public's confidence in the ability of the legislature to fully review government expenditures and to hold governments (no matter what the political stripe) to full accountability.

I am going to make an amendment to the motion, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman):

That the minority report be attached to and included with the report of the Crown Corporations Committee and become a part thereof.

I so move.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — An amendment has been offered to the report of the Crown corporations committee by the member for Qu'Appelle, seconded by the member for Rosthern. I want to, before ruling the amendment out of order, cite the reason why it's out of order. Beauchesne is quite clear on this matter, in the fifth edition, page 205, citation 658(2):

A report from a committee may not be amended in a substantive manner by the House; it must be referred back to the committee.

So therefore the member cannot move an amendment to the committee report; it's out of order.

**MR. R. L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to make one comment with regard to the Crown corporations. I do not sit on the Crown corporations committee, but I do think what I see happening in the Crown corporations is the

development of a hybrid form of government. The board of directors of the Crown corporations in Saskatchewan are members of the cabinet, unlike perhaps some other Crown corporations that we see in other jurisdictions. I think it is very important the accountability question is addressed. It's a complex industry, many of the Crown corporations that we're involved in. I would simply refer the members of this House to the present procedure and movement in the province of British Columbia.

In that province there is an independent review agency composed of five analysts (five specialists) who have extensive experience in the whole industry of large corporate structures, etc. These analysts, with a budget of some \$400,000, are going through the five or six Crown corporations in the province of British Columbia. I think something this House should address itself to is the whole large question of accountability of those Crown corporations and I think this is a very good vehicle that we could all look at.

The members of any legislature or any parliament cannot be expected to have the expertise for the in-depth analysis of the corporate workings of various Crown corporations. In this province the number 20, 21, 22 (whatever it might be), is a very extensive thing. I think it's important that we give very serious consideration to that B.C. model to see if we can't develop a similar system of accountability. After all, that's really what the parliament and the legislative process is all about — the accountability of government. I think it's important that the accountability of those Crown corporations be brought into line with modern times. I would ask all members of the Assembly to give serious consideration to adopting that type of thing, to look at some of the new innovations that are developing in the whole area of accountability of government, whether it's at this level or something else.

The other thing that I think becomes important is the whole idea, Mr. Speaker, of freedom of information. I think freedom of information is another field that we have to address, as legislators and as parliamentarians. The whole concept of freedom of information has to be addressed and clearly Crown corporations is one field where that freedom of information becomes extremely important. We have to look at that.

The province of Ontario has done extensive work; they're coming down with a report in the next two or three weeks. The Prime Minister in the House of Commons the other day indicated that the Government of Canada will be bringing forth freedom of information legislation in the very near future. Other provinces are addressing that problem as well. I think the two go hand in hand. We must have freedom of information legislation. We must have accountability of our Crown corporations, as well as other levels of government. For that reason I would ask the members to really give some thought to this, to be fair about it, to not try to hide behind the political screens, the political doors which stop the public from recognizing, from realizing what the Crown corporations in fact have come to in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. E. L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments. This matter was discussed for a little while yesterday in Crown corporations committee. I noted with interest the comments of the member for Qu'Appelle about considering this in a serious and reasoned manner. Certainly that was not the way in which his colleague approached it in the committee. It was purely a political manoeuvre. Even the member for Estevan said that the first paragraph of their motion which they moved . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I wonder if we could have order so that I can hear the member for Biggar.

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will try to be as orderly as I can. Mr. Speaker, even the member for Estevan admitted and suggested they withdraw the first paragraph because of the provocative way in which it was written. The whole tactic yesterday in Crown corporations committee, in my mind, was simply a gimmick to get some press, a little bit of a political operation.

**MR. LARTER:** — On a point of order.

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

**MR. LARTER:** — The minister is conveying wrong information to the House. That is not the vein that was taken.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — That's not a point of order.

**MR. COWLEY:** — I think the member should read the transcript and find out what he said.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I listened with interest to the member for Kindersley and his discussion of the B.C. system. The last time I checked, they hadn't met since September 1978. That is certainly a very current review.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — I don't know; they may have cranked it up in the last month or so and got going, but they hadn't then. He was talking about the five specialists they hired. I suppose that is one way they could get their leader close to the process. But, Mr. Speaker, I think one should take a look at the review process we have in this province which is, without a doubt I believe, the most regular and the most detailed review of Crown corporations.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — If one looks for example at Ottawa where there are certainly many more Crown corporations than there are in Saskatchewan (indeed there is some question about whether or not they know how many there are), they certainly aren't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Cabinet ministers don't sit on them and control them, the member for Kindersley says. Well if you think that any minister, who is worth his salt, couldn't have as much effective control from outside the boardroom as inside the boardroom, you have another think coming, if he appoints the board members. That's the kind of joke which the member for Kindersley is great at — small politics!

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the Crown corporations at Ottawa. They are not, for example, even regularly called before any committee of the House or anywhere else. Some of them, I might remind the members, are fairly large Crown corporations — Air Canada, Canadian National Railways (you pick them) and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. In our legislature, in our system, each Crown corporation is called annually.

The member for Qu'Appelle again talked about the information being over a year old. I

think if the member for Qu'Appelle would check, that is not true in the case of any but one Crown corporation, the crop insurance corporation — its year end is March 31. All of the other major Crown corporations with the exception of forest products, have a year end now of December 31. Forest products I believe is October 31.

So in this Crown corporations committee for the potash corporation, for SaskOil, for SGI, for the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation, for the Crown investments corporations, we were considering annual reports whose year ended December 31, 1979. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that we could have had annual reports more up to date before the committee unless we wanted the committee to meet later. Because one of the facts of life is that it takes approximately two to three months to have the annual reports prepared, audited, etc., in order to bring them before a committee. Some of them, for example, CIC (Crown investment corporation) is a consolidation of all the others and there is simply no way you can have it before a committee in more than a couple of months after the year end you want to consider.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at some of the other things, I think you will see the intent and the purpose of the motion yesterday in the Crown corporations committee and the motion today of the members opposite. For example, they deal with the whole question of television cameras. And to get some idea of their interest in really in-depth analysis of the Crown corporations, I am certain, if you will check the record, that they spent at least a day more debating whether or not the television cameras should be there than they did on any single Crown corporation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — However, if they and the press thought that was the best they could do in terms of organization for the proceedings and the most exciting thing to come out of Crown corporations, that of course is their decision. Then they say second, recognizing that Crown corporations are a public trust, etc., they shouldn't have the same rules as private corporations do. Of course the members opposite don't believe in Crown corporations, so they don't want Crown corporations which are competing with the private sector to be able to contain any of the information they have with respect to markets or anything. They want that information to be public so the competitors can use it and the Crown corporations will fail, because that in essence is what they want.

I want to suggest, if you check the record (and Crown corporations debates are recorded this year for the first time, which is an innovation and a change) you check what the member for Estevan has said. He said (on at least three or four occasions considering different Crown corporations) well you know, it's not that bad a Crown corporation, but we don't believe in Crown corporations and of course if we were the government, we'd do something else with it. So they are clearly on the record in terms of that, and if they can't get at them one way, they'll get at them another way.

Third, we recommend (they say), the individual financial statements and management letters . . . Again, I didn't attend all the hearings, but I checked with a couple of my colleagues and I do not recall a single case where a Crown corporation was before the committee, where there was a request for the management letters. I do not recall a single request for a single Crown corporation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well how can it not be in the public interest if it weren't asked? Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if it is in the public interest or not because I frankly haven't looked at a management letter for a long time, but if they don't ask for it, they can't get an answer . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if he asked for it, just let him get the transcript and



he can read it back to me. I would be surprised if he can find it.

**Item 4:** 'We request that the Crown corporation committee recommend an independent Crown corporation review committee be established that would review and recommend expenditures and activities for all Crown corporations on an ongoing basis.'

Now that sounds to me like a treasury board for Crown corporations. What the members want is a committee that will decide whether or not the Saskatchewan Power Corporations needs an extra lineman in Martensville. It seems to me that is going to be one big bureaucracy we're going to have here in this review committee. I am shocked that the members opposite would suggest that, shocked!

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — **Item 5:** 'We recommend that an independent public utilities review committee be established to review all power, gas and telephone rates, and this committee be given the power to recommend rate increases . . .'

Now I want to say a couple of things about that. We have discussed public utilities boards before in this province. You will note that they only suggest public utilities boards for Crown corporations; certainly no area where the private sector is involved would they want anybody doing anything about prices. Now here we are, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No suggestion the Premier says of cable TV. But you know within this province with respect to power, with respect to natural gas, with respect to telephone rates, we have direct public control through Crown corporations and boards of directors of the rates for these corporations. We have lower rates than anywhere else in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — And again, the members want to set up a utilities board. Look at a utilities board in Ontario where they have a telephone company called Bell Canada. They have a more dense population; it's easier to serve and they have higher telephone rates.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the member for Arm River is standing up. I don't know whether he wanted to make a point of order and he missed it or what. In any event, Mr. Speaker, take a look at the utilities in other provinces and some of them in the United States in terms of the amount of time and energy they spend and the staff they have just to deal with utilities boards. We are talking about another tremendous bureaucracy which we would be building into both the power corporation and the utilities board. That's what the members opposite want.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! There will be plenty of opportunity for everybody to get into the debate. I am sure there is lots of time. Unfortunately, those who have spoken already will not be able to get into the debate. They have had their opportunity and they used it as they saw fit. I wonder if they could stay out of the debate and we will try to get the rest in later.

**MR. COWLEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Furthermore, look at item 6: 'At the first meeting of the Crown corporations committee, a list of all Saskatchewan Crown corporations and agencies must be presented to each committee member.' Mr.

Speaker, I don't think anyone ever asked for it, but it certainly wouldn't have been difficult to provide it.

Item 7: 'In deciding upon which Crown corporation shall be examined and what order, upon the express verbal request of any three committee members or their substitutes, any Crown corporation may be called before the committee.'

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is an attempt by the members opposite to suggest that somehow the government is not calling Crown corporations before the committee; somehow there is something sinister about Crown corporations; somehow the government is hiding something. Mr. Speaker, there has never been, since I became a member of the Crown corporations committee (which I believe was 1971), a single instance where this government refused to call a Crown corporation before the committee.

The way this is written up, of course, adds in with the rest of it, to lead to the suggestion that somehow there is something sinister here; so we have to fix it up. But the poor old minority (only four Tories on the committee) can't get their way. Therefore, we have to have three members of the committee who can do this. There has never been a single instance of a problem with respect to this.

Item 8: 'Any Crown corporation or agency whose financial year ends prior to September 1 of the current year, shall place its annual report in the hands of the members of the committee not later than December 1 of the current year or the first sitting day of the House thereafter.'

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there was an exception in terms of this.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Tell us about the uranium market.

**MR. COWLEY:** — The member wants to know about the uranium market. I would love to tell him about the uranium market, Mr. Speaker. If he would put a question on the order paper, I will discuss it at great length. I know I would be out of order if I discussed it in this debate, Mr. Speaker. Unlike the members opposite, I like to be in order when I am discussing something.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — As I said at the beginning, the member for Qu'Appelle talked about a serious and reasoned manner of approaching this. Mr. Speaker, when we had our second last meeting of the Crown corporations committee the member for Rosthern suggested (and you could check the record) that he wanted to raise the matter of an amendment to the report. What he discussed was this question of a list of Crown corporations and how they could be called. Before adopting our report, which is before the House today, at that point in time we agreed to meet at a later date, which turned out to be yesterday. Some of the members of the committee, on this side of the House, met and discussed it and were quite prepared, in terms of the matter the member had raised and said he wanted to discuss in a serious and a reasoned way to deal with that. I should accommodate the members opposite because, frankly, we didn't see any particular problem with it. But lo and behold, the member of course, when we get to the meeting, doesn't want to deal with that. Indeed, it is just tacked on the end. This had never been a problem for the committee. Rather, there are some provocative statements. Indeed, the original motion read, not the members of the committee express but the Progressive

Conservative members of the committee express . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it wasn't good enough for a press release. Somebody still had to do some work on it.

It was obvious that the members were not approaching the question in the committee in a serious and reasoned manner. Because if they had been, on Thursday last when they raised this with us in the committee, they would have said there are several things we want to discuss; we want to talk about changing the rules and procedures of the committee and so on. It was not that way, Mr. Speaker. No, they set it up so there would be a short meeting. They would be able to get their motion before. It was worded in such a way that they were certain the government members would not support it. It was simply designed to get a little press, to try to put some question in people's minds in terms of the effectiveness of the Crown corporations committee.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They weren't brought up there in Crown corporations, none of those were brought up.

**MR. COWLEY:** — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't hear the member opposite. I wish, when he was speaking, he had asked his question.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, while our Crown corporations committee is undoubtedly the best in Canada in terms of the scope of its review, in terms of the regularity with which the committee meets and in terms of the regularity with which Crown corporations are called before it, we have never argued that it was perfect.

In the past two years we have made some changes. We have this year on a motion, I believe, moved by myself last year in the committee, brought in recorded transcripts for the debates. I am sure the members will find that very useful in reading over all our wise and judicious comments in this year's debates.

Secondly, because the members opposite criticized (and I think with some justification) the year ends which we had for some of the Crown corporations which corresponded with those in the private sector (for example, potash), we have changed the year end of SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) from March 31 to December 31. It was that way in the committee this year. The year end for the Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation was changed from March 31 to December 31; it was that way in the committee this year. And the year end for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was changed from June 30 to December 31. We have an interim report this year and we will have a full annual report to December 31 next year.

The members, of course, were interested in television. They included that in here. It has already been dealt with and referred to the committee on rules and procedures.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite had really been serious and reasoned in their approach to this, they would have done one of two things. They would have consulted us last Thursday about more of the changes than the small one they mentioned that they wanted to discuss and they would have written it up in a less provocative way (designed obviously to get our opposition). Or they simply would have given it to their members on the rules and procedures committee and raised it there which is the proper place. But I think, Mr. Speaker, both the way in which they went about it and the way in which they approached it in this House shows that the intent (in my belief) on the part of the members opposite was not a serious and reasoned

approach to change, but rather a serious but not very successful attempt at politics.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, for a report that doesn't mean too much to the member opposite, he took an awfully long time to tear it apart. The minister started out by saying that the report which was presented to Crown corporations yesterday by the members on this side was a political manoeuvre on our part. He accused us of not being serious or presenting it in a reasoned manner. He accused us of writing it the wrong way — the way it was written and the way it was presented. I would like to remind the minister that yesterday in Crown corporations when we submitted the report (and we discussed it at that time) we did so in a very serious manner. We suggested to you, Mr. Minister, and to the members who were at the committee meeting at the time, if you didn't like the way it was written, go over it and rewrite it the way you'd like it written and you as a spokesman for the committee yesterday went through every clause as you did again today. In the usual arrogant manner of the members of the opposite side, you found absolutely nothing in it that was to your liking so therefore you rejected the whole report.

You accused the members opposite of taking more time, for example, on debating the TV issue or the bringing of tape recorders and television cameras into the Crown corporations committee than on any of the Crown corporations. Well, I'm very happy that this year we have the verbatim of Crown corporations because if you were to check the records, and I wish you would, you would find that we spent a day and a little bit on television debate. The minister sitting two seats away from you will tell you that we spent three days on his Crown corporation (the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the minister responsible for SEDCO). So for you to make a blatant accusation that we spent more time on that than we did on Crown corporations is to give outright misleading information to this Assembly.

And while you're at it you might check with the minister of SGI who is absent today and find out how much time we spent with the SGI Crown corporation. So, Mr. Speaker, if anyone is not taking this report seriously I would suggest to you that it is the members of the government or the members opposite.

I'm not going to take very long in discussing this because it's already been done very well by the other members on this side. I'm sorry that the Premier has left the Assembly because again the minister was accusing us of grandstanding on the public utilities review committee and ridiculed the idea of such a committee. I have spoken on and debated that subject before in this Assembly. First of all, the minister is saying again that 50 states of the United States and seven provinces of Canada are wrong and he is right. There is no need, let the government do it; they are capable, they can tell us what rates are.

The Premier shouted across (and for the record) what about cable? Well, I'd like to inform the Premier (if he is not aware, and I am sure the Attorney General is aware of this) that cable television rates are set by the CRTC and not by the cable companies and you know that. So in fact and in a sense it is a public utilities review board sitting for the price of cable television, as is the case for most communications as you well know.

Mr. Speaker, another accusation and comment that the minister made was by inferring that we did not ask for management letters. Again, Mr. Minister, I wish you would check the records of Hansard. You will find that we did ask for management letters from, I

believe, SGI. So check on that and you will find again you misled this Assembly in the information you provided on that.

The minister also accused us of asking questions in Crown corporations that would be to the benefit of the competitors of the Crown corporations and said that it was information we could dig out that would be of advantage to their competitors. Well, there are two things wrong with that. First of all, Crown corporations should be responsible to the taxpayers of this province, since they are the ones who are funding these Crown corporations and it is their money that you are investing.

Secondly and the other thing that is wrong with that, what competition may I ask does SGI have and what competition does Sask Tel have? What competition does Sask Power have? For that matter, what competition does SEDCO have other than the businesses themselves that they are loaning money to? They have no competition. If they want to call themselves bankers then they have competitors. But if they want to call themselves what they are supposed to be, lenders of last resort for businesses of this province, then they have no competition. So, again I don't know where the minister gets off on the idea that the information we are requesting from the Crown corporations is for the benefit of the competitors. What competitors does Sask Tel have, especially with Bill No. 13 coming into this Assembly now? What competition are you going to have anyhow? No, the fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, that they have denied us the information we have asked for in Crown corporations and they have denied it to the taxpayers of this province. They have displayed arrogance and continuous refusal to give information to the people and to be accountable to the people of Saskatchewan. That is the crux of the whole thing, Mr. Speaker. Members on the government side refuse to be accountable to the people and the taxpayers of this province.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought motions in and every one of these eight that are requested will be somewhere in verbatim in the transcript. They would all make the committee more efficient, functionable, and responsible to the citizens of Saskatchewan whom we are there to serve; and it's a total disappointment to me that the government members want to play politics instead of serving the citizens of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to enter into this little soiree today, but the political aspects of this debate seem to me to be a little bit beyond comprehension because the members of the government side of the House form the majority on all Crown corporations committees. I don't believe it's necessary to bring politics into this debate today when it is so important indeed to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. And the member for Biggar says agreed. I think he and one member on this side of the House did a very good job in bringing politics into something as important as this.

I want the members opposite to keep in mind that they, the government, form a majority on all Crown corporations committees. Examining Crown corporations committees in the province of Saskatchewan is like the sheep investigating the pigs in *Animal Farm*. Now I don't know how many members opposite or on this side of the House have ever read this very interesting book. But Mr. Speaker, I just want to quote two short paragraphs from this book for the edification of the members opposite, and for the edification of the members of the opposition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, just a very brief quotation.

The flag was green, Snowball explained, to represent the green fields of England, while the hoof and the horn signified the future republic of the animals which would arise when the human race had been finally overthrown. After the hoisting of the flag all the animals trooped into the big barn for a general assembly (like the Crown corporations committee), which was known as the meeting. Here the work of the coming week was planned out and resolutions were put forward and debated.

It was always the pigs who put forward the resolutions. The other animals understood how to vote but could never think of any resolutions of their own. Snowball and Napoleon were by far the most active in the debates, but it was noticed that these two were never in agreement. Whatever suggestion either of them made the other could be counted on to oppose it. Even when it was resolved, a thing no one could object to in itself, to set aside the small paddock behind the orchard as a home of rest for the animals who were past work, there was a stormy debate over the correct retiring age for each class of animal.

That's what we're into today — a stormy debate over each class of animal instead of listening sincerely to a proposition put forward to better the province of Saskatchewan no matter who puts it forward. One more small quotation, Mr. Speaker, from Animal Farm, and it is the concluding paragraph, for the benefit of the members opposite.

Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question now what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again, but already it was impossible to say which was which.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

#### **YEAS — 33**

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Matsalla
Pepper	Mostoway	Lusney
Bowerman	Banda	Prebble
Romanow	Kaeding	Long
Messer	Hammersmith	Johnson
Kramer	Kowalchuk	Nelson
Baker	Feschuk	Engel
Skoberg	Byers	Poniatowski
McArthur	Vickar	Lingenfelter
Gross	Rolfes	White
Shillington	Cowley	Solomon

#### **NAYS — 15**

Berntson	Rousseau	Duncan
Birkbeck	Swan	Andrew

Larter  
Lane  
Taylor

Pickering  
Muirhead  
Katzman

McLeod  
Collver  
Ham

## POINT OF ORDER

### Re Question Period

**MR. COLLVER:** — The rules state that the question period has now gone by the board, Mr. Speaker, because it shall finish 30 minutes after commencement of the proceedings, and the proceedings started at 10 o'clock.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The point of order raised by the member for Nipawin is an interesting observation which in fact appears in the rules that govern the question period. However the practice of this Assembly has been, right from the beginning, that if the question period was delayed, it could be proceeded with later. I think we'll continue to follow the practice. If this is a serious contention of the members, I'm sure that the rules committee will be glad to consider the matter again at some appropriate time.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I suggest then that you put the matter to this House because you are therefore breaking the rule of the Assembly, which is very succinctly put in the book of rules of the Assembly, that it shall conclude 30 minutes after the commencement of the proceedings. That is the specific rule. I think the matter should be put to the Assembly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I've made my observation on it and I intend to follow the practice of this Assembly which is quite clear. If the member believes this is clear and it's a problem, I'm sure the rules committee would be glad to consider it at some future time.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I challenge your ruling and ask you to put it to the House, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What's your point of order?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, the rules of this Assembly are exactly established by the rules committee. Now you can have a practice that it goes by the board for two minutes, three minutes or four minutes, but to suggest that practice should go by the board for one full hour is unacceptable, I believe. I don't believe that it is Mr. Speaker's right to challenge the rules of this Assembly. The rules of this Assembly are very clear. The question period shall cease 30 minutes after commencement of the proceedings. To go along with two or three minutes, I think every member is prepared to do; but to break the rules for one hour, I don't believe it is Mr. Speaker's right to do so.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the member is just debating the issue now. What we're discussing here quite clearly is a matter of principle, not a matter of degree. If I go 10 second beyond the time set aside for the question period, then the question period should cease. It's not a question of two or three minutes or one hour.

The practice of this Assembly is that if the question period is delayed for some reason, whether it's two or three minutes, fifteen minutes, twenty minutes or one-half hour . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think the member is probably right; I'm reinforcing the ruling which the member for Nipawin is not prepared to accept. There is no opportunity for him to challenge the Speaker at this time and I'm going to continue with the practice

of this Assembly, which is to recognize the question period at this time. I recognize the member for Qu'Appelle.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What's the point of order?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Rule 35(2) reads as follows:

The oral question period shall begin not later than five minutes after the commencement of the sitting and shall conclude not later than thirty minutes after the commencement of the sitting.

Mr. Speaker does not have the right to rule on that ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I have a rule which I'd like to refer the member to. It's with regard to points of order, Rule 25(2):

Mr. Speaker, or Chairman, after having called the attention of the Assembly, or of the Committee, to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetition, either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other Members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech . . .

And I won't go on to read the rest of the rule because I think the member is quite familiar with it and what happens later on. Therefore, I will recognize the member for Qu'Appelle.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I move this House do now adjourn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I recognize the member for Qu'Appelle.

## **QUESTIONS**

### **Land Acquisition by Sask Housing Corporation**

**MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — I would like to direct a question to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. If the hon. member is not here, I will direct it to the Attorney General or perhaps the Provincial Secretary (given his comments earlier). A recent press article in the city of Regina indicates that the Sask Housing Corporation is acquiring homes in the city of Regina for infill housing and is refusing to give the information to those evicted as to why the land is being acquired. Now in the interest of full accountability . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** — I rise on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I must ask the member to abide by the rules of the House.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I am doing it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — No, the member is not doing that, because he is not sitting down, first of all. Secondly, there is no opportunity for points of order within the question period. We have an opportunity in which the member may rise, if he does not wish to be repetitious, before orders of the day, with regard to the question period. I will ask him to



cease and desist from interrupting the member for Qu'Appelle. He is depriving the members of this Chamber of the opportunity to have the question period as we have been practising for quite some time.

I might further recognize another citation. This is with regard to the Interim Report of the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures, March 12, 1976, which established this question period. This is the last time I intend to deal with this during the question period in order to bring House to order. It says:

All members must appreciate that in the end Mr. Speaker must interpret the rules and guidelines under which the question period operates.

I'll take the member for Qu'Appelle.

**MR. LANE:** — My question is, given your stated full disclosure, can you tell us why Sask Housing Corporation is not advising the tenants and the owners of the homes why it is acquiring the property and what project is being embarked upon?

**HON. E. L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, I have read the article myself. The minister in charge of the housing corporation and the vice-chairman of the board are not here. I will take notice and endeavour to have an answer tomorrow for the member.

### **Release of Report on Small Rural Holdings**

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a new question then. The committee investigating the question of how small rural holdings should be taxed is scheduled to report in November. The deputy minister of rural affairs said the report will not be made public when it is forwarded to the government. In light of your stated policy of full disclosure, can you tell this Assembly why you will not make the report of that committee public? It affects many members on both sides of this House. Will you give the assurance that the report will be made public when it is completed?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member was looking at me so I assume he was directing his question here. I don't know what statement I made with respect to full disclosure or what the member means by it. I do want to suggest to the member I am not aware of the report, nor am I aware of when it will be tabled. I will certainly bring the matter up with the minister of rural affairs, and will endeavour to have an answer for tomorrow.

### **Sask Housing Corporation — Disclosure**

**MR. LANE:** — A question to the Provincial Secretary on the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. The refusal of SHC to give information has led to concerns throughout the area, and has led to speculation by speculators who are acquiring houses throughout the area. Would you not admit that it is in the interest of the people of Regina that the proposals and the policy and the program of the government be fully disclosed to the public so that land speculators and housing acquisition by speculators can be stopped?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, when one looks at various circumstances, I think one will find there are circumstances where disclosure and total openness in terms of what programs are being pursued is a good idea. There are other circumstances where one

will find, with respect to certain programs, that the exact nature of the program is not yet finalized and therefore it is difficult to make those sorts of things public. There are other circumstances, in various programs not necessarily associated with the housing corporation, where it is not in the public interest to have full disclosure prior to proceeding. So I think one has to examine each of the individual circumstances with respect to the one the member raised with his first question. Again, I reiterate, I will attempt to have an answer for him tomorrow.

**MR. LANE:** — Could the minister also endeavour to have an answer — the most recent report of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation indicates that some operational problems which inhibited project approvals under the new Canada-Saskatchewan Urban Rental Housing Pilot Program for Families of Native Origin were cleared away in 1979. Low approvals for the year were limited to 15. Acceleration of the program is now assured. Is the land assembly and infill housing project of Saskatchewan Housing part of the policy to acquire 1,000 units in the city of Regina over the next three years, and is it part of that pilot project referred to in the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation's annual report?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I can't be certain of that. I recall the discussion which the members had in the Crown corporations committee on this and I think there was some information given there. The member might check with one of his colleagues who was on the committee. I'm just not certain of what the response was there. Your critic may recall it better. But again, I will take notice and try to have an answer for you tomorrow.

### **Freedom of Information Legislation**

**MR. R. L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — A question to the Provincial Secretary in the absence of the Premier and the Attorney General. The ombudsman report which came down, I believe, the day before yesterday called for the implementation of a freedom of information act in the province of Saskatchewan. Can you advise this Assembly whether or not your government is considering bringing in freedom of information legislation in the near future?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the ombudsman's report will receive the usual careful attention from the government. With respect to suggestions such as freedom of information legislation, it will be considered by the government prior to the next session. Whether or not any action will be taken I can't say at this time.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Supplementary. From what the minister has said, does your government support in principle the concept of freedom of information?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I always find it difficult to deal with concepts like freedom of information or concepts in other areas where there is no definition. I don't know what the member implies by freedom of information in terms of what information has to be public and at what period of time, so I find it difficult to deal with the member's question. He is using a catch phrase rather than a particular piece of legislation. With something like that it is easier to say whether or not one agrees or disagrees.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What I am referring to are proposals as advanced by Bill C-15 in the last parliament, the proposals being advanced in the freedom of information committee in the province of Ontario, and the proposal by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons the other day indicating

basically an acceptance of the basic premises as set out in Bill C-15 of the former government. I think most people today would interpret the clause of freedom of information that way. Can you advise the House if you are in agreement in principle with that legislation?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will advise the House in terms of the government's policy when we introduce or do not introduce the legislation. I indicated to the member that will be considered, I am sure, over the summer and we will reach a conclusion as to whether or not we're prepared to put forward that particular kind of legislation.

### **Saskatchewan Road Ambulance Association**

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Urban Affairs I'll have to direct my question to the Provincial Secretary. Yesterday your government was given an ultimatum by the Saskatchewan Road Ambulance Association and if I may, Mr. Speaker, I will read the ultimatum:

In due consideration of the above mentioned facts and without financial commitment from the provincial government, the SRAA has no alternative but to begin action of withdrawal from the MRA (Municipal Road Ambulance) Program as of June 1, 1980 and effective September 1, 1980 rates charged to ambulance users shall be suggested minimum rate of \$75 basic charge and \$1 per travelled mile with no mileage exemption.

Mr. Minister, what does your government intend to do with respect to giving fair consideration to the SRAA in light of the fact that your present offer of approximately 7 per cent over the next three years is certainly insufficient to meet their increased costs?

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can respond in a limited way to the hon. member since I was involved as Minister of Municipal Affairs in developing the Municipal Road Ambulance Program as part of revenue sharing. I think, Mr. Speaker, that certainly the Minister of Urban Affairs will be getting in touch with the road ambulance people. I'm sure his door will be open to meeting with them with respect to their concerns.

I think also the Minister of Urban Affairs will be discussing this issue along with the Minister of Rural Affairs with SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) who were part of the development of the Municipal Road Ambulance Program. There will be approximately (and I'm not sure of the figures) \$2 million plus escalation provided to the Municipal Road Ambulance Program in this particular budget. And the arrangement was that it would be in fact a municipal program to which the provincial government would provide assistance through revenue sharing.

I think the road ambulance people, instead of focusing their attention on the provincial government, should be focusing their attention on the municipal people who are delivering the program under revenue sharing and talking with them. As well, as I indicated, an opportunity is available to them to talk with the particular ministers involved at the provincial level.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, a further question to the minister. Are you not aware, Mr. Minister, that the Saskatchewan Road Ambulance Association has for months been speaking to the municipalities and, of course, based on the per capita grants supplied

by the government, has been turned down. And would you not also agree, Mr. Minister, that your government should not wait until the eleventh hour to make decisions such as this one? We're talking about June 1 and charging people who can little afford it, usually the people using road ambulances today are senior citizens who can little afford a \$75 charge plus the \$1 per mile.

Would you not agree, Mr. Minister, that it's time your government acted on this, instead of procrastinating as you have for many months, now that the Saskatchewan Road Ambulance Association has been in contact with you?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — In reply to the hon. member, I can't at this point in time respond with respect to the meetings that have gone on between SUMA and SARM and the road ambulance people, and the Minister of Urban Affairs and the Minister of Rural Affairs. I want to point out to the hon. member that on the basis of the agreement for revenue sharing in which part 4 provided for a road ambulance program, at no time did the provincial government ever say that we would pick up all of the costs of the delivery of that program. We said that by this agreement we will provide X amount of dollars which will be escalated under revenue sharing. That's what we said; that was the arrangement; everybody knew that. The municipalities knew that and the road ambulance people knew that. They fought at that time and they agreed at that time with that program. I think we should stick with that arrangement and expand the program as necessary.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H. J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Supplementary to the Minister. One of the very real costs being faced by the road ambulance association operators is the additional cost placed on them when they must carry a nurse in the ambulance. They are allowed \$75 for the trip. With nurses' wages increasing fairly dramatically this year, if they are on the road for a couple of hours, they must pay the nurse out of that \$75. It cuts back very significantly on the amount of money they have then as an ambulance operator for that trip. Do you not feel that because of this change in the nursing salary and the salaries of others, you have to go beyond the 7 per cent?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I can't respond with respect to the charge because I think the charge or the payment is a decision made by the road ambulance districts. That's not part of the provincial government's operation. We provide a set amount under the revenue sharing agreement.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the regulations relating to the road ambulance program under which the funds would be provided, those regulations were developed as the program developed in consultation with the road ambulance people, with SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association). They were fully aware that in order to provide an adequate program, certain standards would be set in place and certain things would be required in terms of the type of vehicle and the service within that vehicle. So it was well known.

I think we and the hon. member can argue, in estimates of urban affairs and rural affairs, about revenue sharing and the indexing policy of that. I don't think it is appropriate to argue that, with respect to the arrangements made for the municipal road ambulance program which, in my mind, albeit not perfect, is the best program in this country in providing service for broad areas of a province such as ours which has such a scattered

population.

### **Shortage of Psychiatrists**

**MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, I don't suppose I could have chosen a more appropriate day for this question. As you would be aware, there is a tremendous increase in stress on individuals in our society. This is resulting of course in an increase in crime, suicide, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, irresponsibility and a lack of respect to the institutions of our society, and for our society in general.

Mr. Minister, I don't think you would disagree that mental health care in the province of Saskatchewan is a major problem. It is a major problem in particular as it relates to patients requiring intensive psychiatric care. My question very simply is: would you not agree we have a near crisis situation on our hands as it relates to a desperate shortage of psychiatrists to meet the increasing demands of rising mental health problems in the province of Saskatchewan?

**HON. H. H. ROLES (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, we spent a fair amount of time on this particular topic during my estimates and I indicated to the members opposite at that time that the shortage of psychiatrists is not unique to Saskatchewan. There is a shortage of psychiatrists around the world, particularly in North America. An article in yesterday's Leader-Post said there have been outcries in the province of Alberta where they, because of the hot economy there, have a lot of mobility of people and the break up of families. Alberta has a really serious problem. I think their problem is more serious than, for example, the one in Saskatchewan. I don't disagree with the member that we have a serious problem but that problem relates right across Canada. I will indicate to the member that we are having some success in attracting psychiatrists to the province of Saskatchewan. It is my understanding that by about July 1 we can have our vacancies probably down to about 10 or 11.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I'm quite aware that the hon. member for Maple Creek has raised this particular problem with you. And I think, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, it's quite agreed that the problem is there. It exists. I think the question is what are we going to do about it? Therefore my supplementary question would be: would you do one of two things or both — extend the \$25,000 grant program to psychiatrists which you do have for the anesthetists, or could you possibly provide some kind of an incentive program for Saskatchewan students taking training for psychiatry in the province of Saskatchewan, so that we could maintain those students as psychiatrists here to care and look after the desperate need that exists in the province of Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, what I'm asking is do you not see the need as a government and as a department to put into place a program that will virtually grow our own psychiatrists to meet the rising demand in the future?

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, certainly the member's suggestion has some merit, but let me indicate to the member that I do not think it has as high a priority as, for example, the shortage of anesthetists. I think we want to make sure that we handle the difficulties one at a time. I indicated to the member that I think our recruitment of psychiatrists is going to bear fruit within the next two or three months, and that we will dramatically improve our situation in Saskatchewan, but it will not be satisfactory, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that we would like to see it. His suggestion of possibly giving some incentive for our students to go into the area of psychiatry has some merit, and I will certainly take

that up with my officials.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. I appreciate part of the comment by the minister particularly as it relates to an incentive program. I think my concern is the urgency of the matter and possibly that's where we have some disagreement. Royal commission reports have indicated that we require about 10 per cent of our beds to be allotted for the mental health cases that we have in the province. I doubt very much, Mr. Minister, if we have 10 per cent of our beds set aside for that. We have shortage enough in nursing home beds as it is. Mr. Minister, I would just put this question to you. Do you not agree that the situation we have on hand today is in fact going to jeopardize our whole social structure unless your department, your government, takes some action now with regard to the increasing psychiatric problems and the many ramifications that those problems are creating in the province of Saskatchewan, which I say is undermining our very social structure? I think that action is required immediately and we have to get under way with it. I ask you, would you not agree with those comments as they respect the urgency of the matter?

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, the suggestion was made by the member that our whole social structure is in jeopardy. If the social structure of Saskatchewan is in jeopardy because of the lack of psychiatrists we have here, then there's no hope for North America. The situation is a lot worse in other parts of North America. I think he is dramatizing the situation. He can't take the shortage of psychiatrists in isolation to what is happening in the province in other programs. I think we are providing assistance to individuals who are under stress. One of the best ways that you can do that is to provide jobs for people, to give security to people, to make sure that people have sufficient income on which to live, to provide family counselling to those people whose families are on the rocks, to provide information and provide services in our school system — that's what we need to do. What you are suggesting is to act after the fact, and I'm not saying we shouldn't do that. But let's not dramatize the situation to the extent that everything is going to go to pot because the minister doesn't have a sufficient number of psychiatrists in the province.

### **PCB Spill at Federal Pioneer**

**MR. G. S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Environment. In light of the fact I have new information concerning the time element when the government was first involved in the PCB spill at Federal Pioneer, would you very carefully inform this Assembly of the date when the Department of the Environment first took action with regard to the PCB spill?

**HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not able to give the hon. member the answer to that question today. I can research the material and provide him with the answer, and therefore will take it as notice, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — New question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I have not forgotten the date; you shouldn't have. Will you, Mr. Minister, inform this Assembly why you have insisted on taking Federal Pioneer to court if they do not agree to pay up the millions for the removal of PCBs from their plant, especially when your department has not even come up with a definite plan for removal?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not want (as I have indicated to the press on previous occasions) to discuss the Federal Pioneer issue because action is being taken. The matter is being legally interpreted; we're being legally advised with respect to our

position and, I presume, Federal Pioneer is also. So therefore I do not wish to enter into any discussions or debate relative to the details of Federal Pioneer at this point in time.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — A new question to the Minister of the Environment. Do you not agree that the date your department moved in and took over and controlled the PCB problem at Federal Pioneer is the date you should be responsible financially? I'm sure you can answer that question.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, I certainly want to answer that question; I want to answer that question on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. I do not agree with the hon. member that the people of the province of Saskatchewan, through their tax dollars, should be responsible for the spill of material at Federal Pioneer.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, all persons in the province of Saskatchewan will favour that particular position. People living in Meadow Lake, people living in Kindersley, people living in Maple Creek, in my judgment, have no responsibility nor should they be asked to assist in the clean-up of a spill of PCBs at Federal Pioneer in Regina.

**MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Minister, do you not agree that if you had acted when the report was first submitted to you, you would have had maybe a truckload or two of materials; but now, because of the inaction of your department, you can sue the company for \$2 million or whatever it takes to remove thousands of yards? Whose fault is that?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I think, in reading the report it would be easy to conclude that, regardless of the specific date which the members opposite like to deal with and like to make a point of (though there is no point to be made), the spill at Federal Pioneer began long before it was ever recognized by the media or by the department and by the employees in the plant.

One has to ask the question: how would a pipe running underground suddenly become perforated after being in place for some years, and the report itself indicates (to me at least) that the spill began a long time before it was ever made . . .

### **Condition of Portion of Highway No. 13**

**MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition):** — A question to the Minister of Highways. You will have by now received a letter from the rural municipality of Antler, No. 61, in which they say that council feels (they're talking about No. 13 Highway from Redvers to the Manitoba border) that when the condition of a provincial highway becomes such that traffic is using municipal roads to avoid the highway, it is time for someone in the provincial government to take a second look at their program.

I wonder if the minister will indicate to this House now whether or not he is prepared to review his project array for this year and include the eight miles (I believe it is) from Redvers to the Manitoba border in this year's construction program, they really are a mess.

**HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** — Mr. Speaker, the member says, I am no doubt aware. Now, I am not aware of a letter from . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I didn't say, you are no doubt aware of it. You have probably received it.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Probably received — well, the same thing. To the best of my knowledge I have not. Now there is departmental mail, and the only thing I can do is take note. But neither have I, Mr. Speaker, received any reports or requests from our maintenance people, who are excellent, that they need special assistance in that area. I will check with my staff, (Mr. Mitch Kocur is the engineer in charge of the Regina district) and ask if there are special needs in that area. I'm sure if they are as bad as the member suggests, and as he alleges the municipality suggests, we will be doing something about it because ordinary maintenance demands that the road be kept at a good and safe level for driving.

### **Approach Marking at Wolseley**

**MR. D. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — A question to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, you will recall in estimates I indicated to you that the new approach at Wolseley had not been properly marked. You answered that you would be looking into this. I checked on it; there has been nothing done. The holiday season is starting on Highway No. 1, and my question is, when are you going to get around to marking that intersection?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Mr. Speaker, I assured the member that we would be . . . I have not had a report, and I'm sure when our people have looked at it . . . We have assured him he would get a report as to what may be possible there. I presume it is being considered and acted upon. As soon as I have that information he will be apprised of it.

### **Point of Order**

**MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you anticipated before the orders of the day, my rising on a point of order. I am not going to attempt to debate Mr. Speaker in his ruling today. I am, however, going to attempt to solicit Mr. Speaker's understanding of the rules of the Assembly, here, which the members are supposed to set. Mr. Speaker will be aware that it is the responsibility of the members of the legislature to establish the rules under which they shall behave in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker will be aware that rule 35(2) does not talk about a 25-minute question period; it doesn't talk about a time frame. No instruction from the committee instructed Mr. Speaker that the question period shall be 25 minutes in duration. What it said, Mr. Speaker, is that the question period shall commence not later than five minutes after the commencement of the sitting, and shall conclude not later than 30 minutes after the commencement of the sitting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will be aware that if it is incumbent upon Mr. Speaker to totally contravene the rules the members set, it means the members no longer are able to establish rules for themselves. If Mr. Speaker had a ruling by the committee, if Mr. Speaker were doubtful about the practice, if the practice conflicted with the rule, then it surely should have been incumbent upon Mr. Speaker to go to the committee and ask them for clarification of the rule. It is not incumbent upon Mr. Speaker to establish his own ruling prior to that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. Plainly and simply, the member is debating an issue with the Speaker. I think there is no doubt about that. The member is raising the same point of order he attempted to raise before.

I have no argument with the member that this body is supreme in setting rules. I have never argued that. The rules are established. But the practices of the Assembly are also recognized as being something that is followed. I may say, with regard to the point



of order the member for Nipawin raises, we would never have had a question period in this Assembly if a practice had not started spontaneously where a question was asked. Eventually that evolved into a more formalized approach, namely the oral question period which we now recognize and have since recommendations were brought in in 1976.

If the Assembly wants to change its practices I would be quite willing to chair the committee or anyone else would probably be quite willing to chair the committee which would decide one way or the other with regard to the rules. I am not standing in opposition to any changing of the rules or the practices of this House, I just say it should be done formally.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I then rise on a matter . . . I'm sorry.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What is your purpose?

**MR. COLLVER:** — The reason I am rising is that I believe Mr. Speaker is contravening my rights as an individual member by contravening this rule. I am not, as I say, Mr. Speaker, attempting to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I don't allow other members the privilege of debating my rulings. I have made my ruling. That's it; I'm done with it. Are there any other points? The member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I rise on a matter of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What is your point of privilege?

**MR. COLLVER:** — The point of privilege is that Mr. Speaker cannot contravene the rules of this Assembly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I have dealt with it. I have dealt with that matter. I think I have explained that there are practices and there are rules. I am following the practice of this Assembly which is quite clearly established. I recognize the member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning today's question period. It is my interpretation of question period that it is the time for the opposition to find out the stance of the government and its intentions. I saw today that the Premier and the Deputy Premier were present in this House throughout the debate on the Crown corporations, but when oral question period was called, they both absented themselves. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is a referendum in this country and . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley well knows that he can't make a speech. He has to state what the point of order is. He is not stating what his point of order is. I will have to ask him to get to that immediately.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — My point of order is. How are we to find out the positions of this government at this crucial time in the Dominion of Canada when . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. The member is debating it. He hasn't stated what the point of order is. I have no control over which members are in this House and when they are in

this House. I occasionally have some direction about their leaving the House, but that is all.

**MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member for Moosomin.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Would it be a point of order if in fact all the ministers of this government were not present in the House for the first half hour which would be question period? Would it be a point of order from a member on this side of the House if that were the case? Then Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — No, no. Order. I know what the member is asking and the answer is no. That is not a point of order. There is nothing in the rules with regard to that. The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I would ask leave of the Assembly to offer . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — There are no more points of order with regard to the question period. If we can clear that up first . . .

### **Point of Personal Privilege**

**MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — I rise on a matter of personal privilege and I ask leave of the Assembly to move a motion. The motion is as follows, and I'm sorry to have to move it:

That this Assembly instructs Mr. Speaker that he has no right to contravene the rule of this Assembly as set forth in the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan 1976 and requests that he apologize to the Assembly for contravening rule 35(2) on Thursday, May 22, 1980.

Motion negatived.

### **MESSAGE OF CONGRATULATIONS**

**MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the Assembly to offer a congratulatory message to a very well-known pioneer of Saskatchewan. If I have that leave I'll proceed.

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

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is most appropriate in the 75th year of our province that we should take every opportunity possible to recognize the work of those pioneers who built our province.

Yesterday, Dr. William B. Tufts celebrated his 75th birthday in Regina. I believe the Government of Saskatchewan will also welcome this opportunity to join with us in recognizing Dr. Bill Tufts for his endeavours and hard work on behalf of the people of our province.

Dr. Tufts came to Outlook, Saskatchewan in 1932, in the middle of the drought and depression and practised medicine as a country doctor for 25 years. Dr. Tufts faithfully served his community and many times travelled by horse-drawn buggy and sleigh and often by foot to care for the ill.

During the years of the depression Dr. Tufts saw the economic plight of rural Saskatchewan and pledged his efforts toward the eventuality of a dam on the South Saskatchewan River. Because of a lack of knowledge of the danger of X rays Dr. Tufts lost the use of his hand. When he could no longer carry on the private practice of medicine he was appointed as medical director of the workers' compensation board.

I'm sure the Premier and particularly the Minister of Labour, who worked in close association with Dr. Tufts, can attest to his dedication and efforts in carrying out these duties.

Dr. Tufts, on leaving the workers' compensation board was honoured for outstanding devoted service given beyond the call of duty. In 1968 Dr. Tufts was selected as Saskatchewan's salesman of the year in recognition of his enormous contribution over the years to the final implementation of the plan for the construction of the South Saskatchewan River dam. In 1967 the dream of Dr. Tufts became a reality with the official dedication of the Gardiner Dam.

Prime Minister Trudeau acknowledged the efforts of Dr. Tufts as being worthy of this award and The Rt. Hon. Robert Stanfield appropriately stated:

I came myself from a part of the country where it was sometimes necessary for man to change his physical environment and therefore have some appreciation for the tremendous importance to Saskatchewan of the Gardiner Dam. Dr. Tuft's perseverance has changed the face and prospects of this province and many Canadians outside Saskatchewan welcome the opportunity to pay him tribute.

In 1970 the province of Saskatchewan named Tufts Bay in his honour. In 1970 the Canadian Medical Association elected Dr. Tufts to its senior membership. In 1978 the University of Saskatchewan granted Dr. Tufts an honorary doctor of laws degree for his contribution over many years to our province.

Yesterday a delegation drove to Regina from Outlook to express their appreciation to Dr. Tufts for the contributions he made to that community. Today, I believe it is fitting that we in the legislature thank Dr. Tufts for his contribution on behalf of our entire province and wish him many more years of healthful activities. I therefore call on all members of the Legislative Assembly to join with us in expressing our appreciation to Dr. William Tufts.

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

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture):** — I want to join with the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, and all members opposite in saying a word about Dr. Tufts. I unfortunately have never had an opportunity to meet Dr. Tufts that I can recall. But certainly down through those earlier years I heard a lot about Dr. Tufts as I heard a lot about some particularly strong characters in the province of Saskatchewan. Dr. Tufts was one of the people who saw something that needed to be done and just wouldn't give up until it happened. I think that it's fitting that in our Celebrate

Saskatchewan year, our 75th year as a province that we pay tribute to Dr. Tufts and it's rather fitting that he celebrates his 75th birthday on the birthday of the province. On behalf of the Premier and the member for Moose Jaw North (the Minister of Labour who probably knew him very well and worked with him) and on behalf of all members here, I congratulate the community of Outlook for remembering and coming in and paying tribute yesterday to Dr. Tufts; I thank the Leader of the Opposition for bringing it to the attention of the Assembly.

Our wish is a happy birthday to Dr. Tufts (albeit a day late) and may he have many more and a sincere thank you on behalf of the people of the province.

## **MOTIONS**

### **Special Committee on Regulations**

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Shillington):

That members Lane, Andrew, Duncan, Lingenfelter, Prebble, Romanow, Skoberg, Swan and White be constituted a special committee to consider every regulation filed with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, pursuant to the provisions of The Regulations Act, with a view to determining whether the special attention of the Assembly should be drawn to any of the said regulations on any of the following grounds:

- (a) That it imposes a charge on the public revenues or prescribes a payment to be made to any public authority not specifically provided for by statute;
- (b) That it is excluded from challenge in the courts;
- (c) That it makes unusual or unexpected use of powers conferred by statute;
- (d) That it purports to have retrospective effect where the parent statute confers no express authority so to provide;
- (e) That it is insufficiently promulgated;
- (f) That it is not clear in meaning.

And if they so determine to report to that effect that the committee have the assistance of legal counsel in reviewing the same said regulations; that it be given the power to sit after prorogation of the Assembly; and that it be required prior to reporting that the special attention of the Assembly be drawn to any regulation to inform the government department or authority concerned of its intention so to report; and that the committee be empowered to invite any regulation-making authority to submit in a memorandum explaining any regulation which may be under consideration by the committee or to invite any regulation-making authority to appear before the committee as a witness for the purpose of explaining any such regulation; and that the committee be empowered to review the by-laws of the professional societies and amendments thereto as referred to the committee, to determine whether or not they or any of them are in any way

prejudicial to the public interest.

I so move.

Motion agreed.

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture):** I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Shillington (Minister of Culture and Youth):

That the by-laws of the professional societies and amendments thereto tabled after March 18, 1980 as an addenda to the sessional paper No. 7 of 1979-80, be referred to the special committee on regulations.

I so move.

Motion agreed.

## **SECOND READINGS**

**HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment)** moved second reading of Bill No. 120 — **An Act respecting the Control of Drainage of Surface Water.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to move second reading of The Drainage Control Act. I will not be able to complete it before our noon hour, but I shall begin at least and will continue at this afternoon's sitting.

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.