

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 24, 1981

EVENING SESSION

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 11 - Optics Technology (continued)

MR. JOHNSON: — Mr. Speaker, at 5 o'clock I said that I would compare what has taken place in Alberta with what is taking place in Saskatchewan, in regard to the fibre optics network. I'd like to go back a little, to what I previously said. In Alberta, the public utilities review board said, when the Alberta telephone company applied to move into fibre optics, that it did not think the corporation should do that.

Now, I find this to be a little out of line with what should have taken place, because fibre optics in essence is an integrated system which is able to carry many things other than telephone calls. It can carry cable TV and radio signals; it can be used for the transfer of information between corporations. One of the advantages of this particular system is that it has better security than ordinary telephone lines.

The move in that direction by the review board set up something which has been done a number of times before. It divided an industry into two segments: a profitable area, and an area which provides the service. It moved the profitable area into the private sector where large profits can be made, and tied the other company, which in this case is a public utility, to the high cost service end of it, which does not provide as much revenue.

Take a look at what, as the mover of the motion previously stated, has taken place with Bell Canada, since it is now asking for rate increases in the neighbourhood of 30 per cent.

This means that in Saskatchewan, the system by being integrated and complete, will be a least-cost system and the funding back and forth through it will allow the service to go into the large rural area.

That is a very good area in which to use fibre optics because in long distance, high volume areas, this cable will be cost-effective. The province of Saskatchewan, and I believe also the province of Alberta, would have been the two areas where this would have come about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to second this particular resolution, and I will be supporting it. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, I think maybe we'll read the motion out to start it.

That this Assembly commend the Government of Saskatchewan for its initiative and foresight in enabling Saskatchewan to assume a position of world leadership in the development of fibre optics technology, thereby resulting in the creation of jobs for Saskatchewan residents in an innovative, high technology and environmentally clean manufacturing industry, and in

the opportunity for both rural and urban residents of the province to enjoy the full benefits of modern communications systems and services.

I think if we just go back (and I don't want to dwell on this for very long), it's quite evident that the two members who brought this motion in will never have a chance to be the minister responsible for Sask Tel, and I say, thank God for that.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have much of a minister for Sask Tel right now, but you can take two zeros and you will have zero. It doesn't matter if you multiply it, add it, or subtract it. For one thing, and I'll be checking the record, they don't know the facts about Sask Tel; they don't know the facts about fibre optics. They talk about earth receiving dishes — I don't think they have even seen one, but they talk about them. The member for Yorkton couldn't even read his prepared text properly, Mr. Speaker. There isn't much point in dwelling on this kind of motion with input from two nothings.

Mr. Speaker, they could table their speeches so we could get them printed and put into *Hansard* — save wasting the time of this Assembly listening to them talk about something that they haven't the first clue about. They talk about fibre optics going to service all of rural Saskatchewan — garbage! That's what it is. It is not going to service all of rural Saskatchewan. You tell me one farm in Saskatchewan where they are going to lay fibre optics cable to. Maybe the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resource's farm might get it. He has a road, so maybe he'll get fibre optics. But with fibre optics there is not one farmer in rural Saskatchewan who is going to get the benefit of television through cable or any other media. Not one. That is fact, not fiction.

They talked about the cost, \$22 million, and I am sure that is what they said but I will check the record — it was \$56 million. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, they are talking about spending \$56 million, when for less than \$10 million, there could be earth receiving stations set up to service not only the towns in rural Saskatchewan, but the farmers and everyone else in rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, there is no point in getting wound up and continuing on.

They are backbenchers, and they always will be backbenchers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I would sooner be in the back row over here, having some input into what's going on in Saskatchewan. Even if we don't get leave from this Assembly to debate important issues in this Chamber, it's a lot better than sitting on the other side, Mr. Speaker, and getting up and making those two big speeches a year, getting the big thrill of making one motion a year, and talking about something they don't know anything about.

They want to talk about comparing it with Alberta. Alberta is so far ahead of them. They want to talk a little further about Sask Tel's profits. What about the double taxing system? You were in Crown corporation this morning, were you asleep? You don't even know what's going on. Mr. Speaker, without any further ado, we'll have an amendment to bring into this Mickey Mouse motion from the Mickey Mouse men in the back row. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I want to take this opportunity to make a general observation about the debate in the House. I notice that some members are slipping into a habit which is not good parliamentary practice, and I take this opportunity to bring it to your attention. Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Procedure* Fifth Edition, citation 316:

A Member, while speaking, must not make personal charges against a

Member.

I wonder if I could just have order on all sides of the House. Then maybe we could get this over with, and get on to the next order of business.

I think that members should not make personal charges against other members. Now, I've heard some of that going on recently. It's not good parliamentary practice. It does not deal with the item which is before us, which is discussing in principle the motion that's on the floor. That's what the members are supposed to discuss, and I would ask the members to try to adhere to that rule in the future. I think it will make for better debate and for more quickly dealing with subjects that are before the House.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 16 - Federal Natural Gas Tax

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Chairman, at the risk of raising the ire of the hon. member for Thunder Creek, I'll try to keep my remarks as brief and to the point as possible tonight.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're not good enough to raise my ire.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I wonder if the members can just try to conduct themselves in a parliamentary fashion, and allow the member who is on his feet to give his remarks to the particular resolution before us, and maybe cease and desist from calling across the House in the manner which I hear at this time.

MR. ALLEN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the motion that I move today condemns the federal government for its decision to levy the natural gas tax. The tax was announced, as everyone knows, in the federal budget last November or December by Finance Minister Allan MacEachen. It's just the most recent example of the ill-conceived and short-sighted patchwork the federal government refers to as their national energy policy. While recent moves by Ottawa have aimed primarily at the energy producing provinces, I think it's fair to say that the federal government, over the last half-century, has managed to mismanage the energy future of all Canadians in all parts of Canada.

You've only to look at the question of long-term secure supply of oil and natural gas, and the related question of oil and gas pricing. From 1960, Mr. Speaker, to 1973, in what was by today's standards certainly a time of cheap energy. Canada exported well over two billion barrels of petroleum. At that time oil cost less than \$2 a barrel. The federal government was in a hurry to give it away.

And the Conservatives, during the Diefenbaker years in power, had a similar record of resource giveaways. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the exporting of Canadian oil over the last two decades has cost our nation literally hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. If we still owned that oil today, it would be worth 12 or 15 times what it was when we shipped it south of the border.

The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has now raised the price of a barrel of crude oil on the international market to well over \$30 a barrel. Much of the oil that we buy today from Mexico is being bought at \$42 a barrel or more. Some of the oil is costing premium prices higher than that figure.

When you go back and consider that in 1970 that same barrel of crude oil was selling

for \$1.80 a barrel, you get some idea of the tremendous economic impact OPEC has had on many parts of the world (and Canada is one of them) that must import oil. Canada relies on imported oil to meet the needs of the Maritimes and parts of Quebec. And for all of the empty talk by Peter Lougheed or Joe Clark about self-sufficiency, it seems more and more likely, Mr. Speaker, if you look at those figures realistically, that we are going to become not less dependent, but more dependent on foreign sources of oil.

I believe, and I have some facts that substantiate what I am going to say, that this increasing reliance on foreign sources of energy points to one of the most tragic failings of successive Liberal and Conservative governments in Ottawa. We, as a nation, have been exporting oil and natural gas far too quickly. Even during 1973, the year that has become famous because the energy crisis began then, the Canadian government was through long-term contracts permitting private energy companies to export 60 per cent of our domestic oil production and 40 per cent of our natural gas production. And why was that? Why are we selling our irreplaceable energy stock at these low prices? We're doing it because the oil companies said we had lots of oil and gas, and the government of the day believed them.

Then came 1973 and OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) began to boost energy prices in the international market, and the big oil companies, operating from their bases here in North America, wanted to get in on some of those windfall profits. So they changed their story, Mr. Speaker, and developed the idea of an energy crisis, an energy shortage, and suggested that they would require huge profits in order to ensure that we would have a supply of oil and natural gas for our future generations. The major international oil companies misinformed and misinterpreted the facts repeatedly to the Canadian people in order to enlarge their own bank accounts. And the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party have only been too willing to act as the willing dupes of oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning of my remarks that I was going to keep my remarks brief tonight, and I want to get strictly to the point of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, the federal government, in applying and designing new taxes, has made some very, very aggressive moves in the territory of the provinces in recent years. We now have a federal excise tax at the gas pump, which the provincial governments view quite rightly as an invasion of their jurisdiction. We have now a federal surcharge imposed on oil that is exported. And as light and medium crude export declined in recent years, the surcharge fell very heavily on Saskatchewan because there was no immediate market for our heavy oil in Canada, and as a result it was exported to the larger market in the United States. The situation became very inequitable, as an example from a year ago will demonstrate.

Near the end of 1979, Canada was exporting about 135 barrels a day of oil, of which 45,000 barrels were Lloydminster heavy crude and 30,000 barrels were medium-gravity oil from Saskatchewan. The Lloydminster oil was worth about \$12.75 a barrel at the wellhead, from which comes the provincial royalty, provincial income tax, federal income tax, the cost of production, and if there's anything left, the producer's profit. But when it was exported, and virtually all of it was, the federal government imposed a surcharge of \$16 a barrel, all of which went to Ottawa. So, Mr. Speaker, the federal government was earning \$450 million a year on Saskatchewan oil, while the provincial coffers were only being increased to the tune of about \$300 million. So, in other words, the federal government gets \$450 million a year from our oil; Saskatchewan, \$300 million a year.

A similar situation existed for natural gas. There was no surcharge on exports. Instead, the difference between the Canadian domestic price and the export price is allowed to accrue proportionally to all gas producers in the exporting provinces even if the individual producers are not exporting gas themselves. What that involves, Mr. Speaker, is Saskatchewan natural gas producers being denied a share of the export revenues even though they serve a Canadian domestic market — just as some Alberta producers do, but who do share in the revenue pool. At the end of the last year the difference amounted to 60 cents per mcf and totalled about \$20 million a year that Saskatchewan producers were losing under that system. Mr. Speaker, this new natural gas tax is in keeping with all the other taxes that I have mentioned. This new 30 cents per mcf tax is yet another invasion by Ottawa into provincial jurisdiction.

Now, since I put this item on the order paper in December there have been some interesting events, to which the hon. member for Kindersley alluded this afternoon, as well as the member for Estevan and the member for Regina Wascana. I refer, of course, to the recent Alberta court decision. I say it's interesting in this sense — I think we have to realize that the Alberta case was a very narrow case and was specifically designed by the province of Alberta to be narrow. They took, Mr. Speaker, Crown land where they knew there was gas; they developed that gas themselves and exported it; then they took the federal government to court. The Alberta Court of Appeal held unanimously that:

The tax on exported natural gas under the proposed federal legislation would, to the extent that it purports to tax the natural gas described in this reference and exported from Canada for use outside Canada, be ultra vires the Parliament of Canada.

Why did they say that? They said that because one government can't tax another. The Crown cannot tax the Crown. Well, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that our government, looking at that precedent, might want to widen the scope of that narrow decision. In the case of Alberta gas, all that gas was owned by the province of Alberta. I suppose the question becomes in the case of Saskatchewan where the Saskatchewan Power Corporation owns the gas. Some of it is owned by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation on Crown land here in Saskatchewan. Much of the other gas is bought from the province of Alberta, but when it is bought surely it becomes then the property of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Mr. Speaker. And in that sense, I don't believe that if the case were held in Alberta to be that one Crown corporation cannot tax another, the federal government is acting in a constitutional way in imposing the tax on our natural gas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — So, Mr. Speaker, with those very brief remarks I would move, seconded by the member for The Battlefords:

That this Assembly deplore the federal government's decision to levy a natural gas tax which imposes higher prices for natural gas upon customers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and which intrudes upon traditional sources of revenue for the provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. MINER: — Thank you for giving me this rather unexpected privilege . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm quite delighted to have the opportunity to second this resolution. Simply stated, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is any precedent (prior to the activities of the federal government in this particular activity) that suggests that it is proper either constitutionally, or proper in any other way, for one government to tax another government. Quite frankly, I think that part of the entire issue associated around the dispute between the federal and provincial governments at this time is around just such an issue and that is the authority of one government vis-a-vis the authority of another government. Indeed, I believe that the entire constitutional question is something more than just a simple exchange of words between two governments that are, at the present time, trying to establish once and for all a precedent through which governments can, for a long term, follow a practice on which they believe they can rely, both in terms of their expenditures and their receipts. This question becomes a part of that overall issue.

It would be surprising to me if members of the opposition would find themselves in opposition to this particular resolution. I believe that if they take a position contrary to this, they would have to search long and hard to find some shred upon which they could hang their arguments to suggest that the Crown corporation of the Government of Saskatchewan should be taxed, in any way, shape or form, on property that it owns, by another level of government.

Indeed, I believe, Mr. Speaker, you found yourself in such a discussion as it applies to the city of Regina and the province of Saskatchewan when you were a minister of the Crown, and I believe that at that time the position taken by the opposition was not one that was consistent with supporting one level of government taxing another.

So, Mr. Speaker, without any further words on this particular issue, I would like to urge the members opposite to support this resolution because I believe it is in the interests of Saskatchewan people in a manner that is much broader than even this resolution itself implies. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I think without too much searching, one can find a shred to look at and I'd like to point out that I thought the mover of the motion put forth some very valid points. I would like to say at the beginning that I certainly oppose the actions of the federal government in taxing our gas. However, when one looks at this motion, one sees the hypocrisy of the government opposite. You know, I heard the mover get up and say that the federal government was guilty of an "ill-conceived and short-sighted patchwork." He went on to talk about the "empty talk" of Peter Lougheed. I don't think it is supported anywhere in western Canada, that the talk of Peter Lougheed is in any way, shape or form, empty talk. I think that was rather a wild and sweeping statement. But then, to show the hypocrisy of the government opposite (and that's what I intend to do in this motion) I would just like to read it again, where it says:

That this Assembly deplore the federal government's decision to levy a natural gas tax, which imposes higher prices for natural gas upon customers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Now, my gosh! All of a sudden the government opposite is worrying about the cost to the subscribers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. We, on this side of the House, have stood up repeatedly, time after time, and asked, "Will you freeze the rates of the

Saskatchewan Power Corporation?" No, you gave it no consideration at all. Then the member gets up because the federal government has put on a tax. All of a sudden he's worried about the consumers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Well, if you're concerned, government opposite, about these consumers, as we are on this side, why then will you not freeze the rates?

We have asked time after time in this House for a public utilities review commission, and it falls on deaf ears on the other side of the House every time. Then the government opposite has the sheer hypocrisy to put up the member for Regina Rosemont to say that he is concerned about the price of natural gas to the customers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I say those are idle words; that's a bunch of hogwash!

If you're really concerned about the customers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, then it's fine to blame the feds. I don't agree with what they're doing either, but put your money where your mouth is, my friends, and freeze the rates, or at least institute a public utilities review commission. You can't have it both ways. In one situation, you can't be willing to see the rates of power continue to skyrocket and then get up in here with this motion and say you're concerned about the customers.

MR. ANDREW: — Perhaps I could make a few comments with regard to this motion, and I can advise the member for The Battlefords that I will be voting for this motion. We can dispose of this matter tonight, if you like.

I would commend the member for Regina Rosemont, I think he made a good speech with regard to the issue. Obviously he is going to make some political shots, but that's the name of the game. I would, however, ask him to square this particular issue. He spends a lot of time being critical of the Liberal and the Conservative parties in Ottawa as national governments, and their policy of exporting oil to the United States in past times. I suppose it's easy enough to be critical of that.

I suppose the question that logically follows from that is this: is the government opposite equally opposed to the present policy of the federal government to export natural gas to the United States? The reason I ask that is that the national NDP are very strongly on record as opposing the export of natural gas. However, last year in this Assembly when that matter came up, the then minister of mineral resources was four-square behind the Trudeau government's policy of exporting natural gas, and was four-square behind the policy of the national government for the Alaska gas pre-built. I assume that policy still stands in place today, so how can you criticize the government for exporting, yet turn around and favour it now because you might see a dollar return? How can you criticize the federal government for exporting oil to the United States in the past (you said from 1973-74 on), and still advocate the increased export of our heavy oil into the United States market? How can you stand by and criticize them on one hand, and yet, when it comes to dollars in your pocket, you're not prepared to say, "Well, we better leave that oil in the ground and develop it later, because we shouldn't be using it now?" It's the same argument, and it seems to me you're talking out of both sides of your mouth.

The only other comment I have is: I think the member for Regina Rosemont is taken a little too much with the narrowness of the decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal. The Alberta Court of Appeal was a milestone case in the whole question of the interpretation of section 125 of the constitution. The big dilemma, which we face now, is that it is one thing to win a case in the Albert Court of Appeal, and quite another to win a case in the Supreme Court of Canada. I think the question boils down to reserving

judgment about just where the case is going to go. I was glad to hear the Attorney General announce the other day that Saskatchewan is going to intervene with Alberta in the pending challenge in the Supreme Court of Canada. I commend the government for taking that step.

I also commend the government for actively considering joining with the group of six (if you like), to challenge the constitutional resolution in the supreme court, as well. We, on this side of the House, have called for that for some period of time, and frankly, I am glad to see action by this government on both of these court actions, which are fundamental crucial decisions that must be addressed by the supreme court.

Without further comment, I advise the members of this Assembly that, although we are not particularly pleased with the way this resolution is written, the basic concept and principle is there. I think all members of this Assembly can accept the motion, and should support the motion.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

CULTURE AND YOUTH

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 7

Item 1 (continued)

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, in the past the culture and youth estimates have taken very little time in this Assembly. I was asked by the Attorney General yesterday if we were going to be finished in May. I said that if they were to bring in a bill to investigate the cultural policy secretariat, we would still be here in July.

I notice, under the recommendations in the report, that they suggest that the Department of Culture and Youth be changed to the department of culture. I wonder what has happened to the 'youth' in our province. Is it true that they all go to Alberta as soon as they get out of school and that's why we don't pay any more attention to them?

I notice, also, that there is a tremendous cutback, where I would suggest there should be a substantial increase. That's in sports and recreation.

We've had another mild winter and the demand meters are still jammed into the recreation centres depriving the people of winter recreation. They also have them now in the schools and churches. Imagine, you have to pay as you pray.

You also announced, in your reply to the budget, the following: an increase for cultural activities around the province, an increase in support for Saskatchewan's 180 community-based museums, resources for the conservation activities of the new heritage property legislation, increased grants for provincial library systems, improvements to services at all provincial parks, and a new Saskatchewan archives

building. I am not in disagreement with this. I certainly do disagree, however, in that we are not putting enough emphasis on sports and recreation throughout the province.

I noticed in this beautiful report that under the special projects, R46, tourist material (posters, a calendar of harvest time events and other material) is to be produced with a view to encouraging a regular harvest festival in Saskatchewan. It would appear to me, Mr. Minister, that you are taking Christ out of harvest time. What happened to Thanksgiving?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, that's a winner! That's like the trappers with their portable colour television sets.

MR. PICKERING: — I'm certainly more interested in exactly why the cutbacks are taking place in sports and recreation in the province and more money is being put into these other areas.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question as to what's happening to the youth in our province, I think the hon. member will find that our youth numbers in the labour force continue to grow. The youth in this province are certainly not, from anything I can see . . . If you look at the statistics in terms of the changing age structure of farmers, we see there are more young farmers in Saskatchewan than any other province today, certainly quite a contrast with the province of Alberta. We see our young people moving into the labour force in very substantial numbers. I can attest to the interest of the young people in staying in Saskatchewan by the demand of the 16-to 24-year-old group on our post-secondary education system. I would say to the hon. member that no time in the past compares to the present, in terms of the way the young people are making a commitment to this province and are drawing upon the services available in this province and those that the government can provide.

Certainly, in terms of the Department of Culture and Youth, I have made no proposal at this time to eliminate any youth programs. The youth programs continue with the same emphasis they've had, and I do not intend to reduce youth programs in the Department of Culture and Youth. I might say with respect to the hon. member's reference to the change in spending, that, in fact, the spending in sport and recreation is up very, very substantially. With respect to the overall spending in the department, the spending is up, if one takes into account the fact that last year was the year of Celebrate Saskatchewan. There is a very substantial grant to the Saskatchewan Diamond Jubilee Corporation. You take into account the fact we are on the final phase of the cultural and recreational grant program, therefore, the draw-down from the cultural and recreation grant program will be lower this coming year than it was in the past year. Those two factors give the appearance of spending being down, but taking those factors out, you will find that spending in the department has increased very substantially.

With regard to the suggestion in the cultural policy secretariat report that there be something done to encourage a regular harvest festival in the province, I am not like the hon. members opposite when I receive suggestions about possible activities that can be undertaken in the province. I recall that the members opposite made very light and frivolous of the idea of Celebrate Saskatchewan. We know quite well in retrospect how successful that Celebrate Saskatchewan activity was. I think it shows, that with a little imagination and a little effort, there are a variety of activities that could take place in the province.

The cultural policy secretariat report was an attempt to put forward (not as government policy) suggestions and thoughts based on discussion with interested groups and parties around the province. Many suggestions came forward, including suggestions from trappers who are very, very interested in the question of communication, hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley. If the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley would spend even, perhaps, one day in the North he might come away much better acquainted with some of the aspirations northern people have with respect to cultural development, communications development and that sort of thing.

So I would suggest to the hon. members that they might, perhaps, want to sit back and take an objective view of the question of developing some consideration of some options and ideas — not all the ideas would be good ones. Not all the ideas that came forward from groups and organizations which made suggestions to the cultural policy secretariat necessarily were good ones in my view. And there are, obviously, not necessarily good ones in the view of the hon. members opposite. But I say to the hon. members, let's take all people's ideas and give them a little thought and consideration, and not make jokes of them. Let's make some reasoned decisions about which ones we should accept and which ones we should throw out. Certainly not all of the recommendations of the cultural policy secretariat report will be adopted. But I suggest to you that it's important for you, as responsible elected people, to give some consideration to these suggestions and not make light of them, simply for pure political advantage in the hope of getting a few headlines.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, I'm glad at the start of your remarks you mentioned that we have more farmers in Saskatchewan under the age of 25 — indeed, we should. We do have 40 per cent of the farmland in the whole of the Dominion of Canada. So as a result, I'm still going to say we're not spending enough on recreation facilities out in rural Saskatchewan. The towns and villages are dying. There are not enough people to support these facilities and you have these demand meters in them. They're cutting back because this year being a warm winter they can't afford the power bills. They're cutting back, some of them, to three months or three and one-half months because of artificial ice and the demand meters in there. Have you given any thought to taking these demand meters out in the immediate future so that these facilities can go on for a six month period at a lot less cost?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, this question has been dealt with previously in this Assembly during question period. I have indicated to the hon. members that I am not considering removing demand meters. I have indicated to the hon. members the reasons for demand meters. And I've indicated to them that I am currently considering ways and means through which one could make adjustments in the rate structure, in particular, to try to alleviate the impact of demand meters upon those who cannot make adjustments in their power consumption patterns.

As you know, the demand meters are there as a measurement of the peak demands that are placed on the system by the variety of users we have. And the peak demands on the system are a very important feature of the decision-making we must go into in terms of new investment in capacity. So the demand meters themselves, I believe, in the interest of conservation and in terms of trying to conserve as much as possible the capital expenditures that must be made in the system, are important in general.

I certainly am looking at options through which we might recognize those users who cannot make adjustments in their peak demands for very good reasons, or who are severely impacted by the results of demand meters being in there. But I am not

intending to eliminate demand meters, because I think they are an important way of encouraging people to take conservation measures that will decrease the peak demands placed on the system which are such an important part of the heavy capital investment that we are required to make in the system.

MR. PICKERING: — Well, Mr. Minister, I know that you mentioned in question period that you did understand demand meters — and I understand them also. And I know that the peak demand only has to stay for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but I don't think we should get into a discussion in culture and youth estimates of demand meters and the power corporation. That would be more properly asked in Crown corporations committee or during the ordinary question period. I'd ask the member to stick to the culture and youth estimates, item 1.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Chairman, I would have to challenge your ruling because of the fact that these things are directly involved and are depriving the people of rural Saskatchewan of winter activities. And if he's the Minister of Culture and Youth, he certainly should have to answer to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. The Chair has been challenged. Those in favour of sustaining the Chair say aye. Those opposed say no. The Chair is sustained.

MR. THATCHER: — Nice, friendly discussion here tonight. The member made a very valid point and I say respectfully, Mr. Chairman — and I emphasize respectfully — that I don't think you really understand the concept of demand meters, and neither do I, other than to say that they are involved with the winter activities out in the curling rinks, and other recreation facilities, and I would suggest to you that directly those . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. I've made my ruling. He made a passing comment on demand meters. The minister answered the question. I simply say that I don't believe it's under this item. If the committee has unanimously agreed to deal with something which is clearly out of order, I suppose that I, as Chairman, have to do that, but I don't believe it's in order. So I had to make that ruling.

MR. TAYLOR: — Surely the cost of operating recreational facilities must be discussed within the context of youth and recreation in this province. All my colleague was trying to get at was the cost of operation. This was not diverting at all; that subject is part and parcel of it, so I think it has to be discussed within this forum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, I simply made the ruling. I didn't think a detailed discussion of demand meters was in order in culture and youth estimates. That was my ruling.

MR. PICKERING: — Where do you want us to deal with these demand meters, since they are in recreation centres throughout the province? I'm asking him when he'll take them out and explain exactly what a burden it's putting on the people of rural Saskatchewan, where they don't have the population to support such a cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Does the committee want to deal with demand meters?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could make a restricted comment about demand meters as they apply to recreational facilities, and try to deal with . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Not unless everybody agrees to do that. Is it agreed that we do that. Did I hear a no? I don't think I heard one. All right.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that I erred in discussing in general the question of demand meters. With respect to the restricted application to recreational facilities, I am prepared, as I've indicated in this House before, to look at the impact of demand meters (not the removal of them) on the recreational facilities, in order to assess whether or not they do place a burden which could be altered through a consideration of the circumstances of those recreational facilities.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, would you give me an indication of exactly when you are going to do this?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, I said to the hon. member that I'm giving consideration to the subject. I can't give you an exact date when the minister responsible for SPC will be making a decision, but a decision will be made in relatively short order.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, I'm familiar with how these meters work (and the Chairman disagrees with me) but I still want to get this on record. I say demand meters because the fact remains that if the peak is reached for 15 minutes during one month, you pay on that basis. The rest of the month it could be at a minimum, yet you pay based on that one 15-minute period. That is true, Mr. Minister. Explain that to me differently.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the charges for electricity in recreational facilities, it is not necessarily true that a recreational facility will have the demand charge placed on it for its whole use during the month. The rate schedule sets the number of hours during that month during which the demand charges will apply. That is not necessarily the total hours of operation of the facility.

MR. PICKERING: — Yes, Mr. Minister, it only takes 15 minutes to get the demand meter up there. That's what I'm saying. Is that not true?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — What you say is true. It is done on a 15-minute basis, but it is applied for a certain number of hours only, which is a best-guess estimate of the number of hours that likely pattern of demand will cover during that month. Now it won't, because it's an estimate in a block, cover necessarily the exact hours for every facility.

MR. PICKERING: — I know it does vary, but are you aware, Mr. Minister, that it increases in a lot of cases?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Back to culture and youth estimates; I think we're carrying this a little far.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, last night we were discussing two employees, one who was fired and the other . . . Well, they were both suspended — one was dismissed, the other was rehired. I asked you if you would obtain some information about the activities of Giant Enterprises for the three years prior to June 6, 1980, since your predecessor said in this Assembly on that date that that sort of information had been made available to the RCMP in its investigation. I'd like to hear the answer to that question before we go any further, Mr. Minister, if I may.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member has indicated, the RCMP did come to the Department of Culture and Youth and took documents with respect to the cultural and recreational facilities grant program; the application forms and other forms associated with it.

I would point out to the hon. member that I indicated last night that I would check those records. I have been able to determine, Mr. Chairman, that the applications and reports filed with the Department of Culture and Youth as part of the cultural and recreational facilities grant program do not contain full and complete information with respect to contractors undertaking work on projects. I should point out to the hon. member that the application forms are based on regulations which determine the criteria, based on per capita criteria, whereby municipalities are eligible for funds. The municipalities can apply for those funds, and if the projects are eligible for coverage, and if the application is put forward in such a way as to draw upon the funds, then that is all the information that is required. And the municipalities, as independent governing bodies, undertake to contract with contractors.

I would point out to the hon. member, also, that there is, incidentally, mention on some of the forms, in certain cases, of contractors, although it is not required. I am informed that the information available from the documents we have does not show Giant Enterprises to be the contractor on any project funded by cultural and recreational facilities grants from the Department of Culture and Youth. As I indicated to the hon. member, I am also informed that the RCMP did take those documents and used them as a basis for some of the information they would be gathering in the course of their investigations.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, then you are presently using identical procedures — the same application forms, and the same procedures?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Yes, we do not ask the local governments whom they intend to contract with when they apply, because obviously they tender the projects. In most cases — I would assume probably in all cases, though I don't know — it's standard practice for local municipalities to tender projects. So they're not required, and they could not possibly give an indication to whom they intend to give a contract at the time of making application. It wouldn't be possible to ask for that kind of information in the application forms, which are some of the forms filed on the projects.

MR. THATCHER: — I'm not sure where your offices are. Are they in the C.M. Fines Building, by any chance?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — No, my office is downstairs; the Department of Culture and Youth is on Victoria Avenue.

MR. THATCHER: — I was just wondering. It just seemed appropriate that something like this should be centred in the C.M. Fines Building. It just seemed so appropriate.

Mr. Minister, I find it pretty hard to imagine that we can have a scam, which we went through last night. Two employees were involved in the processing, distribution and approving of the grants, and the minister can stand in this Assembly with a straight face and say, "But look, all they did was approve the money to go out to local government. It's none of our business whom they hired." It would appear that these employees had the opportunity to, and I suggest to you, did approve grants and process them. One of

the preconditions in a game they ran was that they were going to do some work; they were going to do some construction work and they were going to sell you some product. But, what I find even more incredible is the minister standing up today and saying, "We haven't done anything about it. We had an investigation. We suspended them both. We rehired one, put the other one back. For what reason, I don't know."

But after going through all that, did the minister order a change in procedure in his department? Heavens, no! I can't believe that, and that is the biggest indictment. The rest of it, you may be able to pin on your predecessor for being slack. The fact you haven't changed your procedure is right around your neck and the necks of your top-level people in that department. You have to take the bell for allowing this procedure to go on. You've had this drawn to your attention months ago and you can still stand in this Assembly and say, "Oh, it's none of our business what local government does with that money." Hogwash! Two employees processed and approved that money and part of the precondition for that approval was their involvement in a roundabout, backdoor approach which, obviously, in the opinion of the people conducting that investigation, was deceitful and dishonest. Otherwise both the employees would be there. Mr. Minister, this one is right on your neck. I just can't believe it. I thought you had too much ability to leave such a tangled-up mess.

Would the minister tell me, in light of the fact that this was brought to his attention many months ago, how he can justify in this Assembly today having known about this corrupt practice for many months, but having taken no steps to put in the proper controls?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. member, first of all, that if his allegation with respect to the alleged wrongdoing, as he sees it, on the part of these employees were true, then I would very strongly suspect that the RCMP should have recommended to the criminal prosecutions branch of the Department of the Attorney General that there be prosecutions and that the prosecutions branch of the Department of the Attorney General would have proceeded with prosecutions — not being a lawyer and that being their subject to investigate, I can't really comment. But, I would suggest to the hon. member that I would suspect that would be true, and as the hon. member is well aware, this matter was referred to the RCMP and the RCMP did undertake a full and exhaustive investigation, according to my information. But I am not the minister responsible for criminal prosecutions and not the minister responsible for the RCMP and the Attorney General could appropriately answer that question further, but I would suggest that that would be the case with respect to that matter.

I would say with respect to the suggestion that we should somehow have in our applications an indication from local governments whom they are going to give the projects to on the basis of tender, that that is virtually an impossibility. Mr. Chairman, I agree we have a responsibility as a department to identify whether or not there are any cases of employees becoming involved in any kind of possible or actual conflict in their jobs in terms of making recommendations to the municipalities or in terms of approving grants, and that if those employees are engaged in that kind of thing, it is our responsibility as a department to take action with respect to those employees. It is our responsibility to take all the steps we can to ensure that employees are not in that position, but if they are, to take the appropriate steps. That is the appropriate kind of control with respect to administering these kinds of programs.

I would say further to the hon. member that where there is a suggestion of wrongdoing, it is appropriate (as was done in this case) that immediately the RCMP should be called

in to undertake an investigation to determine whether or not (beyond the conflict of interest question, which is our responsibility in terms of the master-servant relationship one has in law with an employee) there has been wrongdoing. That is a fundamental aspect of the way our society functions. We depend on a competent police force to undertake those investigations and we depend on prosecutors proceeding where evidence justifies such prosecutions.

MR. THATCHER: — Thank you very much for the lecture on police procedures. I would feel much better about that lecture if the minister were tabling the report of the RCMP. But the minister knows where that report went — it went to the Attorney General's office. It went off to the Attorney General's office, where the Attorney General's people decided whether or not there was going to be any criminal prosecution. It was all neatly tied away in another department. Yes, I would love to see the RCMP report. I would love to see what the officers, as they dug through those files, came up with. I'd be intrigued to see what their recommendations were, and I would be even more intrigued to see the recommendations forthcoming from some members of the Attorney General's department who acted on them, as well as the criteria they used to act on them.

The minister says that it is impossible to put controls on it, yet the minister had two employees investigated — the department had two of them investigated. They both are in the same business, Giant Enterprises. They own the same proportion of the company; they are involved in the same process of processing and approving grants, yet one gets fired and the other one is rehired. Mr. Minister, if Tuck is guilty of wrongdoing and you fired him, are you trying to tell me that Nobes isn't equally guilty? Your only defence last night was that Nobes wasn't in as senior a position.

I suggest to you that if that RCMP report were available, and if the recommendations of the Attorney General's department were here, we could view them both together. I think we'd have just a real dandy here. I wonder what Nobes has on your department because if Tuck goes, Nobes had to go with him. You know it and everybody in this Assembly knows it. If you are going to hang one, they both should have hung.

What has Nobes on that department? If there was wrongdoing on Tuck's part, I don't think there is a person in this Assembly who doesn't believe that Nobes was right in there with him. But Nobes is back in his same old job — processing applications — and you, as a minister, don't know if he is still up to the same activity he was up to last year and the year prior to that and the year prior to that. You have acknowledged in this House that you have made no change in procedures. How do you know what Nobes is doing? We thought we'd seen the epitome of a horribly run department in DNS, and I guess you've had input into DNS, but culture and youth I find equally shocking and even more surprising.

Well, Mr. Minister, you can hang a lot of this on your predecessor, but the fact is that you have put Mr. Nobes back there. For all you know, Mr. Nobes is still on his little gauntlet which he was on in conjunction with Mr. Tuck. The fact that you can stand in this Assembly and say, "I really don't know. It's not my business to find out," is an abrogation of your responsibility and, I suggest, a real indictment of one of the supposedly new heavyweights in the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Minister, I want to know what you're going to do with Mr. Nobes. I suggest to you that he can no longer stay in the capacity he is presently in. I don't have access to the documents to know whether your decision on Mr. Tuck was valid. Assuming that it was,

frankly, there is no place for Mr. Nobes in the Department of Culture and Youth. There is no place for Mr. Nobes in the public service, if your decision on Mr. Tuck was valid.

There is only one way to determine that. Give us the RCMP report and let's see the dirt they brought out. Conversely, the minister could clear the air. Very quickly, the minister could stuff all this down our throats. The minister could spring to his feet and say, "I'm going to stuff this down your throats; I'm ordering a public inquiry into the Department of Culture and Youth." Does anyone want to bet me a nickel that he's not going to do that? I don't think he's going to do it. No, he's not going to do anything. What intrigues me, Mr. Minister, is this: what does Mr. Nobes have on your department? That's the part I find most intriguing of all, because there's no place for him any more, if what you said about Mr. Tuck is correct. Now, tell me what your plans are for Mr. Nobes.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, first of all I should indicate to the hon. member that it simply is not within my power to table an RCMP report. The RCMP is not reporting to me. The RCMP, as I understand the system, deals with the public prosecutions branch of the Department of the Attorney General. It reports to that branch, and the Attorney General is the minister responsible, in this House, with respect to matters pertaining to the RCMP. It simply would not be possible for me to table the RCMP report. I think the hon. member knows that and is simply using a little eloquent language to try to make a point.

I would say to the hon. member, with respect to Mr. Nobes, the considered view was that in the position he occupied, he did, indeed (and no one has denied this), through his involvement as a shareholder and director in Giant Enterprises, contravene The Public Service Act. There's no question about that.

However, given the fact that he did not derive any financial gain from Giant Enterprises, did not, as far as we can determine, participate on a management level within the department and therefore was not in the same position to exercise such influence over decisions or to play a role in the decision-making process in the same way as Mr. Tuck, it would not be necessarily true that Mr. Nobes should be subject to the same kind of disciplinary action.

I would point out to the hon. member that Mr. Tuck was Mr. Nobes's supervisor. Mr. Tuck sat on the interdepartmental committee which is involved in reviewing the applications for these grants in order to ensure that they are consistent with the regulations. Mr. Tuck also sat on the management committee of the department. He was a very senior official in the department. He was in a position such that I cannot see how one could draw any other conclusion than that he should be dismissed under these circumstances. With respect to Mr. Nobes, he simply was not in a parallel position, in terms of decision making, management responsibilities, and in terms of ability to bring any kind of potential influence (as a result of the potential conflict of interest) to bear on those who would be making purchases of these kinds of equipment and supplies.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I would just like to draw to your attention that in approximately 1977-78, I was directly involved with the construction of a \$500,000 arena. The two people who I met with, along with the members of our committee, were none other than Glenn Tuck and Cec Nobes. It seemed shocking to me that soon after this meeting I was approached and it was indicated there was a certain Giant Enterprises that did some of this contracting. That is what happened. When you say that they didn't know who the contractors were, that is not correct. We had one meeting

with Glenn Tuck and Cec Nobes, and then our contact with your department was none other than Cec Nobes, who was down at least three or four times. He knew who we were contracting with. You know that in your department specifications have to be correct and an engineering firm must okay the specifications before a grant is received. So don't you stand in this Assembly and try to tell me that the Department of Culture and Youth doesn't know who is contracting on these specific things.

I heard you say to my colleague a minute ago that Mr. Cec Nobes did not receive any financial gain. How do you know he didn't receive any financial gain?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the question whereby the hon. member suggests the department does not maintain records of those who undertake contracts, I am informed that, while certain information occasionally is recorded from these visits, there is not a systematic requirement that these contracts be recorded. What the consultants do is maintain some follow-up in these projects to ensure the specifications are being followed and that the basic program that has been adopted when it was proposed is being followed, and that sort of thing. But there is not a follow-up with respect to the question of who the contractor is. I don't doubt that, as a result of the consultants periodically visiting communities, they, on many occasions, would know who the contractor was. However, it is not a matter which is recorded on the files, because it is not required in terms of regulations and the act.

MR. TAYLOR: — If you have ever been involved in dealing with the Department of Culture and Youth in trying to build a rink or a swimming pool or whatever, I tell you, Mr. Minister, there is so much red tape that they know every move you're making. And, if the department doesn't know, then you're fighting with a fire commissioner to find out the regulations you must meet, and then with the Department of Health. The government opposite knows every move which these organizations in the small towns are making, and they know every contractor who they are dealing with. Perhaps the information isn't asked for on the form, but I say to you that after the track record of Mr. Nobes and Mr. Tuck, I can't understand why it isn't on the form.

I would like you to stand up in this House and give us the assurance that this same thing isn't still going on in your department. If you are hiring back one of the fellows who was guilty, goodness gracious, what is to say that it still isn't continuing? Can you give me assurance that there are no employees within your department, which hands out numerous grants throughout Saskatchewan, who don't have some type of businesses operating which is similar to Giant? Doesn't it seem strange to you that one would meet with these two men who deal with the grants and then after be approached to the effect that one of the group who could put this artificial ice plant in for you is called Giant Enterprises? I just say, thank God we didn't go with them. It seems very suspicious to me.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I don't know anything about your particular case. I can certainly check, when I have time, to see what the situation was with respect to that case.

I think it is true that the consultants do maintain follow-up visits to see that progress is taking place, that work is completed, and so on. In the course of accumulating that information, we do not necessarily accumulate the names of the contractors because the contracts are let by the municipalities in accordance with their standard provisions.

What we record are the expenditures and that sort of thing as follow-up, on the understanding that the contract meets the basic requirements. We do not have a systematic record of who the contractors are. I would point out to the hon. member that this is a very difficult matter. There is no question that we must be vigilant with respect to whether or not public servants (it would be small in number under any circumstances, but that makes it no less important), under some circumstances, in a variety of ways, take advantage of their position.

We must be vigilant and provide adequate supervision and certainly Mr. Nobes is under different supervision. I would say it is clearly one of the problems which arose here. One of the reasons there is a difference is that the supervisor in this case, over Mr. Nobes, was Mr. Tuck. Therefore, the whole process of supervision broke down, regrettably but necessarily, because of the nature of the case.

We certainly maintain, through our supervisors and management staff, as close a monitoring of the activities of staff in the department as is possible, in order to ensure that no one is contravening the basic requirements of the act and the regulations, and that no one is putting himself into a conflict of interest situation.

We also try to maintain (and the methods, you will know as well as I do, are not that easy) and ensure that there is no other way that employees are gaining. Obviously, there would be ways other than having a construction firm. That would be only one way. So we try to maintain a close watch over that. One of the ways we do that is that we have a very stringent public service act, and a very stringent set of regulations. We remind employees of that act and those regulations.

We also have another check, the Criminal Code, which prevents people from undertaking gain in association with their work through illegal means. When evidence appears, the RCMP undertake investigations. The one way we try to maintain as much control over this as possible is, when evidence of any kind appears, to take it immediately to the RCMP, so there can be complete and full investigation of all of the facts relating to the case.

MR. THATCHER: — You know, Mr. Minister, regrettably the two employees we have been talking about, for as long as we have, are not worth such a long debate.

Very clearly, the provisions you have in the public service are not sufficient. They have to be discussed at another meeting, perhaps when the Premier's estimates come up. Obviously, we need stronger conflict of interest provisions for the public service at the department head and deputy minister level. In light of this case, I think that's very clear.

Mr. Minister, as you know, I sort of like you and your family. Regrettably, as you've been squirming the last couple of nights, most of your colleagues over there have been enjoying it. These two people are not worth your squirming. The only reason they're not operating and this scam isn't going on is that we received an anonymous tip and started checking down at the companies. The director of companies tipped off your office, and you moved before we could bring it up in the next question period. Without that anonymous tip which we received, these people would still be going.

Mr. Minister, I think you know the comments of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley are valid — that that sequence of events very well did happen. You made the comment as we started out tonight . . . Then you did a total flip-flop, because first, you said that

you really didn't have any record of what the local municipalities had done with your grants — you really didn't know. But then a little bit further on, well, yes, you did know. You didn't keep precise records but, yes, your officials knew everything.

Mr. Minister, you've been let down by your departmental people. I don't know why you're standing here defending two people who aren't worth defending. They ran a scam; you caught them. I don't know why you didn't deal with the other one. Maybe we'll never know, and I don't hang that part on you. I hang that on your departmental people who, respectfully, were our positions, reversed, would have some severe answering to do to me. I don't know why you don't do that. Maybe you're doing it internally; I hope you are. These two people aren't worth the time that we've spent on them, and I don't understand why you don't hang them out to dry. They're not worth one squirm on your part. That's a tough thing to defend. I don't know why you're doing it. If your predecessor fouled up, all right, but your departmental people have let you down. These people have been operating at least as far back as 1976. You made the comment — and I suggest you made it off the cuff — that they had reached no financial gain. Mr. Minister, I suggest you really don't know that. In fact, you probably know that they have. Otherwise, I think Mr. Tuck would still be there. I think you know that that isn't accurate, and I think it was an off-the-cuff remark on your part.

Mr. Minister, we're going to leave this because we want to move on, but I sincerely hope that there is a heavy shake-up coming in your department, because they deserve it. Your people have let you down, and were our positions reversed, had I been let down the way you've been let down, there'd be hell to pay all day today. I sincerely hope that you're going to be moving in this regard tomorrow, particularly in the area where nothing has been done. That's the biggest indictment; you've got to wear the belt on that one. I think we're going to move on to another area.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I'd like to go back to the Vichert report that we were discussing last night, and the rather sweeping statement that he makes in this report about the need to protect the government's interests in film making, books and records and the necessity for the Crown corporation for culture. I think, last night as we were wrapping up, in my remarks I said that we in Saskatchewan are proud of the culture that we have had, and do have — not through any government guidance or anything of this nature — but just because of the interest and the sheer hard work of Saskatchewan people. This culture spills into Manitoba and Alberta and there's a western flavour to it. I suppose it spills somewhat into North Dakota, and so on. We're pointing this out. We're all proud that this has happened and that it has come to this stage without any type of Crown corporation and without any great degree of government guidance.

I am of the opinion that perhaps this spontaneous growth, coming from concerned individuals, is really what culture is. I don't think you can really mould, shape, direct and guide a culture that is really a true culture. You can do that if you want to indoctrinate. That's possible. And there are states in the world where this happens. But I don't think you or I — and I know I for sure — want to see that happen in this province of Saskatchewan. I think you must be proud of this broken-funded approach that has brought together what Saskatchewan means to me, and the Attorney General. I think we have done quite well. As I said last night, I take great insult at this report when the author says that somehow we are not in the mainstream. I don't feel that at all. I don't feel isolated from the rest of Canada, or from other parts of the North American continent. I think that we here, with our sports teams, our Saskatchewan Roughriders, and things of this nature, are part and parcel of this whole mosaic. I think everybody in this country and in this province is very proud of that, and want to see that type of thing

continue.

So, therefore, I wonder at some of the recommendations in this report. I have the suspicion, Mr. Minister, that there is more than just guidance in some of the recommendations that Vichert has come forth with in his report. When he starts talking about safeguarding the government's interests. I wonder what interests you are trying to safeguard. He talks about the Department of Education producing textbooks with Saskatchewan content through contracting with local writers and publishers. Now, I want to see Saskatchewan writers and publishers have their chance to develop in this whole Saskatchewan picture, but I think you must agree that when the Department of Education would be selecting certain writers and publishers a definite slant could be quite possible. I don't think that is the kind of culture I want to see. I want to see a fellow out in North Battleford, or down in Carievale, or wherever, write a play or write a book which attracts the interest of people. And because of that, it becomes part and parcel of things. I don't think it should be the Department of Education that picks certain writers and certain producers. I think that could be a danger. That isn't development of spontaneous culture. That could lead to indoctrination.

The same thing with films, Mr. Minister. On page 27, he suggests this:

There should be specified a certain level of Saskatchewan content in theatres. We suggest that this regulation require a Saskatchewan-produced short feature to be shown, at a minimum, with every third feature film

Now, I don't know what he has in mind there. But as I pointed out last night, there are some short feature films in the theatres of Saskatchewan right now which are just advertisements of the Crown corporations of this province. They are Saskatchewan features. I don't know if they are produced here. I would doubt that they are. But they are supposed to be Saskatchewan features. If that is what he is talking about as Saskatchewan content, pushing an ideology through films and records, then I don't think that is in any way, shape, or form the development of culture. That is what I see in this report, Mr. Minister. We could go on.

I will finish up because some of my colleagues want to get in on this discussion of the report. I have had considerable say. I would sum up with this, Mr. Minister. I know you said it is out there for discussion. You are having meetings. I think you have to agree with some of the things we have raised; this really is a poor assessment of what Saskatchewan culture is, or what Saskatchewan culture could be. I would urge you, Mr. Minister, not to pay too much attention to some of the recommendations which Vichert has come forward with in this report, because I think he hasn't really tested the waters. I think he hasn't really assessed, grasped or felt the Saskatchewan situation.

I will just say in closing that I think there are a lot of things in here, that if implemented, would not be conducive to building a true Saskatchewan culture.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to comment on the initial remarks of the hon. member with respect to the role that individual artists, groups and organizations within our cultural milieu play in the cultural, artistic development of the province. I couldn't agree more with the hon. member that it is critically important to recognize that creativity starts with the individual and the community. You can't box that into any particular philosophical direction or any philosophy, whether it be of art, politics or society. That would be (I agree with the hon. member) out of step and inconsistent completely with the pluralistic kind of society that we have, and the broadly pluralistic kind of creativity in our society.

But the emphasis, both in this report (I would suggest to the hon. member) and certainly of the Government of Saskatchewan, has been and will continue to be supportive. There is no question about that if one attended the Culture Talks and one listened to the representations and submissions made by individual artists, cultural organizations and art groups. There is no question that they are of the view that it is possible, desirable and necessary for the government to provide some support if we are to have the fullest possible development of the potential we have in culture and art in this province, the fullest possible access to the very best that Saskatchewan, Canada and the world has to offer. There's no doubt that that cannot happen without some support from government.

What this report is addressing and what we, as a government, have been addressing and intend to address is: what is the best way, not to control that development, but to support that development, to give it support so that the full creative potential of all individuals and groups in the cultural and artistic fields can be realized? That's what it's all about.

We do not in any way suggest what the hon. member is implying (I think) with respect to the objective. I might say that he attempts to use a specific suggestion, which I neither accept nor reject, that the Department of Education might, for purposes of developing curriculum materials, textbooks and support materials, undertake to develop through contracts, materials made, written and created in Saskatchewan. I suggest to the hon. member that it is perfectly possible to have good Saskatchewan history material and studies material developed here in Saskatchewan through a route whereby the Department of Education makes provision for the development of those materials. I don't know really what alternative the hon. member has to offer in that regard. I know that it is a widely held view (and it's held by members of his party and my party and members of neither party) that we do need more Saskatchewan-oriented material in our school system. There's no question that it is needed. And the suggestion is we should provide support in order to get that done, tying it not to some sort of government aim, but toward the needs of the curriculum.

With respect to film, I think we do have a clear indication with the pattern of SaskMedia here and the National Film Board in Ottawa, that it's possible to have these kinds of supportive structures. I challenge the hon. member to look at the productions of SaskMedia and tell me that the fears he is talking about are justified, looking at the past, at least as an indicator of the future. I don't believe that the fears you express are in any way justified in relation to the kind of productions SaskMedia has been able to do here in Saskatchewan. And I think they have done a darn good job, in a little province with limited resources, to get into that kind of production, and I don't think we'd have production without that approach.

I would close by saying that I think the hon. member's comments reflect a certain misunderstanding also about the process. The process here was to set up this cultural policy secretariat to go out to talk to individuals, groups and organizations, and through its research and creative thought, develop some ideas and possibilities and recommendations that we could consider. We have made this report publicly available and we have given the opportunity through the Culture Talks for free and open dialogue, criticism and discussion on the basis of this report and of other thoughts and ideas that individuals and groups have. That process is clearly not one of control. That is one of participation, openness and dialogue. Out of that, we hope to come up with what is our ultimate responsibility as a government — a statement of some policies and

programs that will provide the kind of support we have identified as being needed through that participatory process. I would defend that process just as strongly as I would defend any process going. Whether or not you like some recommendations in there, the purpose is to engage in debate and discussion on the basis of some of the ideas being advanced and to develop additional creative ideas or to shoot down some of these ideas, in order to know what people think.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, if it's really participatory, nobody on this side of the House will argue against it, but your track record indicates that that is just a sham. Those are idle words, and I will give, as an example, the de Vlieger report on the ward system for the schools in urban Saskatchewan. You went out and talked to the trustees and they said to a man, "We don't want it," and here you're going to bring in legislation to ram it down their throats . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order!

MR. TAYLOR: — I just get a little worked up when I hear this talk about participation which is just idle words — and we won't get into another department. I wonder how much the participation really counts when the blueprint is set, when the die is cast and when the government is hell-bent on introducing that program. I think sometimes these reports are written as a justification. This is something to go out and talk to the folks about, but you don't pay a heck of a lot of attention to what they say. You go ahead and do what you want to do in the first place. That's what I fear. That's why I object to some of the recommendations because I honestly think, regardless of what the people out there say, some of these things are going to be implemented.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the lesson the hon. member seems to be giving me — and I believe it is a lesson — is that in the future I should simply decide what I am going to do and do it and not provide an opportunity for discussion. I don't agree with the hon. member and I do not intend to do business that way, regardless of what position these Tories adopt about that kind of process. I believe that even though people will disagree with what is found in reports, they are a very important way to find out what people want, think and believe should happen. There will always be divisions of opinion on what should be done; I agree with that. I think that one way you find out the differences of opinion and of wishes and the strength of these is to be open and to provide some thoughts and ideas. These need not be ones you're absolutely committed to, but you put them forward in advance to provide people with an opportunity to have input into that process and to express their views. You don't try to muzzle them. Then at some stage, after full dialogue, you make decisions, and I am prepared to make decisions.

I would challenge the hon. member to show me any Tory government in Canada, whether it relates to cultural policy or to education, which is prepared to put forward studies as opportunities for people to make submissions and to discuss and debate the propositions as much as we are doing in these areas.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I know you have just come to the education scene, but if you would look into Ontario's education and the report that was done on "Living and Learning," it is the most exhaustive report into the future of public education that has been done in this country. Now I know you were at DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) when this took place, but I was in the educational field and if you haven't seen the report I'd be only too glad to provide you with a copy of it. So don't

stand up and say that Tory governments don't look into situations pertaining to education, because Ontario put forth a study which would make anything we have done to date look like kindergarten work.

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, I am just going to get into this debate briefly. It has been a disappointing debate so far because it really hasn't been a debate on cultural policy. We haven't had a single proposal from the members opposite on what cultural policy in this province should be. There has been a few references made to recreation. There have been no references at all from members opposite on what the framework for a new cultural policy in Saskatchewan ought to be.

The critic for cultural policy opposite, and the members for cultural policy opposite, obviously haven't attended a single one of the cultural policy hearings which have been taking place around the province. If they have, they haven't shown any evidence of it in the debate this evening. I have had the privilege and the pleasure of listening to some 40 briefs at the cultural policy hearings in Saskatoon. I want to tell members opposite, and members of the House, that the opportunity for input into cultural policy was appreciated, and the Government of Saskatchewan was praised on numerous occasions for holding these hearings. I just want to tell members of the House, the members opposite, and the minister, some of the important things which I think came out of those hearings, and raise with him a few things which I hope the Department of Culture and Youth will look at seriously in the next year.

One of the things which came out of the hearings, and which is also referred to briefly in the Vichert report, is the fact that we need, in each one of the recreational districts, cultural animators if you like, or consultants, who can work in conjunction with local groups in providing support to expand and develop cultural activities.

One of the things I heard my constituents saying at those cultural policy hearings was that there is a need for the government to look seriously at developing and promoting arts councils in conjunction with each one of the recreation boards now operating around the province. At those hearings, a desire for an increased emphasis by the Government of Saskatchewan on multicultural activities and multiculturalism in our province was expressed.

I also heard expressions of concern indicating that our government ought to give a good deal of attention, not just to the professional arts groups which are operating now in the province, but also to a lot of the voluntary bodies which are operating around Saskatchewan. Whether it be museum boards or volunteer theatre groups, we should see these as being just as important as the professional groups which are operating within our province.

I heard requests for financing which I thought were very worth-while suggestions, such as suggestions for tax incentives for patrons of culture in Saskatchewan, and tax shelters for artists who are living and working in Saskatchewan. The Crown corporations of this province ought to be giving more attention to making donations to the arts, and we should in fact establish a preferential purchase policy with respect to buying crafts and art for donations, for protocol through the Government of Saskatchewan, or gifts that the Government of Saskatchewan might make to those visiting the province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The hon. member for Rosthern makes the point that this is already done to some extent. Of course, it is. But a

great deal more could be done, not just through the protocol office but through the Crown corporations that are successfully operating in the province of Saskatchewan today.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go into a lot of detail on the many excellent suggestions that came out at the Saskatoon cultural policy hearings. But I do, Mr. Chairman, want to touch on a couple of areas that are of particular concern to me. One is in the area of museums policy. And one of the things that I want to urge the minister to look seriously at in the coming year is providing funds to the museums that we have around the province of Saskatchewan for operating and expanding their museum programs. Most of the museums in the province at the present time don't receive operating grants. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that we need to look seriously at providing such operating grants to local museums.

We should provide those grants, Mr. Chairman, on the understanding that a number of conditions are met. The first condition should be that the local museums be required to ensure that their entire collection is publicly-owned, and they should be required to undertake a program of upgrading the quality of their museum collections. In addition, Mr. Chairman, I think that the province of Saskatchewan needs to provide professional expertise to the local museums to make sure that quality standards with respect to the collections are maintained and adhered to — in many cases the collections need to be upgraded in quality very significantly.

We also need a laboratory in Saskatchewan, I believe, for the preservation of books and documents, many of which are now rotting away or are in very, very poor condition.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The archives building.

MR. PREBBLE: — No, the hon. member opposite says that this will come with the archives building, and he's incorrect. It will not necessarily come with the archives building. I want to tell the member opposite that he is right, though, in the sense that it would be very worth-while if it did come in conjunction with the archives building. I tell the members opposite that if they look seriously at the waiting lists for binding of books and preservation of books across this country, they'll see that the waiting lists are very long. And we need to look seriously, in conjunction with the federal government, at providing facilities that would reduce those waiting lists significantly.

Mr. Chairman, I think that's a priority for the Government of Saskatchewan and a priority for any new cultural policy that we would establish.

I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think that the Government of Saskatchewan needs to do more to encourage independent book stores to operate and locate within the province. Right now, I know that within the city of Saskatoon we really have only two independent book stores left. All the rest are operated by chains, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Multinationals.

MR. PREBBLE: — No, they're not necessarily multinationals as the member opposite suggests. But they're nevertheless chains. The independent book store is rapidly fading and that's a concern I have, a concern expressed very articulately at the cultural policy hearings in Saskatoon.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to comment on some concerns I have with respect to

government policy in the area of heritage preservation of architectural quality in the province of Saskatchewan. I want to urge the minister to provide more assistance in the future to ensure that heritage buildings in the province of Saskatchewan are preserved.

In the past year we have seen heritage legislation, and I am delighted it has now been implemented. In addition to that legislation, we need the funding to make it operative. We have seen some positions allocated with that in mind in this year's budget. But what I believe is required, Mr. Chairman, is direct funding to assist owners of buildings who wish to preserve their buildings. Right now, I believe, financial assistance is limited to about \$50,000, which is very low. In addition to that, financial assistance is needed to assist in integrating new developments and buildings into existing heritage buildings, so that the most important aspects of those heritage sites can be preserved.

I am also concerned about the many unattractive buildings that I see being constructed in the province of Saskatchewan. I want to urge the minister to establish awards for architectural excellence in our province. I also urge him to establish awards for the restoration of buildings in the province and to try to set up some incentives for people in the construction industry and owners of buildings to achieve a higher level of architectural quality than is presently the case.

Mr. Chairman, I think we also need to look more critically at whether we should always be building new office spaces or new buildings instead of creatively using the old buildings we have. I think a concrete example of that is the sanatorium in Saskatchewan. There has been some talk that that building may well be torn down when the new 238 bed chronic care facility (which I am pleased the Minister of Health recently announced) is built. I would hope that we could look at preserving a building of that nature and using it for some other purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to raise some concerns about the library system in the province. I think that members opposite will have to acknowledge that we in Saskatchewan have the best regional library system in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member as I have others, but there is an item titled Provincial Library in the estimates, and you will have an opportunity to go into that in more detail at that time.

MR. PREBBLE: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry. I thought it did come under culture and youth estimates and I appreciate your drawing that to my attention.

I just want to close then, Mr. Chairman, by making a couple of comments directly with respect to policies for promoting the work of artists in the province of Saskatchewan. I want to urge the Government of Saskatchewan to look at the arts, and the work of artists and musicians, as a very central part of our society here in the province. I am pleased with the recommendations that art, literature, music and dance consultants should be established in the local regions. I think that is a worth-while recommendation in the Vichert report and I hope it is implemented.

I hope the Government of Saskatchewan will give increasing support to travelling art exhibits and travelling music concerts in the province. These are key opportunities, Mr. Chairman, for providing employment to local artists and musicians, and they are also a key vehicle for enhancing our cultural life in the province of Saskatchewan. I hope that we will also look seriously at the proposal in the Vichert report for establishing artists-

in-residence for our elementary and secondary schools because that would be a very worth-while recommendation.

A lot of the art galleries, Mr. Chairman, at the cultural policy hearings I attended, emphasized to the Government of Saskatchewan the need for more operating funds if they are to work successfully. I hope that we might look seriously at that.

And finally, I want to particularly draw the attention of the minister to the problem that's arising in Saskatoon right now with respect to the cancellation of the folklorist position at the University of Saskatchewan. This is something a good number of people in Saskatoon are concerned about. This is the only folklorist position in the province right now and I believe that it's important that we have a provincial folklorist to act as a consultant to our museums, to act as a consultant to the Government of Saskatchewan, and to teach at the university and carry out work in collecting Saskatchewan traditions that would otherwise go unrecorded. Clearly, this position could either continue to be attached to the University of Saskatchewan or it could be attached to the archives. But it is an important position to maintain in the province of Saskatchewan and I would hope that the minister, in the coming year, could look seriously at working to ensure that that position is retained within our province.

I think that these are just a few examples of the concerns that people, at least in urban centres in Saskatchewan, are expressing with respect to cultural policy. They are the kind of suggestions we haven't heard from members opposite, Mr. Chairman, and that's why I felt I should step into the debate. Thank you.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to the hon. member that I appreciate the very, very extensive and quite exhaustive set of suggestions he has made with respect to areas that we might look at as we review and develop new policies with respect to culture and the arts in the province. I am not going to respond to all comments the hon. member made. I will try to take an opportunity on another occasion to talk in more detail about some of them, but I do want to mention a few of them.

I might say with respect to the question of museums policy, that I am pleased to tell the hon. member that I agree that our small museums around the province, in particular, are in need of a great deal of additional assistance and help. The hon. member will note (perhaps it is not clearly illustrated in the subvote structure) that in the estimates this year we have increased very substantially the financial assistance that will be available to museums in the province. The small museums previously had a total of roughly \$60,000 in grants; this year the grant money available for that program will be over \$300,000, which is a very, very substantial increase and will go quite a considerable way toward meeting the needs of the small museums. In addition to that, we will be providing for a museum advisory service so that those museums can have professional advice with respect to the managing of their collections, and the developing of their collections, and the management and operation of their museums.

We are currently involved in discussions with the Saskatchewan Museums Association to work out the exact application of this very extensive new program of funding and of assistance in terms of museum services. I agree with the hon. member that in the course of developing that funding, it will be necessary to have a good program behind it that does establish certain guidelines with respect to the operations and collections of those museums. We are providing an opportunity for a full consultation by the museums association, thus for the operators of the museums, in order to establish the standards and conditions that should apply, including the whole question of collection

policy.

I also agree with the hon. member with respect to his comments about the necessity for services that can help and assist with the maintenance and protection and preservation of books and documents. I think your suggestion is a good one, and it is one that I must confess I had not looked at as a possible extension service to the new archives building, but it is something we could look at. This is to say, perhaps the preservation services of the new archives facility could be extended and I will investigate that — in order to serve the smaller museums and smaller collections around the province.

I was listening to CBC radio this morning. I heard a gentleman, who's concerned with archaeological sites, indicate that the Saskatchewan legislation is the most progressive in Canada, and I thought that was an interesting comment.

With respect to the heritage site presentation question, we have this year, as a follow-up to our legislation last year, doubled our funds in terms of assistance for the preservation and maintenance of the municipally and provincially designed heritage buildings and sites, and we will be utilizing those funds to try to assist in the direction that you mentioned.

In addition to that, we are bringing in to play the various sections of The Heritage Properties Act, which will not only be making a major contribution in terms of preserving important heritage sites such as buildings, but also in terms of archaeological and other sites. I note that rural areas are taking advantage of this legislation in a very extensive way.

Well, I won't comment on the other items. You did raise a number of important points, and I will try to discuss them with you later.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Chairman, now that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has let us know where John Richards is, we can get on with culture and youth estimates, I guess. I listened very carefully to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, and he mentioned that all the artifacts in the museums throughout the province should be publicly owned. Is it not true, Mr. Minister, that many of the artifacts in the museums throughout the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I am asking you. Are you not the Minister of Culture and Youth? Is it not true, Mr. Minister, that many of the artifacts in the museums throughout the province are indeed on loan to the museums at this time, and not publicly owned?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I'm not sure what the hon. member is referring to. I think it is true that there certainly are collections which are on loan to museums around the province, and I don't disagree with this point.

MR. PICKERING: — Do you agree that they should be all publicly owned, as the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland suggested?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I'm not sure exactly what the hon. member for Saskatoon-Sutherland was suggesting. I think, from my own experience, it will likely be necessary for certain items to be on loan. I certainly believe that it is important to try to place as many important historical and heritage artifacts as possible into the public domain, and that is an emphasis of our heritage property legislation. I would expect that the largest part of our heritage properties, and the largest part of our important provincial historical items and artifacts will be in the public domain, and I think that that is important. I don't disagree with the hon. member that museums can provide an

opportunity for certain loan materials to be placed in the museums.

MR. PICKERING: — Well, I don't think you totally answered my question, Mr. Minister. The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland did say that all the artifacts in the museums, if they are going to be funded with government money, which is the taxpayer's dollar, should be publicly owned. Do you agree or disagree with that?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I again can only answer the question by saying that I don't believe that it is necessary that all contents of all museums be publicly owned, but I certainly believe that the vast majority of what is held in museums should consist of items that are of significant historical or heritage importance. Probably the most effective way of maintaining those, and preserving them in the long-term future, is to attempt to get as much of that into the public domain as possible. Therefore, I certainly agree with the hon. member for Saskatoon-Sutherland that that is a worthy objective to pursue with respect to the maintenance and preservation of our historical artifacts and documents, and our important heritage items.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I want very briefly to reply to the Minister of Education and his comments. I want to allude very briefly, as well, to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. His comments were very directly and pointedly aimed at the opposition in saying that we haven't proposed any constructive alternatives.

The Minister of Education has alluded to the same thing — that we, on this side of the House, have not proposed anything constructive.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what we are discussing right now, in these estimates for culture and youth, is, of course, this report — the cultural secretariat report. It was put together by Mr. Gordon Vichert, director of the cultural policy secretariat.

I have a suggestion which I feel is very constructive, and I would appreciate, Mr. Chairman, if the minister would pay attention to this, because I'm not going to be on my feet for any more than three minutes. My constructive suggestion to you is that you disregard, at this time, this report. This man from Ontario doesn't know any more about the culture of Saskatchewan than to indicate that it's not unusual to find trappers in northern Saskatchewan carrying portable colour televisions — that is just one line in many. We have marked this book full of yellow to indicate the things we adamantly disagree with. The book is almost all yellow now! The points that are marked yellow are about as absurd as northern trappers carrying colour televisions around.

Now, my suggestion is a very constructive suggestion to you, Mr. Minister of Education. I challenge you, as the Minister of Education, to introduce from that side of the House, (I don't really care who introduces it) a motion to be debated on private members' day, seconded by a member of the opposition, to discuss in this Assembly the merits (pros and cons, if you like) of this report. When that debate is concluded, Mr. Minister, we might have a report that is reasonable. And, let that report be the one that the people of Saskatchewan discuss at the various hearings that are already slated throughout the province.

Now, there is the challenge. There are two constructive suggestions. First of all, either you scrap the thing right now, given the fact that it's almost all yellow, or, secondly, you introduce a motion from that side of the House. We'll second it, gladly. We'll have a full debate on it, if you like, on private members' day, and let the outcome of that be the property of discussion of the people of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, in principle I don't adopt the kind of approach the hon. member puts forth. When you get a lot of recommendations (not all of which I agree with, and not all of which any individual is going to agree with), for example, that local museums receive more support (I don't have to go on and list them all), he says, "Scrap them all; throw them away." Well, I say to the hon. member that I simply don't think that's the way to work.

I think it is quite legitimate to take the important suggestions and ideas that are contained in this report and debate and discuss them rationally and intelligently. I don't think there is anything the matter with that at all. So, I stand behind the process of putting forward a report with suggestions and proposals.

I would say that, based on the kind of comments I have heard in a quite prolonged debate on this discussion now, I would fear for the hon. member's participation in the debate on a resolution of the sort that he suggests, but I certainly would be more than happy to spend some time on private members' day debating a resolution related to cultural policy.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I presume the Department of Culture and Youth is responsible for the lotteries that take place in this province, is that correct?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Culture and Youth, I am responsible for The Interprovincial Lotteries Act, which relates only to the Interprovincial Lottery Corporation and the Western Canada Lottery Foundation. The Department of Consumer Affairs (I believe I'm correct) is responsible for licensing individual lotteries in the province. But with respect to the major interprovincial lotteries, that is correct, I am the minister responsible.

MR. KATZMAN: — I assume we're talking about Winsday, the Provincial, and Super Lotto as it's now called. Mr. Minister, that particular group of lotteries is run by a group which is better known as SaskSport. And my understanding is that SaskSport decides who gets the funds with a basic principle such as 40 per cent to the culture, 50 per cent to sport and 10 per cent to recreation. Are those figures correct?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — If you gave the figures of 50 per cent to sport, 40 per cent to culture and 10 per cent to recreation, those are correct.

MR. KATZMAN: — I believe that it was the sporting people who originally got involved with this Interprovincial Lottery Corporation in order to get the revenue to assist them in their endeavours through grants within the provinces. The culture people then became involved and of course the recreation people. Am I correct in those assumptions?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the management of the lotteries, SaskSport was designated by the Minister of Culture and Youth to be the agency responsible for the management and sale of the lotteries in Saskatchewan, and for the distribution of the revenue generated by the lotteries. And the designation of the split was made at the time of establishing SaskSport as the responsible body, and that division of the revenues continues with my agreement to the present time.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you make reference to your agreement; that's my concern. Page 50 of this report indicates that the authority for this money be taken

away from SaskSport and placed under the Department of Culture and Youth. Let's make sure we're on the same wave length before I go further.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure exactly what the hon. member was driving at as a question. Certainly the report makes reference to the possibility of a certain part of the lotteries revenue being transferred to another agency in terms of allocation to individuals — a certain part of the lotteries money.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, if you check this carefully enough, I think it indicates the whole 100 per cent, not just the 40 per cent that goes to culture now. It suggests that be transferred to the arts board, and so forth, and to the Department of Culture and Youth, rather than leaving it in SaskSport, which is a group appointed by the organizations and composed of volunteer people who are very capable and look out for the interests of all the associations in the province of Saskatchewan — some professional and some not. This gentleman says in his study that they are not competent people. I totally disagree with that portion of the report. And I want to know if you agree with that report, when he suggests that it should be taken out of their hands?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, first of all, I should say to the hon. member that if he will read page 49, the reference there under SaskSport Trust is, as I indicated, part of the lottery funds, and particularly, the culture and arts division of SaskSport, which is not the whole 100 per cent, as the hon. member was indicating. I have neither adopted nor rejected this suggestion. I have met with the executive committee of SaskSport. We have discussed this item thoroughly. They have not, from my recollection of the discussions, judged it to mean what the hon. member apparently attempts to suggest it means, that is, that their division is not competent to allocate these moneys. They have judged it to mean what I think it does mean, and that is that there is perhaps something to be gained (I don't necessarily say I agree with this at the moment) by integrating these funds into a single allocating body. That is not a judgment with respect to competence. It is only suggesting that there might be something gained in terms of an allocations policy if they're integrated into one particular body.

I don't necessarily agree that that is true. And there certainly are alternatives within that that could be looked at in terms of bringing about the most effective co-ordination of decision making with respect to allocations of funds.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you referred to the meeting you had in the last month — it was actually not that long ago — with the board of SaskSport. Mr. Minister, I'm going to ask if you will guarantee, as you did at that meeting the executive of SaskSport that in no way will you take away the rights SaskSport presently has in respect to funding and how it is distributed? That guarantee was given by you at that meeting. Will you now put it on the record of this House?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the hon. member was behind the wall or something. He seems to indicate that he was a participant in that meeting and heard guarantees made. I didn't, to my recollection, make a guarantee. I gave SaskSport an assurance that I would listen carefully to the case they made. I certainly indicated to them that certain important parts of their case were very convincing, but I have not adopted a position on this item and I did not indicate to the members of SaskSport, that I can recall, that I had adopted a position.

The hon. member attempts to bring forward some suggestion of what was decided at that meeting or what the discussion related to at that meeting. I think it was a very good

meeting. I'm sorry that the hon. member feels that it is in any way productive to take what he has apparently heard, either through listening at the keyhole or through talking to someone who attended the meeting, and to try to manipulate it and warp it in such a way as to cause some misinterpretation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you can make all the fancy statements you want and twist words all you want. Let's get down to the basic fact. SaskSport people are volunteers in most cases, other than the people they hire. They represent every organization that goes out and raises money. They get the funds back on the joint agreement between Manitoba and those that are participating in the lotteries. They, without political interference, decide where that money will go — to those most deserving and those who bring the best program. The criteria of 40, 50 and 10 is there and they live within it. They do a very capable job within it. Those people are there representing their organizations and up until now a minister has not interfered. Right here and now, will you give this House a guarantee that you will continue to leave that as it is? It has functioned so well, and done so well for the people of Saskatchewan. Will you keep your fingers off?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I am the first one to support SaskSport and to believe that SaskSport has done an excellent job. I would suggest to the hon. member that for that, SaskSport deserves the major part of the credit. For that, also, goes some credit to the Government of Saskatchewan for recognizing that SaskSport can and does play this kind of role, and for providing recognition of SaskSport as the responsible administrative body. So, I don't think the hon. member need suggest that, in any way, this government or this minister has any kind of axe to grind with respect to SaskSport. I think they do an excellent job and I support them fully.

The process is not at a stage where I am prepared to give, as I have indicated to all groups with whom I've been discussing this cultural policy report, any guarantees that I will reject any particular aspect of this report. I have my personal opinions and thoughts on certain aspects, and I've reflected some of those thoughts in some of my discussions. But I am not, at this point, going to stand up and say, "I have made up my mind, so there's no point in you talking any further." I think it is important that all groups which are interested in each and every one of these recommendations have an opportunity to make their cases. I suspect there will be additional groups which will wish to make a case with respect to this item, and I'm prepared to listen to them.

MR. KATZMAN: — I am looking for an assurance from you that something which has worked very successfully and done an excellent job in the past, that has a proven track record, will not be interfered with by this idiotic report. They are scared of having it politicized.

Mr. Minister, I watch with some interest as occasionally I go to a function and I see a member of the government giving out a cheque on behalf of SaskSport. The first time I saw that, I was a little concerned that SaskSport was now being taken over by the political arm of the NDP. But fortunately I was able to find out after that SaskSport and youth and culture were giving matching grants. They were both giving a grant and that's why the member was there giving it, saving two people coming to the meeting — he did it for both. I have no argument with that. My concern is that your department should not be using that as a political tool; it should be left in the hands of the volunteers who have done an excellent job. I want you to state that as you did in a meeting that you had with the executive of SaskSport. But you don't seem to want to put on the public record what you seem to say behind closed doors.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member makes an allegation, which, I think, has no support. The only case that I can possibly think of (I know of no case personally), where any member of the government or any member of the legislature would be involved in presenting a SaskSport cheque, would be where SaskSport extend an invitation. We would certainly be most pleased to accept an invitation from SaskSport because we appreciate the kind of relationship we have. I say to the hon. member that the implication of his allegation is false. The track record shows that there is no intention to politically interfere in SaskSport's operations. I can assure the hon. member that we have no intention of politically interfering in any operations of SaskSport.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Chairman, I have a few words I want to say to the minister. I'm going to say them in words as short as I possibly can. In this whole set-up here, I smell a rat. I don't know whether the rat's the minister or not, but I smell it and I think what you've got in hand . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sit there and laugh, you turkeys, you're not going to laugh when I get through with you.

You have one thing in mind, Mr. Minister, and that is to form a Crown corporation in youth and culture. You're going to put an end to SaskSport. I want to get it from you tonight, instead of the political posturing you gave to this gentleman beside me here. You got up to give all the answers but you just politically postured and gave none. I want it on the record, tonight, that you are going to promise to this House that if you form a Crown corporation, you will leave out SaskSport, the lotteries, bingo, and all games of chance. You won't do it. You're not man enough to stand up there and give this promise.

You're not getting up yet, because I'm not through. Just sit down there for a minute. I read *Hansard* where they asked you why you're forming Crown corporations out of this youth and culture department. You're sending your hacks out to talk about forming a Crown corporation which the people in my area don't want. What you, Mr. Minister, have never got into that head of yours is what the critic for education tried to get you to answer (and he's been trying in this House for a long time): you never thought of listening to people. All you have to do is listen to the majority.

You people go out in the country and you think that you're representing 48 per cent of the people in this province. Well, I'll tell you, you are representing 48 per cent of the popular vote, but two-thirds of them are in the urban centres. The other 52 per cent are represented by us, the opposition. Two-thirds of them are out in the country. You are going out there and trying to sell your Crown corporations to them, and they are not going to sell.

Tell me why, Mr. Minister, I'm getting letters now saying that when they ask your people, "Are you going to put a Crown corporation in or not?" you will not answer yes or no? Will you stand up here tonight and say that youth and culture is going to be made into a Crown corporation? Will you stand up here and answer these questions exactly the way I'm going to put them to you once again? Are you going to stand up here and say that there is going to be a Crown corporation formed, and when?

You're going to keep your hands out of SaskSport. Don't interfere with the horse racing which is already in agriculture. That will soon be in your department, too. You'll take that over. I wouldn't even be surprised if the lotteries which you're involved in are hooked up in the underworld now. I don't trust the underground. I don't trust you guys at all. It's coming. With the things you've pulled off, you could be hooked up with a

secret line right through to Vegas now, for all I know.

Give me your promise now, I repeat, that there will be no lotteries, Saskatchewan lottery, SaskSport, games of chance, horse racing, bingo, and any of these things, in your Crown corporation, where there will be closed books and secrecy from the people of Saskatchewan. Answer those questions and no fiddling around.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, SaskSport will not be changed into a Crown corporation. SaskSport will continue to exist. I continue to support SaskSport and will always continue to support SaskSport, in answer to that question.

In answer to the question of transferring culture and youth into a Crown corporation, the Department of Culture and Youth will not be transferred into a Crown corporation.

Thirdly, with respect to lotteries, I have no intention of taking over all of those games of chance and horse racing and all those things which the hon. member is so interested in. They are not something I am going to put into a single Crown corporation. I would suggest to the hon. member that when he makes the allegation that the underworld are running the lotteries we now have, then he must be making the suggestion that the underworld is running SaskSport. I would suggest to the hon. member that there is no evidence of that. I don't believe that he can support that suggestion and if he has any evidence to support that suggestion, he should table that evidence. I just do not believe that there is any better operator of lotteries than SaskSport anywhere in Canada and I believe their record is 100 per cent clean.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Chairman, I say to the minister I guess I should have come in here last night; we must have wasted a lot of time because we finally have something on the record from you. I want to ask you one more question. I am satisfied now we have the promises on the record and I thank you for those promises. You said that you are not going to make a Crown corporation out of culture and youth. Does that mean that you are just going to set culture and youth aside? Like the Provincial Secretary's department, it'll just sit there and then you will put culture and youth into another organization and it will still be under a Crown corporation. Let's have one more straight answer that there will be no Crown corporation with all the working facilities of youth and culture under it.

MR. HARDY: — I have a question to the minister, Mr. Chairman. I think one of the most important issues that the Department of Culture and Youth has or one of the most important aspects of the whole thing is sports. I grant you I may be a bit sports-minded, but sports touch every one of us, every family and everybody in different aspects, whether it be through curling, skating, baseball or whatever. I would like to ask a few questions regarding sports. What do you have in your program for 1981-82 for upgrading existing facilities which are run down and in need of repairs?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I certainly want to agree with the hon. member that sports and recreation plays, and has played, historically, a very important role in all of our communities in Saskatchewan, both for our young people and for our adults. We support very strongly the fine work being done by organizations, volunteers and groups, as well as through some of the work that the Department of Culture and Youth does. I agree with the hon. member that recreation and sport (he makes particular reference to sport) is extremely worthy of support and we support it wholeheartedly. I

want to say to the hon. member that the culture and recreational facilities grant program continues this year and applications will continue to come in and funding will still be provided under that program. At the same time, we will be reviewing the possibility of introducing a new program (recognizing that program had a definite period of time to it) to recognize the continuing need for both upgrading facilities and for developing new facilities.

MR. HARDY: — In regard to that youth and culture grant, a lot of the communities have used up their grants. I was just wondering what the minister had for the communities that have used up existing grants? I believe the grant was supposed to run out in March of this year; I think it has been extended. A lot of the communities, I know in my area, have used up all their grants and I wonder if the minister has anything planned for the summer of 1981 (when most of the rebuilding or whatever is done with the facilities grants is done) for the communities which have used up their existing grants and have nothing more to work with?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, I'll point out first of all that as I indicated (and I know that doesn't deal exactly with this point) for the remainder of this calendar year the communities that have not used their culture and recreational facilities grant will be able to draw upon that. That will bring that program to a conclusion. At the present time, the community capital fund is in operation, and communities are in a position to draw upon that. As I indicated to the hon. member, we are currently assessing the possibilities for a new program to replace it at some point; I can't make a commitment on that because we're waiting for the existing program to complete its term. We're looking at the possibilities of new programs that might come in to replace the existing program, but that is premature at the present time. We'll be looking at that now that the current program is drawing to a close.

MR. HARDY: — In other words you're telling me, Mr. Minister, that as far as you know, there will be no new grants for this year. Is that what you're saying?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — That's correct. There is no new grant program this year.

MR. HARDY: — With regard to these small museums, I believe you partially answered the question, but there are a lot of small museums in my area and their concern is the grant structure — what's available for them. Is there any new grant system or are there grants that are going to be available in small communities to better their standing, or better the artifacts they have?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Yes, I would point out to the hon. member that the estimates this year create a new \$.25 million program for support for small museums that will provide financial support to those small museums all across the province, which I agree with the member are important to support. In addition to that, we will be providing a museums advisory program, so that the museums will have access to professional advisory services to help them with their planning and management administration.

MR. HARDY: — What financial assistance will be given to each of these museums? Will it be a general funding per museum, or will it be per capita, or what?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — The exact formula for administration of the funds has not been finally concluded. We are holding discussions with the Saskatchewan Museums

Association, which includes representations from the small museums, in order to determine what would be acceptable to them as a program for the distribution of these funds. Until we've completed those discussions, I would not be able to indicate to the hon. member the exact criteria that will be used for the distribution of those funds.

MR. HARDY: — There is just one more question, and that has to do with safeguards within the sporting activity. I know that it's probably a tough thing to control, but I was just wondering if you have any training programs within your department toward safeguards — say, swimming, or whatever, that would be necessary, that would help especially in minor sports, where a lot of injuries have occurred. I know there have been some safeguards put in, but I was thinking mainly of swimming.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I should indicate that we do place considerable importance on this subject, as part of our sports programs. We do provide funding to sports medicine organizations, such as St. John's Ambulance, which put on courses with respect to sports medicine and sports safety and that type of thing. The sports medicine association is funded by the Department of Continuing Education, as well as by the Department of Culture and Youth, which provides programs in this area. We certainly encourage the organizations involved in organizing sport activity to make this an important part of their undertakings and programs. A lot of sport activity is not organized directly out of the department, as you will recognize, but through sports organizations and at the local level through recreational boards and associations, and so on.

In addition, I might point out to the hon. member that the physical movement program — the physical education program, if you like — in the Department of Education puts very strong emphasis on safety and prevention of injuries, and that sort of thing, in the whole area of sport and recreation.

MR. HARDY: — I just have one more question for the minister, and that is in regard to sports facilities for the handicapped. Has there been anything done specifically or extra in this year's estimates for the sports for the handicapped in the province of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — We have a grant program in the recreation for the disabled program, and out of that we provide grant support to non-profit organizations in terms of improvement of facilities and support for ongoing programs. And we are currently extending the level of support, through a change in the regulations, to increase the support that has been provided to organizations under that program. They are just in the final stages.

MR. HARDY: — I have just one more question, not really to do with sports, but to do with these cultural history books that were in our centennial last year. Many of the communities prepared cultural history books, and now there are still quite a few left who haven't done it. Is your department prepared to assist these groups that missed out on last year's centennial year grant system to finish up these history books?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — We had a one-year grant program which was part of the special Celebrate Saskatchewan program which was the funding we provided for those. We are currently examining the recommendations of the cultural policy secretariat that this be made into a more permanent kind of program, but there has been no decision in that respect to the present time.

MR. HARDY: — Do you expect there to be a decision this year on that?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I couldn't tell the hon. member whether there will be an announcement this calendar year on that. I think I would be misleading the hon. member if I thought I could reach a conclusion on that matter during this calendar year. I would like to but may not be able to.

MR. HARDY: — Could you tell us how extensive it would be? Would there be a considerable grant available or training available?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I really couldn't indicate. As I indicated to the hon. member, it is a matter that is being considered in the review of the cultural policy secretariat report, and I don't have any specific suggestions to make, if we did adopt such a proposition, as to what it would contain at this time.

MR. GARNER: — Just a couple of quick questions, Mr. Minister, about the cultural talks that have taken place and are taking place. When do you expect them to be finished? Is there a date when you will be receiving a report from the cultural negotiations and talks that are taking place?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — The culture talks were completed last Tuesday. The last one was held at Estevan, and the panel that participated is now assembling the presentations they had. There is no fixed schedule when their work will be completed, but I hope to move it along relatively quickly.

MR. GARNER: — Could you give me a list of the people on that panel? And as soon as the report hits your desk and after however long you want to review it, can you see to it that I receive a copy of that report? I have had some concerns from some of my constituents regarding obtaining a copy of this report. They had asked for it at some of these cultural talks, and they were told they couldn't get it. They said they would try to get it from the minister. I would like to know if we can have a copy of the report you received from that panel.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the panel is essentially the group of advisors who advise me with respect to cultural policy and they will be reviewing and providing recommendations on various aspects. I don't propose that we have another report on cultural policy. The purpose was to hear responses to the report we have. And so I don't propose another report but rather, as minister, I will be developing a framework for policy in various areas, and announcements will be made on those as they're developed.

MR. GARNER: — Well, are these all government employees on this panel?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Yes, that's correct.

MR. GARNER: — And you will send me a list of the panel members?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I will.

MR. GARNER: — My concern was that some of my constituents had gone to these cultural talks and had input into them. They are concerned as to what impact the briefs that they presented will have on the direction you will be going. That's why we're suggesting a report or something along that line, Mr. Minister, because I think the

people of Saskatchewan, the grass-roots people, would like to know if they've been listened to in these discussions.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, certainly I will be reporting on the conclusions that we draw with respect to the various aspects of the Vichert report and people will, through that process, be able to determine whether or not, and to what extent, we've been able to adopt the suggestions they've made.

MR. THATCHER: — No, we're not going to agree tonight, gentlemen. And I might as well tell you that every time you pull that kooky stunt of turning the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland loose on a 20 to 25 minute tirade, we aren't going to finish those estimates at night. So, we're not finishing tonight. And we had every intention of finishing and we should finish. Nobody wants out of here more than we do, or is more prepared to move things through the House speedily than we are — which I think we have to at this point in time. But we're not putting up with that sort of nonsense. So, every time you turn him loose . . . He has his own medium; he has caucus; he has private members' day; he has a variety of options open to him to make his views known. But estimates is traditionally opposition time. Fine, we don't mind the odd few minutes, but if you're going to make these long-winded speeches, we're just not going to finish that day.

I notice your report, in the area of film distribution, suggests that in the theatre a regulation be established which would require a Saskatchewan produced short feature to be shown with every third film feature. Mr. Minister, do you concur with a recommendation like that, and do you really believe that it's realistic?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Certainly, that is one suggestion in the report that I have yet not drawn a conclusion upon.

MR. THATCHER: — Let me ask you about the next one a little further down, that the corporation would manage the government's equity in Teletheatre. I'm sure you've had that one posed to you. And you might as well answer concerning the recommendation which would ensure Saskatchewan control of software, thus guaranteeing substantial Saskatchewan content in the new channels made possible by the impending fibre optics network. Now, you know what software is, and you know what the implications of that are. Would you tell us whether you agree with that?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Again, I'm not able to say I've developed a particular view on exactly how to approach this question. I think there is no question that with respect to what is generally referred to as educational broadcasting, there is a greater and greater interest in that area within Saskatchewan. And it's something we'll have to give careful consideration to. I don't know what would be the appropriate mechanism. I have some sympathy for the view that perhaps educational broadcasting can be best handled at the community level. I know that there are difficulties in developing effective products and viable operations at the community level. So, the possibility of being able to integrate SaskMedia, which essentially now produces software (films and productions) which are utilized by the schools and by a couple of community-based educational broadcasters, and Teletheatre into some common corporate body is not entirely ruled out in my mind.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Minister, I would just like to speak for a few minutes. I see it's getting close to 10 o'clock, so I know I won't be finished tonight. Yesterday in response to some of the queries I raised, you used the famous NDP excuse for criticism: the Tories are going to destroy this; the Tories are going to destroy medicare; the Tories don't believe in home care. That's your favourite response to inquiries. You said we were against museums and community crafts and things like that, but I can tell you that this particular report is a very glossy, slick publication. In the tradition of socialists, you have typically . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well okay, the Minister of the Environment said "Communist." Maybe that's a closer word. I don't know; he should know for sure. But you've taken a few good things, and those which I'm sure a lot of people presented to you in their briefs or the committee, and mixed them with a bunch of bad things in hope of getting something by. The member for Arm River stated that he feels that he has smelled a rat, and so do I.

We believe in cultural grants to establish centres. When you hear the other members state the difficulties that rural Saskatchewan villages and towns are having keeping their recreation facilities open because of rising costs, I would suggest that rather than making an out-and-out grant to build yet another facility, perhaps we could look at a way of utilizing the facilities we already have in our rural communities.

One I would like to point out would be the senior citizens recreation centres, which (I know in my constituency and I'm sure it's evident all over Saskatchewan) most smaller communities do have. Perhaps a cultural centre could be integrated with those particular centres. I'm sure that the artifacts and things which would be in there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Who belong to those centres would have a wealth of information for people going through these particular centres. Certainly, the recommendation of a full-time director for these centres is admirable.

AN HON. MEMBER: — If you can afford it.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Can we afford it? It's easy to say. I could go back to the Minister of Health. We made a lot of recommendations and he said they're all admirable suggestions and that he agrees with them, but that we all have budget constraints and priorities. I think low-interest loans to crafts people — certified crafts people — is also a good suggestion. I do think that the Saskatchewan Arts Council needs a full-time executive director whose salary is paid by the government but who isn't appointed by the government.

The museum advisory service which is suggested is essential, but I do not agree with the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, who said that, if these provincial grants are made to these museums, certain conditions have to be attached, such as that the artifacts or displays within that museum must be owned by the public. I can tell you that in my constituency we have three museums: one at Fox Valley, one at Maple Creek and one close to Cypress Park. These rival any museum in Saskatchewan history in the province. But these are all private collectors who open their doors. The one in Maple Creek doesn't own a thing. Everything is on loan. In fact the fellow from the archives board was down not too long ago and he was just overwhelmed at the things we have in that particular museum. Certainly, if we want to keep these artifacts within the province, the government must make some type of a grant available — but I would say an unconditional grant. They must provide small, private museums, so to speak, with expert advice. I know that you can send things to the archives and they will do a lot of restoration for you.

A permanent headquarters for multicultural research, libraries, things like that, I think, should be established. But perhaps we should have two, one in each of the two major cities — Regina and Saskatoon. Things could be interchanged between the two.

The provincial library system certainly should be expanded into the North with special emphasis on native languages and art crafts.

Another recommendation, R. 15 says traditional Indian names of northern geographical features be respected and maintained. I think that should be a top priority. There are definitely areas that we sure do not agree with. As I said, this is a typical document put out by your government where you have some good things mixed up with a lot of bad things.

I think the choice of forming a Crown corporation on culture has to be the dumbest thing I have ever heard. The reasons for recommending a Crown corporation by the author is that it would put, at arm's length from the government, the cultural policies to be set. That is just absolutely ludicrous because you and I both know that Crown corporations are no more at arm's length from the government than the Department of Culture and Youth.

Mr. Chairman I have more to say on this and I call it 10 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Just before adjourning, I want to refer hon. members in connection with the remarks regarding the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland and other remarks that have been made towards members of the House. I refer members to a ruling made on March 28, 1941 by a Mr. Speaker Agar in which he said:

Certain hon. members seem to have developed a practice of late of referring in somewhat sarcastic terms to the debates which take place in the House. Too frequently hon. members are prefacing their remarks by allusions to the amount of time taken by other members and making use of such statements as "too much talk," "waste of time," and "useless debate," "getting down to business," and so on with reference to the House itself and nothing is done. It is my considered opinion that such comments are subversive to the dignity of parliament and the prestige of this Assembly. They are also calculated to restrict privileges of individual members which are his by right, by precedent and by tradition in a British Parliament. Nor is it given to any member on the floor of the House to characterize any debate as useless, any speech as a waste of time. It is the duty of the Speaker so to conduct debate that the irrelevant is excluded, the dilatory quashed, the obstructive prevented, the tediously repetitive curbed.

Surely, too, the few weeks we spend here are not too many when we consider the magnitude and importance of the problems confronting us, the legislation upon our desk and the amount of public money we are asked to appropriate for the conduct of the people's business. I would ask all hon. members to keep that ruling in mind in future.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:05 p.m.