

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
MAY 13, 1981**

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ordinary Expenditures — Vote 42

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would ask the minister to introduce his officials.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, it's my distinct pleasure. I would like to introduce my deputy, Mr. Howard Leeson; sitting behind Mr. Leeson is the director of the constitutional affairs and research branch, Mr. Robert Weece; behind me and to the left of Mr. Weece is the director of the intergovernmental co-ordination branch, Mr. David Hawkes. I have a cast of supporting thousands as needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I can't think of a minister who needs the casts of thousands more than the minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs.

My first question is: was the department aware of the so-called leaked document released at the 1980 September federal-provincial conference? And if the department was not aware, would you explain why? Secondly, if the department was aware, what advice did they give the minister on their view of the so-called leaked document?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that this is the case with respect to the officials in the department; certainly it is the case with me. The leaked document came, I believe, on Tuesday of that week-long conference (September 9). There was a rumor on either the day before (Monday, September 8; perhaps even Sunday night) that a leaked document was about and was going to be tabled by some journalists (or whoever) outlining it. I do not believe that the officials (I can only speak for the two most directly involved in this at the conference), Mr. Leeson and Mr. Weece, had any advance knowledge of that.

MR. LANE: — I didn't ask about advance knowledge. I asked if they had knowledge of it.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, then, of course, the whole conference knew that. Once the document was out, it was tabled and there were more photocopies produced within a matter of hours than probably anything else. Of course, then the documentation was read.

As to the specific question (I don't mean this in any confrontational sense) but what advice, of course, the deputy and the department would give me, I would like to treat as being confidential. All that I can tell you is that the government position was, as a result of all the advice and documentation that we read, that it was business as usual for the

balance of the conference, which was, in broad, general terms, for Saskatchewan to try to fashion together as much of a deal with as many of the provinces as we could (and the federal government) before the conference broke up on Friday. I think it was over on Saturday.

MR. LANE: — Well, if that's the advice given or if that was the policy decision taken, then it was not only business as usual during the course of the conference, it was business as usual until February 1981. My questions were: first, did you have an analysis done of the so-called leaked document? And if you had an analysis done, are you prepared to table the analysis made by your officials of the leaked document?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that there was an analysis in the form of a written analysis by the department. Perhaps the deputy could advise me in a moment if I'm wrong. I can correct it in a subsequent question. Obviously, there were analyses of the paper. We spent not a great deal of the portion on the paper but a substantial part of the time during that 7 week — on parts of it that we agreed with and parts of it we didn't agree with (I forget now) all in the course of verbal discussion and caucusing in the morning and in the evening sessions that took place at the conference. So, there has been an analysis in that sense. I do not believe that there has ever been produced a concise analysis; if it has, it has not come to me. In any event, I would adopt the position that if I did receive it, it would be an internal document which I would not table.

MR. LANE: — Did the department do an analysis and are you prepared to table it? The two salient points in that document basically were that the federal government had a deep fear of a common western front, and secondly, the position in the leaked document is that it was incumbent upon the federal government to look for an ally in western Canada. I'm sure in a political sense that those were the two most salient features of that document as they apply to western Canada. I wonder: did the minister accept those two points as an accurate assessment of the federal position or did you come to the conclusion that those were not basically relevant positions or not serious positions?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I think I can tell the hon. member quite candidly that during the week of the conference . . . Candidly even today I don't feel any particular compulsion of accuracy about that analysis or any kind of feeling that it prejudiced or jeopardized the things that we did at the conference and subsequent to the conference.

I'm sure the hon. member will realize that over the many, many meetings that we had over the summer — most of them in a group session, but some almost bilaterally — this was a very subjective analysis by one individual only. He's Mr. Michael Kirby of the federal-provincial relations office.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And the staff.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — No, I think he did this himself. He may have had some input but I think that Kirby did this himself. I wouldn't swear to it but in subsequent discussions with him I think that that is the case. It is an opinion. Again, I don't know where it would lead us, but as the member would appreciate, we had our judgments as to where we thought the weak links were on the things that we were trying to negotiate or bargain — not only from a provincial point of view necessarily, although that was an obvious area of concern, but also with respect to federal issues.

So, my point, and I think the member gets my point, is that I didn't particularly pay any attention to it as to its accuracy or inaccuracy. Our game plan was set, more or less, and we followed that for the balance of the week, or as you said, as it turns out, to the balance of the first part of February.

MR. LANE: — So, you made your decision as to your game plan prior to the so-called leaked document and you didn't take the leaked document into account. Is that correct?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — We took it into account because we read it and we analyzed it, but it didn't impact on the strategy. We knew what we would like to get out of an ideal constitutional provision — the member and I have talked about this before — dealing with resources, what our position could or couldn't be on a charter of rights, amending formula options, and that kind of thing. And we tried to figure out as best as we could where each province would stand on these particular areas. Then you try to fashion out of that some form of a coalition which would (while achieving the provinces' objectives) avoid the kind of destruction and divisiveness that the country is now undergoing. So, the Kirby memorandum was taken account of. But it didn't alter anything; it didn't change what we wanted to try to achieve for resources for the province or what we decided we should do with respect to the charter of rights and so forth. It was in the end result but one man's opinion of the Saskatchewan view and maybe other people's opinion. I don't know. Maybe it was the hon. member's opinion. But it had no bearing on the actual negotiations and discussions.

MR. LANE: — It really wasn't one man's opinion of the Saskatchewan view; it was, I suggest, more than one man's opinion as to what action the federal government would take. Heaven knows I wouldn't attempt, and I am not trying, to put words into the Attorney General's mouth — but are you saying in effect that the so-called leaked document, the Kirby memorandum, was not a factor in the position taken by the Government of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I think that's correct. I could say it was not a factor — not to my way of thinking, and to the best of my knowledge, not to the Premier's either. I would say before I take my seat on this question that I think it was the Prime Minister himself who, on the day of the leak of the document, immediately dismissed it as not being federal government policy, and took that position. Now, whether he did that for political reasons or whatever, I don't know. The fact is that they, themselves, never said it was government policy. It was Mr. Kirby's view of where the players were standing on the various issues.

MR. LANE: — I suggest to you it was never a policy document. It was a strategic and a tactical document. What did you expect the Prime Minister to say about the document?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that if it had been an official government policy, he would have had to admit it. It may be true that you can draw distinction between policy and tactic. I don't, because in these negotiations so much of the process is tied into the substance — right up to the very fact of the resolution that we're debating now. As the member knows, we debate the way it's being done.

MR. LANE: — On the so-called leaked document, or the Kirby memorandum, you took Prime Minister Trudeau's word that it wasn't government policy. Is that correct?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — No, not only that. What I'm trying to say to the hon. member . . . I know why the hon. member is trying to say this. He has in the past tried to argue the point (and I don't agree with it, but this is obviously the point he advances) that the federal government had targeted Saskatchewan as a weak link in the constitutional negotiations. He puts too much emphasis on that. I'm saying that it doesn't matter to me particularly whether it was Mr. Trudeau saying it, or what.

From the Saskatchewan point of view, taking into account all of the inputs — Mr. Trudeau's comments, Kirby's comments, press commentaries, our department officials' commentaries — it had minimal impact on what we were doing that week, and what we were doing subsequently. Now, the hon. member opposite perhaps would want to advance a different theory, but I'm telling him as truthfully as I can how I recollect those discussions and those negotiations.

MR. LANE: — Same impact or no impact?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Minimum impact. And again, these are quantitative or subjective judgment calls. There was an analysis pertaining to the province of Quebec, I believe it was, dealing with what Quebec would or wouldn't take as to a possible amending formula. I mean, it had an impact. That kind of information was important. It was valuable, if it could be believed and if it could be assessed and followed by us without our own game plan. But the specific reference that you're talking about, the fact that they targeted us on this, had, I can only repeat again, minimum impact. If we could see their observations, fine. But it didn't change what we wanted to achieve.

MR. LANE: — The interesting thing about the Kirby memorandum is that the individual happens to have been right on. If one doesn't come away having read that document with a great deal of respect for some of the senior public servants in Ottawa, then one is being a political fool. That strategy and that tactic from last September laid out what would happen, including what would happen if the federal government didn't get it through quickly enough, and what would happen if they were forced to go to the supreme court. That is in my view an absolutely brilliant assessment by senior public servants of the political process and political realities of this country. I would be very hard-pressed to find areas of import in that leaked document that were significantly wrong. And so, if one takes that document and goes back to the statement made by the Attorney General, that that document had only minimal impact on Saskatchewan, one is led to one of two conclusions: either the officials of your department were politely asleep at the switch (and I'm not prepared to grant that argument), or the Attorney General and the Premier of this province were themselves asleep at the switch, to the extent that they did not take a clear and unequivocal warning and statement of strategy by the Government of Canada.

You say it had a minimal impact on your decision. I frankly regret that. I think that most politicians, except for senior members of the government opposite and a lot of the backbenchers of the government opposite, would not take a statement by the Prime Minister of Canada, his office or his officials, that they need a western ally and are basically in deep trouble if they don't have a western ally, as a statement of minimal impact. I suggest to the Attorney General that what you've said tonight indicates that you, your officials or the Premier completely misread the intention of the Government of Canada as to what it was going to do in the constitutional matter. The other logical conclusion is that, taking your position as well, you had already made up your mind well before, and a clear warning wasn't going to change it. This leads into all sorts of other

possibilities.

If I were in your position, looking back at the accuracy and, I say, the brilliance of the Kirby memorandum, I would be doing whatever it takes to hire the guys in this province. That's precisely what I would do, because I haven't seen (from people involved in the partisan political process) a more accurate or better analysis of the political realities in this country.

All that one can accept from what you've said tonight is that it had minimal impact. Perhaps you had your minds made up beforehand and weren't prepared to take a clear warning from the Government of Canada that they were going to play you off against other provinces, the very clear warning of the Government of Canada that they wanted a western ally and needed to divide the common western front. This indicates a political naiveté on the Attorney General's part which I'm not prepared to grant him.

I suggest to you that the only conclusion is that either a deal was made (on which I'm not prepared to spend a great deal of time tonight, unless the Attorney General is) or the Government of Saskatchewan fell into Pierre Elliott Trudeau's constitutional trap and has to take the responsibility for the constitutional divisiveness that we have in Canada today.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, there is nothing I can do to change the hon. member's assessment, but I would like to make two points briefly. First of all, I don't agree that it's a brilliant analysis and the proof of the pudding of that is there is a united western front. That's the proof of the pudding.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's too late.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, the hon. member says it's too late. But if the federal government's fear of a united western front was so strong in September of 1980 as to warrant some form of a trap falling by us or something else by them — if they were so concerned about it then, why weren't they concerned about it in May? Why is it that the very thing they fear has proven not to have come true?

The second point that I make, of course, is that the documentation, if you go through it, talks about the question of timetables. I remember (I don't have the documentation in front of me) timetables about getting it out of parliament by December. They were going to get it out of parliament in December. They were going to have it over to London and we were going to have it back here by July 1 and the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada were behind this.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Be careful now.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, they've missed on every . . . They may make it by July 1; there's an outside chance. But they have missed on every timetable. If I were Mr. Michael Kirby, I wouldn't be holding my breath for possible employment with the Government of Saskatchewan because, as able as he may be (and I take nothing away from the man), his concept of the country, as reflected by that document, is at variance with my concept of the country.

MR. LANE: — Well, it may be at variance with mine, but I don't think he was establishing a concept of the country. I think he was establishing an assessment of the political realities. I think, to that extent, he was right on. Certainly he gave the deadlines as to when it should be done to avoid the very problems that subsequently happened. He

May 13, 1981

also gave a very clear warning to the federal government of what would happen if they didn't meet these deadlines — all of which have come true.

I just don't believe that any rational or logical person could come to any other conclusion than that the Government of Saskatchewan either walked into Pierre Elliott Trudeau's trap or had another arrangement prior to the September conference. The Attorney General says, "Well, we're now together." The fact is that you bought for Pierre Elliott Trudeau nearly six months of very precious political time to allow him to talk to eastern Canadians and people in western Canada and say, "Well, I've got support in western Canada. Saskatchewan isn't with the other provinces." You gave Pierre Elliott Trudeau some very precious and necessary political time by your actions.

I'm of the opinion (and I know many people in Saskatchewan are and I also know that a significant portion of Saskatchewan people are not of the opinion) that if you had taken a common western position, at least by last September, Pierre Elliott Trudeau would not have stage managed that conference last September. I ask people to go back to the fact that we had come out of a summer with the Attorney General himself very personally involved with everybody having some hopes of success with the active participation of Jean Chrétien, with everybody going in from a summer's endeavors to a conference where most people believed that there would be, perhaps, not a resolution or a solution but a significant narrowing of items of dispute, to a conference which within five days blows everything apart, with the Prime Minister of Canada saying, "Oh, you couldn't get together anyway and I'm going my own way." One can take a look at the political process and can only again come to one conclusion — that the Government of Saskatchewan was Pierre Elliott Trudeau's ally in the constitutional debate. My personal view is and I think historically it will be proven true, that Pierre Elliott Trudeau would not have proceeded with the constitutional package without the tacit silent support at a very crucial time of the Government of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, again the hon. member and I are totally at odds on this on the assessment and on the tactics. And again I would make very few brief points — all through meetings on the constitution all summer long I think the record will show that the provinces were united on many of the 12 agenda items and maintained that unity straight through the first ministers' conference. There were one or two notable exceptions, but one could pick resources. With the exception of the Ontario and the federal government there was, more or less, a united, all-province position on resources. We maintained that position through the week of September 8 and post-September 8. Indeed, we were very much conscious of the unity of the provinces and the need not to be, in effect, bilaterally dealt off by the federal government.

The second point I would like to make is that when the Prime Minister unilaterally introduced this motion, we took the position then — and still take the position, and I will always take the position — that the unilateralism was wrong; it does violence to the principles of co-operative federalism. That is my position today on May 13; it was on October 2 and it was on September 8. But for all its having done violence, I think that in a small way some benefit also came from our subsequent attempts to make the resolution more acceptable to more Canadians. We did, in a small way, modify the referendum mechanism by making it a tie-breaker (this is not enough to satisfy us, but it's a modest improvement) and the recognition of multiculturalism was in our brief to the parliamentary committee on December 19.

The hon. member for Wilkie doesn't like that; I happen to like that very much . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon me? The hon. member may not support

multiculturalism; I do, in the constitution and the same with native rights. I suppose the hon. member for Wilkie doesn't support that kind of improvement as well. All of these, I think, slightly improve the package to the benefit of all Canadians, if the package is going to be ultimately upheld to the supreme court and ultimately enacted. I still hope that we can sit down around a table as Canadians and work this thing out. So the second point that I want to make is that there has been some modest improvement, but on the major fundamentals, combined with the process, we could not and will not accept the package as it stands. So I simply make those two points; we did maintain unity and I think there was some small degree of usefulness in the efforts that we made in trying to improve it.

MR. LANE: — I suppose the analogy is: if one is going to be raped, can we do it on the bed and not on the floor, which is basically the Attorney General's position. You and I will debate this for many, many years and at some point I will and I'm sure others will eventually get to the truth. I don't think there's much . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Let me proofread it. That's the only suggestion I make to you. Okay. Just in the interest of historical accuracy and salability of the novel, I suggest you let me proofread it.

Would the Attorney General advise me as to all administrative staff — their salary range, the previous experience of those that are in the increase, the number of those in years from three to five and all so-called other expenses that are estimated for the year 1981-82? And if the Attorney General is prepared to have his officials give that to me by Friday, I'm prepared to accept that.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I'll undertake to provide a breakdown of the information that the hon. member has asked for by Friday of this week.

MR. LANE: — Then basically on the question of other expenses, have you budgeted for different scenarios of supreme court decisions? You and I have talked about the different ways the supreme court could go. I strongly suspect the supreme court is going to divide the package. How? I would hesitate to hazard a guess. But how much of that is for lobbying in England and what individuals are projected to take the lobbying for the province of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I would tell the hon. member that we have not budgeted, as such, for the future activity based on the various scenarios in the supreme court — mainly because up to now, albeit the range of options are somewhat limited in the supreme court, the developments have been changing almost daily and the circumstances have resulted in sometimes various actions being taken in response. Accordingly, what you see in the blue book is a standard budget. It is from last year till this year, as you will appreciate. What we've been doing is going to cabinet for special warrants or virements from a vote to a vote as may be required.

But now I'll speak more directly to the hon. member's question on what I may describe as the London strategy. This is being co-ordinated by the Hon. Dick Johnston, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs from Alberta, on behalf of all of the eight dissenting provinces. It is a kind of informal committee made up of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Quebec, and Nova Scotia. The current strategy involves a whole range of options, depending on what comes out of the supreme court. And as the hon. member will, I'm sure, agree with me, while the end results can be fairly narrow, the nuance of the decisions and the breakdown by the court, five-four, and Quebec benches, etc., carries a lot of impact and a lot of weight as to what would happen in

May 13, 1981

London.

All I can tell the hon. member is that we are examining options such as the introduction of a petition on behalf of the eight dissenting provinces at Westminster. We have that process of petition in our House. I can't say that it's exactly the same as that at Westminster. There is a process, which was used by western Australia, I think, in the middle 1920s. We are looking at correspondence to the appropriate people — Prime Minister Thatcher and others. We are looking at the question of continuing the lobby by the agents-general, which has been going on for several weeks, of the individual MPs.

There has been no decision made yet as to whether there will be any further political trips to London, in the sense of premiers or ministers. It is thought that, depending upon the circumstances, possibly the premiers themselves might be making, as a team, an appropriate position to the people at Westminster. But that depends, again, on when the decision comes down, the timetable and things of this nature.

As you can see, it's a little bit flexible, of necessity. I want to be careful as to the depth of the strategy that I reveal publicly. I don't want to deny my responsibility to the member, or to the members of this House, but quite clearly there are aspects of this which require some more careful consideration. We are here contributing, but basically following the lead of Alberta as to the London strategy.

As funds are required for lawyers, personnel, advertising and whatever they will be obtained, I'm quite sure, from our treasury board personnel.

MR. LANE: — Well, I and my colleagues, and a significant segment of Saskatchewan society, view the government opposite as the Judas of the constitutional fight, in terms of the provincial position. Are you prepared to consider including in the Saskatchewan delegation a member of the official opposition, should it become necessary to continue the lobbying in the United Kingdom? I suggest that for a reason, because although you and I may have some very significant differences as to tactics, (and we obviously do) there may be a fair degree of similarity.

We have a difference in terms of the equalization formula, and we've debated that in the past. It is our view that it is something to be determined by the provinces, and we have a belief in the willingness of the provinces to make decisions in the national interest, with their own resources. I believe that if they had the maturity of using their own resources, they would make compromises in the national interest. That suggestion, subsequently, was borne out by other organizations. I believe it was the Pemberton study in British Columbia which made that suggestion. We disagree on that area, but I doubt very much if we disagree on the fact that the provinces need, and must have, the right to their resources and to determine matters within their jurisdictions, in order to be able to make some very rational political decisions as to how to deal with those financial resources, in the interest of their own peoples. I think at that point we may not have a great deal of difference. Would you be prepared to consider (and I say that guardedly; I don't want that as a blanket excuse) members of the official opposition in this Assembly, should lobbying in the United Kingdom become necessary?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I would not rule that out as a possibility. It is true, as the member says, while we have differences, the fact is this Assembly did pass unanimously a resolution condemning the federal resolution, its process, and substance. I think that this is something which carries more weight as far as the British are concerned (the unanimous voice of a legislature), more weight than we'd care to sometimes admit.

Offhand, the only caveat that I would, perhaps, attach is the activity of our sister provinces in this area. We would not want to break patterns with them, or to adopt a course of action which would in some way or other cause embarrassment for them and their legislative oppositions and the like. Quite frankly, we have not yet met, as ministers, to review the work of the officials related to the London strategy. That, I think, is anticipated in a couple of weeks time. I will take the opportunity of considering with my colleagues what they intend to do in this eventuality.

MR. ANDREW: — My question to you, Mr. Attorney General, is this. Since the federal resolution has gone to the supreme court, what type of information are you now receiving back from your officials in Great Britain as to the position of the House of Commons, in particular, on the question of the constitutional change?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — The information that we are receiving, generally, is that most parliamentarians in the United Kingdom seem to hope (and that is perhaps the best word to use there) that somehow the supreme court in its ruling will solve the problem for them, namely, avoid their having to decide on that trusteeship role. There is some information coming back which says that if the supreme court rules Mr. Trudeau's proposal is legal, that that could be it in London. The opposition to the proposal is legal, that that could be it in London. The opposition to the proposal will simply fade away.

After all, they are like politicians anywhere. They have their own problems about defections, budgets, gasoline prices, and everything — Northern Ireland as an example. So, I think the best intelligence that I could tell the hon. member is, roughly, that the United Kingdom people (as we are told) are in a kind of holding pattern, as I suppose Canada is, awaiting the supreme court decision. There is some expression of hope that, in the decision, something will come out of it which will avoid parliamentarians in the U.K. having to make the hard choice of having to act as a trustee.

MR. ANDREW: — Okay. To get even more specific, are you telling me that the sound that is coming out of Great Britain is, basically, that the Parliament of Great Britain is going to hang its hat (or is probably looking to hang its hat) on the supreme court decision? Is that really how it sounds over there now?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — First of all, with respect to the Government of the United Kingdom, of course, there is, I think, no change. Their position remains that it is their obligation as government to pass forward to the United Kingdom parliament, as quickly as they can, whatever clears the joint addresses of the Canadian parliament — the Senate and the House of Commons. But with regard to the private members, I would only go part of the way with the member's assessment. There is a slide toward the view that we're hanging our hat on the supreme court. But there are still many MPs who (even in the eventuality of the favorable Supreme Court of Canada decision for the federal government) will, in the United Kingdom, say this offends what they view as their duty under section 7 of the Statute of Westminster. But it's basically a hole with perhaps a little bit of a slide toward the idea that the supreme court will decide.

MR. ANDREW: — Right. The observations that I made were that the Government of Great Britain was on the side of the federal government and as I think you said, they are going to pass it through. Now, that would obviously carry with it a large amount of support within the government benches. In order to be successful, you would almost surely need the support of the opposition — particularly of the Labour party. What type of reaction are you getting from the front benches of the Labour Party with regard to

this question?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, quite frankly, the official shadow cabinet of the Labour Party in the United Kingdom, officially as a shadow cabinet, has taken (so far as I know) no final position on this. When you talk to some members, both within the shadow cabinet and outside the shadow cabinet, they will quite candidly express their concern at the massive interference of the division of powers between the federal and provincial governments that the Trudeau resolution makes and, of course, the process. They (I suppose more so than in our Canadian political situation) as a shadow cabinet will act ultimately (I perceive) almost like a cabinet will once they come down to a policy decision based on all the political factors that are influencing them. If they decide to support it regardless of the individual reservations of some of the members, they will do so.

So I size up the Labour Party as being like any sensible opposition. This is a hot potato that the government has to pick up first. And the government members have to pick it up first, not the opposition. They will wait to see if and when and how that resolution comes over and what it looks like, and what approval or lack of approval it attaches with it in the supreme court; they will see how the government of the day handles it before they make their decision. Privately, one will get a great deal of support for the province's point of view. But whether that will ultimately translate itself into an effective voice and vote against the resolution once it reaches the U.K. is too speculative.

MR. ANDREW: — Not to put down the members of parliament in Great Britain, but I think they are like any parliamentary system, politics plays lots in it. The Labour Party (it would seem to me) finds itself with probably the two most effective lobbies. Probably now working on the Labour Party would be the Government of Saskatchewan people and the lobby from Mr. Broadbent in Ottawa. Is Mr. Broadbent, to your knowledge, as a federal NDP leader, actively lobbying the Labour Party in Great Britain?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — No, to my knowledge, he is not. But I don't know. There has been one party official over there (that was the subject of a question period by the member for Qu'Appelle). He was the federal secretary of the party. I do not know, and I say that truthfully, whether he was an emissary of Mr. Broadbent. I think not. I don't believe that to be the case as much as he was an emissary of the federal party.

MR. LANE: — Would the Attorney General (in all cases) be prepared to advise us as to all outside consultants hired in the past year, the amounts paid, and how much is budgeted for in the estimates for 1981-82?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I can provide that to the member now. We would have no objection in telling you whom we engaged on an advising capacity, the sums paid to them and what their job was. I just thought I might have the information . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — No objection or no choice?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — And no choice. If you will give it to us this Friday, I will try to phone that information to you for Friday as well.

MR. LANE: — Remember, I very carefully asked, in relation to the question of other expenses under administration, the total amount for other expenses. The total is going

to come out to \$78 or a \$100. I would like the same figures or the same information in each of the five items. I'm going (if it's all right) to go through my question on the five items. With respect to item 2, constitutional affairs and research, the annual report indicates that officials of the Department of The Attorney General are also advising on the question of the constitution. My question, first, is what officials? Secondly, how is the budget allocated to the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, we have essentially two lawyers who are advising the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs on constitutional affairs matters. One, who is a resident in the intergovernmental affairs, is Mr. George Peacock. His salary is being taken care of by the Department of the Attorney General in the ordinary fashion. If there are any expenses, they are attributed to the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. The other person is Dr. John Whyte, who is on a two-year extended contract now from Queen's University. He is the director of our constitutional law branch and he, too, advises. He is resident in the Department of the Attorney General but has been very central to this. His salary and expenses are looked after by the Department of the Attorney General. That's essentially how the advice is breaking down.

MR. LANE: — Under the category of constitutional affairs and research, the deputy minister of intergovernmental affairs is a member of the Canada West Foundation. My first question is what other organizations are department officials members of, in whatever capacity? Secondly, in light of two significant events (one being the desire of the member for Nipawin to join the United States) what research did the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs undertake in order to be able to respond on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan? What research has the department done with regard to the matter of West-Fed as a body or the concept of western independence or western separation, in order to be able to respond on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, with respect to the membership in organizations, Canada West is, in effect, essentially the only membership organization. This is an organization, as the hon. member knows, of the four western governments. We do make a grant to the Queen's Institute of Intergovernmental Relations in the amount of \$5,000 and Mr. Weese is on the advisory council. I think those are the only two where we have a membership involvement.

Secondly, as to what kind of research papers have we done, I advise that the department originally prepared some considerable information for me (some of which I passed along to my cabinet colleagues), on the question of the American connection — the Unionest Party — when it first was announced. We have done less analysis on West-Fed. This is mainly because, in some ways (although the United States connection is a very major difference between the two) the same kinds of concepts and researches as to the economics and the like would be to a great extent covered in the one area of research.

I can tell the member that all of our conclusions — not that we had any doubt about it whatsoever — indicated that this thing is not a very workable or satisfactory solution to western Canadian grievances or alienation.

MR. LANE: — Well, I may use harsher words. Would you be prepared to supply the opposition with the results of your studies?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like, again, to take the position

which I have in the past — these are internal studies. I think that, in this case, I don't want to be as firm about that as I have been on the other one or two questions the members has asked. I would ask that the deputy see if he can uncover that documentation for me, and, if there seems to be anything which ought not to be released in the public interest, we won't.

MR. LANE: — I would think that the Attorney General would be wanting to arm as many of us as possible with the ammunition to be able to fight. I'm prepared to make a suggestion to the Attorney General as to any part which doesn't suggest the options available to the Government of Saskatchewan. I'm prepared to accept that you may wish to keep that confidential. But, as to the information as to the grounds for response, I would hope that you could make the commitment tonight to make that available.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, I'm sorry. I just can't make that commitment. I would like to see the documentation; we don't have it here with us. I don't quite recall what was in it. I would like to see it first before making that commitment. The position which we generally take is that any kind of internal survey or study, as a principle, should be left internally for the advice of government. Otherwise, civil servants do tend, quite naturally, to start vetting their advice and their documentation, never knowing quite fully when it's going to be revealed to the opposition or to the public.

In order to get ministers into the position where they receive the best advice, we try to maintain the policy position that what they tell us — frankly, candidly, embarrassingly or whatever — is left with us, and we'll make the policy basis on that. That is the general position I take here too, but I will make this concession to the member. I will review the documents and if it looks, in this case, as if we can break the rule, we'll ship them over to you by Friday too.

MR. LANE: — I'm prepared to make a suggestion as well. In the case of the information and the facts, because I don't believe that any opposition party has the research capability to be able to do all the economic, social and non-partisan political research which is necessary to respond to all the accusations made by western separatists, I would take it a step further.

In the interests of maintaining the people of Saskatchewan's belief in our country, I suggest that that information also be supplied to any other registered political parties in the Saskatchewan, in terms such as, "Here's what we're basing our economic, political, social and cultural analyses on." I very carefully said that I don't expect you to supply us with the information as to the policy considerations or the options available from that information. I think any political party or any other group taking that information can come to whatever conclusion it may. That's the political arena. But, I would hope that the Attorney General would, maintaining his own position, be prepared to table that information for this Assembly.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, I don't think I can add anything further. I understand what the member is saying. We will very carefully consider it.

MR. LANE: — In the estimates, would you indicate (some partial information had been supplied in the past; I don't recall whether it was from the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs) the number of surveys done on Saskatchewan voters' attitudes to the various political questions such as separation or whatever they may be? Who did those surveys and what was the cost of such surveys?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know if we can do all of this before Friday, but we will do as much of it as we can. I would answer the question of surveys along the lines and in the same form as the question which was asked by the House last year — ordered and provided.

MR. LANE: — Would you try to supply that information by Friday? If not, would you respond by saying, "Look, we can't get it by Friday, but we can have it by next Wednesday or some deadline?"

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — We will try on all of these before Friday. I am not trying to alibi here, but we don't have a very big department. There are only about 14 people all told. If we don't, we will get them to you within two weeks of today, by letter.

MR. LANE: — Why is there a significant increase in both the number of person-years in the protocol office and the individuals involved? In all cases, I am asking for the increase. When I ask you for the officials, their qualifications and previous employment, I am only asking for those included in the increase or those who are new. Is that understood? I am not going back. It seems that in the protocol office, we have had the functions carried out by capable people over a period of time. Now there is a significant increase. Why is there this significant increase?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, the protocol office has greatly expanded its functions. I have a document listing protocol office functions. I don't know quite what this figure means. I guess it means number in the year. I will just give you two examples here. One figure here deals with visits: ambassadorial, delegations, heads of state, councils, Canadian ambassadors, etc. In 1977-78, we had 20; in 1980-81, we had 55 visits (ambassadorial, etc.).

Other administrative functions: hospitality grants, services for official functions, gifts — that kind of activity — from 1978-79, we had 400 of those; in 1980-81, we have approaching 1,000 of those. It is just that more people are coming through Saskatchewan and visiting us — more ambassadors, delegations, and community services.

Secondly, as to the positions, we had two and we went up to four. One of those two additional ones is what they call a conversion from a temporary position to a permanent position. Those who are in protocol now are Michael Jackson, who is the chief and also the director of our office; Mr. Jack Bruce, who co-ordinates our visits; one position is vacant and there is one secretary. That's all the office does. Really that's a very, very tightly budgeted and run office, based on what the projections are in terms of work.

MR. LANE: — Well, the protocol office arranges, I assume, gifts or presentations to visiting dignitaries. Will you advise us as to the total amounts of the gifts and the gifts bought? Then I would ask the reverse question.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Could I just interject for one-half second. Again, on the value of the gifts — I can get this for you, but it will take relatively a lot of work, because the director, Dr. Jackson, says that there are many gifts which are given out. But the largest only amounts to about \$40 per occasion or event. The majority of them are, in effect, smaller token or symbolic gifts. I wonder if the member does want that information in the light of all of the work that it is likely to require. We are not looking at gifts of \$500 or \$100. We are looking at gifts in the \$40 or \$50 range.

May 13, 1981

MR. LANE: — Yes, I would like it. I would like to know what the thought is. Are we giving unique Saskatchewan gifts to the visiting dignitaries or are we presenting them (like we did with all of the school kids), with a Celebrate Saskatchewan pin? I suspect that is not the case. I may come back next year with some suggestions about Saskatchewan artists and assisting them in that regard. I would like to know what the situation is now, before I make any suggestions to these artists.

Secondly, (and as I said, the reverse), does the province of Saskatchewan require (like the Government of the United States) that all gifts to the province or its officials be kept by the province of Saskatchewan and not by the individuals? What practice do we have for collecting these gifts or mementos on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, as to the kinds of gifts we give, Dr. Jackson advises that they are exclusively Saskatchewan gifts, such as a book or books (pictorial or histories) or pottery by local Saskatchewan potters, some Indian craft work or that kind of gift. We will uncover the list of the gifts for you in due course. I do caution, however, that this will take time.

Secondly, as to what happens when we get gifts, this is a good question. Frankly I don't believe there is any policy. The Premier has taken the policy that he tries with gifts made to him (and sometimes it is kind of hard to know how to describe this) as Premier (on occasion they may be given to him as an individual) to put as many as possible down in the entry lobby as you walk in the main door. To your right you see the Indian headdress, the Ukrainian Easter eggs and the gifts which he gets. There are hundreds of them. You know, I get one almost every time I speak. I got one at the Saskatchewan Motor Dealers Association only yesterday, which is a very small gift, a \$25,000 Cadillac. No, the one that I got was a painting. I don't know what to do with it. I don't know whether to hang it up in my house or hang it up in the buildings. Does it stay with me afterward? I just don't know. All I know is that rarely will you get a gift worth more than that. What any visiting fireman will give us is another book about China or a book about Ontario or something of that nature. So, really we don't have a policy on this.

MR. LANE: — I suppose I could suggest that if it's a self-portrait give it to the member for Saskatoon Centre. Perhaps his best gift when he went anywhere on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan was a one-way ticket back home, which I don't expect him to table anywhere. I'm sympathetic with the Attorney General. I'm not sure that the people of Saskatchewan are well served by having a collection of every province's cuff links or something of that nature.

I think the Government of the United States has a policy and I believe the policy guideline now is \$160, but I'm subject to correction on that, if they come in above that, in fact, they're given to the United States government and it then stores them. It does have an option as well, which is an interesting one. If they are of value, it can lease them out to the various government departments to show or whatever and it keeps them circulating.

I don't know whether we're in that position or not and I ask the question for information only to know where, in fact, we do stand. You've indicated that there's no policy. If we're looking at gifts of, I suggest, maybe \$150 then I think the Government of Saskatchewan should, in fact, take charge of those and make use of them. I can't think of many less than that that the people of Saskatchewan would be much interested in.

Would you list all events that the protocol office was involved in last year and the known

events that the protocol office has scheduled for the 1981-82 fiscal year?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — First of all, with respect to the gifts policy, I think this is a good suggestion and I'm going to ask the deputy and Dr. Jackson to work up a policy along those lines. I'll simply say I received letter openers enough to give every one of my friends in the Legislative Assembly one. Even the opposition I could give one to. And of cuff links I have enough to string beds around. Anyway, we'll try and whip up something on that.

Now, what you want to know about is hospitality grants by protocol or do you want to know functions such as ambassadorial visits and the like?

MR. LANE: — I'd like to clarify. I'd like to know a list of the events during the past year that the protocol office was involved in (and I'm not asking for that tonight if it's going to take time to supply it). Then I would also like to know the events known to date and expected of the protocol office for the fiscal year 1981. Okay. Then I'm going to ask the question. You judged my question accurately as to the hospitality grants and how much is allocated in the estimates for hospitality grants and any that perhaps have already been allocated and those that you've had applications on?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I will mail over to you the protocol office activities for the 1980-81 fiscal year. They are self-explanatory. With respect to the projected ones for 1981-82, this will be impossible for us to tell you because Dr. Jackson . . .

MR. LANE: — I asked for the ones that are now up to date.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Yes, we'll let you know those that are known. This may surprise you but they are not very well known in advance. We get a call from Ottawa and the ambassador wants to come out here next week or 10 days from now; that's virtually how it operates. At the most, if you get a month's notice you are very lucky. Sometimes it's 10 days. We'll give you what is known.

Secondly, you want to know about hospitality grants. You want to know what has been spent? Do you want to know every individual organization or not? Every individual organization that has priority grants — do you want to know that? I'll send that over to you and I'll send you over an update on the grants and allocations. Just for the information of the members, it totals out at \$84,000 for last year — April 1, 1980, to March 3, 1981. It involves everybody from the North American Moose Conference to the Leonard Cheshire Foundation to the Regina Stamp Exhibition to the fifth annual conference of the Canadian Rock Art Research and the National Brown Swiss annual meeting.

MR. LANE: — I missed the latter one.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Brown Swiss — cattle.

MR. LANE: — I know what it is. Office of the agent general — I'd like to know the location, your annual rent of the premises, including all leaseholds. I would also like to know all other expenses in the estimates for the office of the agent general. I would like to know the individuals or groups that the agent general entertained last year and those that have made application to date this year.

May 13, 1981

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — First of all, I can give you some information to try to cut down on the massive information which we'll have to supply to the member at a later time. The space rental amounts to \$30,000 a year; it's a five-year contract.

MR. LANE: — Pounds or dollars?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Dollars. The office is located on a street called Cockspur Avenue which is just off Trafalgar or near Trafalgar Square, if the member knows London.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Unfortunately, he doesn't.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, we'll try to do our best when the next petition comes to have you. In any event, Cockspur is near Trafalgar. We are subletting, of that \$30,000, \$17,000 in extra space that we originally had to our friends in Air Canada.

The position is held by Mr. Merv Johnson. He has with him one general services officer and one secretary only and one vacancy, I believe. The vacancy has been transferred back to us. So it is a three-person office.

The next item that you want is expenses for entertainment. That we have to uncover for you. We just don't have that. We will mail it to you. It is limited to the occasional cocktail party. I don't know if the boys who went over there had anything, but we will get it over to you.

MR. LANE: — I'm assuming from the comments that it's not a very high budget, but I would like to know the budget. I understand the agent general maintains a list of those people who are entertained and contacted on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan. I would like that list to May 1.

With respect to item 6, "grants to planning and research institutions," to whom are all grants made? To whom is it proposed that grants be paid in the fiscal year '81-'82?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — In '80-'81 we paid \$5,000 to the Queen's Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Mr. Weese.

MR. LANE: — I hope that's not a scholarship to any sons or daughters of any senior official of the government opposite.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — No, this is the Richard Simeon operation . . . (inaudible) . . .

The institute for research and public policy, last year, received \$80,000. This year, we are budgeting zero. It's an endowment. The figures are as follows: for the Queen's Institute of Intergovernmental Relations (I mentioned that) - \$5,000 last year, and \$7,500 this year; The Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat — \$30,000 last year, this year, \$40,000; The Canadian Plains Research Centre, Regina — \$30,000 last year, \$68,000 this year; Canada West Foundation — \$15,000 last year, \$17,500 this year; and IPAC (Independent Petroleum Association of Canada) — \$4,500 last year, \$5,000 this year. The grant total last year was \$164,500, and this year, a grand total of \$138,000 — a reduction.

MR. LANE: — What does the Canadian Plains Research Institute do for the Government of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — The Canadian Plains Research Institute, right here in Regina, has its main objective the co-ordination and encouragement of research projects for a better understanding among the prairie provinces. Alberta pays \$30,000; Manitoba is not paying this year; Saskatchewan pays \$68,000 (Manitoba and Saskatchewan's share). Some examples of the recent work are the establishment of a computerized inventory of prairie-related research projects, Can Plains data base and environmental research directory, and a kind of general update on various prairie ethnic history, culture and education. In fact, it is kind of a storehouse for these kinds of activities, on a prairie basis. We don't ask it to do specific work for us, but we have access to it if and when we require this kind of information not only in intergovernmental affairs, but in the government; or that matter, anybody does.

MR. LANE: — I have no further questions, and I'm prepared now to turn you over to the members for Rosthern and Kindersley. I thank your officials.

MR. ANDREW: — At the start of this session, I asked you a question with regard to the representations that you had made in Ottawa regarding Bill No. 43. I don't know whether that is under your capacity as the Attorney General that you act, or in your capacity in intergovernmental affairs. The bill concerns freedom of information and privacy. Is that under this department or the Attorney General's department?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — It's under the AG's department.

MR. ANDREW: — Okay, because I take it that the concern you raise is related to the release of documentation between various levels of government. Is that the area of your concern?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Yes, it's under AG. I did that as a job on behalf of my colleague AGs. I don't have that information with me. We can speak about that tomorrow, or whenever we get the AG's estimates. I have no objection to tabling that letter. I perhaps can show the member that letter privately, for that matter. It's just that it hasn't been tabled in the Commons. We were told that it was to be tabled in the Commons, and it just hasn't been tabled in the Commons. My people are telling me in the department, "You can't table it until the Solicitor General, or whoever, decides to table it." So that's the position I'm stuck in.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Attorney General, in your department this year you have the protocol office. I think this is becoming a ritual with me and the protocol officer of your department, who was formerly of the Premier's department, and so forth. It's really the grant system that is used for official functions with the government, the granting of \$3,000 or whatever the figure is, the method by which it is passed out and the regulations and rules surrounding it. I understand the rules suggest that only a cabinet minister or a high-ranking official of the government is allowed to be at a function; therefore, the grant will be given if they're there. And those are the only people the rules allow.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, I don't know if the member is asking me to confirm that that's the policy, but that's the policy. I think it's a pretty good policy.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I'm glad that now we have the Attorney General saying, "That is the policy." Then would you tell me why you send back-bench NDP members to represent you? That's against the policy, from what you just said.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — No, the issue you make is that an opposition MLA can represent the government. He can't. A government member can represent the government. My colleagues who support the government can represent the government. But I don't see how an opposition member can represent the government. I don't want to make a big deal out of this, but I just don't understand how that works. I have been to many functions where the opposition MLA is there. They call on that guy, or that gal sometimes — I've never been at one in Maple Creek. They haven't invited me to Maple Creek lately. And the chairman will say, "I call on Mr. Ralph Katzman to say a few thousand well-chosen words." But they'll call on the government to make the grant. And that's the way the policy has always been. By the way, it has never been (so far as I know) under the Premier's office. It's always been under the Provincial Secretary, or something else. It doesn't matter — it's a two-cent item. But this is the policy.

MR. KATZMAN: — First of all, let's talk about changing the policy, and let's talk about specific areas only. I'm referring to the protocol area only, in which are supposedly non-political function. What I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Attorney General, when a function is held in any constituency within the province, is the following: I agree with your policy that the cabinet minister or a senior ranking official shall be there to present the cheque for the banquet (or whatever the protocol cheque is for) on behalf of the government, or to bring greetings, and that usually means the cheque comes after. Take your choice of which way your department does it. But I also suggest if the high-ranking official cannot be there or the cabinet minister cannot be there, that the suggestion made to one of my constituents that the grant would not be approved unless one of those two arrived at the function should never ever be placed out there. Mr. Jackson knows the case I'm referring to very well.

Now that you've been filled in on what the situation is, I suggest that the second point should be that if neither of those two people can make it, the MLA of the area (no matter who he is or what side of the House he sits on) should be there to make sure that the function can qualify for its grant. I'm not playing partisan politics with that statement. If the Minister of Tourism were here, he would tell you he arrived in my constituency and I was supposed to do a function on behalf of the government, which I think all members of this Assembly were doing last summer for Celebrate Saskatchewan. We were presenting flags, pins and heritage awards on behalf of the government and that's a prime example of where members were not playing politics but were there representing the government — both this side and that side. I suggest to the Attorney General that there is your prime example of where the rule has started to be changed and I suggest that you continue it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I wasn't.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to make one point. With respect to hospitality grants, there are no politics played there. If an organization qualifies under a six-point guideline, it gets the grant and that list of information.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What are the guidelines?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — The guidelines are:

1. The organization must be non-political;
2. The organization must be interprovincial, national or international in scope.

3. The function being held in the province must be an annual meeting, convention, sporting event, or similar gathering;
4. Government assistance will be limited to once every five years for each organization;
5. A majority representation of delegates must be from outside the province;
6. The organization must be non-profit. It may not be a trade organization, the purpose of whose meeting is sales or the promotion of a product. Priority shall be given to volunteer community and charitable organizations.

If they fall within those, they get them. We have given grants to the North American Moose Conference, League of Canadian Poets, Canadian weight lifting champions, national karate champions, Grand Orange Lodge, Regina Stamp Exposition, whooping crane association, Canadian Cowboy Association (getting now more to my liking), the Waldheim Snowjammers and the Canadian Morgan Horse Club, and this just covers the waterfront.

Point number 2. I will look at the member's suggestion to see if I can implement it, but I do not want to hold out high hopes for it because I repeat again the protocol office tries . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, let him ask me. The protocol office tries to advise the MLA, opposition or government, when such a function is taken on . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We tried that. We try to notify them.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Never happens.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, okay, we only have a three-man office. So we try. But you're saying that an opposition MLA should say on behalf of the government that we're going to make the grant. I just don't see that. I'll look at it (maybe I'm missing something) but I just don't see that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, first of all, may I correct one of your statements? The opposition members are not notified. You referred to one on the long list that was in my constituency. If it weren't for the promoters of the activity being concerned that they weren't going to get the grant because they couldn't get a high-ranking official and they couldn't get a cabinet minister . . . Fortunately, Mr. Gross took the time and came, and they got their grant. Mr. Jackson knows this complaint constantly.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Ralph, I sign letters saying, "Here's the grant, good-bye and good luck." I never even show up.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Attorney General, you said just now from your seat that you sign grants and say good-bye and good luck, but then you send the member for Saskatoon Centre to represent you. You sent one of the Regina members down to Estevan (so I'm hearing) to represent you at a dog show; the other one that was referred to was a skidoo race. There is no reason, Mr. Minister, that the residing member for the constituency cannot be asked to do it, no matter what side of the House he is on. That's my argument.

If you want to play politics with it, like the backbenchers are yelling over there, fine. Stand up and say you want to play politics with the grant — let's get it over with. If you want to say that the non-political grants are meant to bring money to the area because they are holding conventions which helps every area — fine. But, if you want to make them political — fine. If you want to make them fair and just, let's do it that way. Take

your choice.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I don't know what more I can say to the hon. member. All I can say is that if the Canadian Cowboy Association (my favourite association) qualifies for a hospitality grant, it gets it. There may not even be any one there to present it. We'd like to have somebody present it. I'd like to have the resident cowboy on our side of the government go to the Canadian Cowboy Association and present the cheque. That's me. But some times I can't make it, and I have to delegate one of the other cowboys over on this side of the House.

I don't mean to make light of this. I do want to say to the hon. member that I know your point. I cannot make a commitment to that but I will look at it. We will try to get notices out to the opposition MLAs and to all MLAs when we are making a grant. But I do say, government is another thing. And that distinction must be kept central and integral. It has been when we were in opposition. And I think the ground rules are sound even when you are in opposition.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Chairman, I wish I was in the position of the member for Rosthern or wherever, so I could complain about these things, because no one from any party has been in my constituency presenting grants. And, quite frankly, I don't care who does it — just get down there and do a few.

MR. KATZMAN: — One more comment on this particular issue, Mr. Minister. I accept your suggesting that you're going to attempt to do something. I assume next year we'll be back discussing what your attempt brought forward, or didn't bring forward. But let me suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that you have your department person responsible. Just do a bit of checking about some of the MLAs last year who were presenting on behalf of the government, the Celebrate Saskatchewan flags and the heritage awards. We weren't presenting them as opposition members; we were presenting them as members of the Legislative Assembly on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan. If I'm called a hypocrite because that's the statement I'm making when I go out on the platform and present a flag on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan for Celebrate Saskatchewan, or present 75 heritage awards and say as a member of the Assembly, on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, I wish I could give you one of these awards. That's not blatant politics, Mr. Attorney General. That's representing this House and the Legislative Assembly as 61 members.

We're representing this government as 61 members: 20-some happen to be cabinet ministers or whatever, 40-some happen to be government side and the rest happen to be opposition. But our salaries are coming from The Legislative Assembly Act and so forth. We are members the same as you are. The only difference is you guys are on the government side and we're on the opposition. But, basically, we're still covered by The Legislative Assembly Act and, basically, we're supposed to be out there for the betterment of the people of Saskatchewan. Our philosophies may be different. We should be allowed to give our grants on a non-partisan basis. That's the key word. If somebody is caught playing political games, slap his fingers and tell him, "You keep doing that and you don't give out the grants." If you give them out non-politically, fine, that's a fair ball game. That's the way you should be looking at it.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make one last point on this. I think the hon. member, with all due respect, is slightly confused as to his grants. We're talking about hospitality grants. That's all I'm responsible for. Heritage grants, so-called, as

you know, were the result of Celebrate Saskatchewan. There were local Celebrate Saskatchewan committees which, on local community basis, would decide whether a local MLA would or wouldn't be making presentations. Sometimes culture and youth would have a say in it. Let's forget about that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Look, I am arguing for hospitality grants and my case for hospitality grants is that in a vast number of these cases the hospitality grant payments aren't even made until after the function is over. There's no cheque even presented. They don't know how much the expenses are. There's no big deal where the local MLA comes up there and says, "Here, I'm presenting a cheque." I mean you're making an issue out of nothing. You're manufacturing it right like this — right out of the air. So, look, I just want to tell you that the hospitality grants operation has been straight down the line, and where it covers the guidelines they get it. We do it. These are community people. They deserve the proper treatment we give them. I'll consider the hon. member's request, but you can't change the numbers on the deck. We're in government representing the government, you're in opposition representing the opposition. Now let's keep those facts in mind. Okay?

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 6 inclusive agreed.

Vote 42 agreed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW (Supplementary)

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ordinary Expenditures — Vote 42

Items 1 to 5 inclusive agreed.

Vote 42 agreed.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I think that is it for intergovernmental affairs and supplementaries. We may be stuck for a little bit of work to do, so perhaps we can get to do some clause by clause.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I would like, Mr. Chairman, to take the time of the House for just 20 seconds to perhaps embarrass a person who ought not to be or doesn't want to be embarrassed, but I will introduce him, in any event. Sitting opposite us in the other gallery is the former provincial treasurer of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. C.M. Fines and Mrs. Fines, together with their family. (I believe that's Mr. Fines' son.) I don't want, as I say, to embarrass them, but people in the province of Saskatchewan will know this person as having made an excellent and major contribution to the life of the province of Saskatchewan. I would ask all members to welcome him as a former member of this House.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (continued)

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 30

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We are dealing with the Department of the Provincial Secretary. I would have the acting minister introduce his officials.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce the acting deputy provincial secretary, Mr. Phil Flory; Earl Saunderson, who is the superintendent of insurance and Mr. Bob Leonard, the director of the provincial inquiry centre. The hon. minister, Mr. Cowley, is away on official government business today and for the balance of the evening. Accordingly, with the permission of the House, I would like to handle his estimates.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, I have a few question which I would like to ask through the Attorney General who is handling the estimates of the Provincial Secretary. I notice there are basically three subvotes here. I would like to deal with the office of the Lieutenant-Governor, and just lay out to the Attorney General some of the concerns which I have expressed to the Premier and to the Minister of the Department of Culture and Youth. I feel the treatment of the expenditures, on behalf of the Lieutenant-Governor in this province are certainly not as adequate as they are in some of the other provinces. I have asked the Premier to consider a better lodging for the Lieutenant-Governor. I don't know if you've had the opportunity to visit his suite, but I think it is not quite as adequate as we can probably provide in the province of Saskatchewan. I am sure the Premier is considering the suggestion I gave him about the use of the grounds owned by the Wascana Centre Authority at St. Chad's. I would just like to know what the expenditure of \$62,000 provides for the Lieutenant-Governor and how that compares to some of the other provinces in Canada. So, if you could respond to that?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, the \$60,000 the member refers to has three categories to it. First of all, for personal services there is \$41,280 identified, as the vote shows. For contractual services, that's broken down for an additional \$18,600. Material and supplies are \$2,510.

A detailed breakdown of that \$41,280 goes something like this: first of all, permanent salaries, \$20,265; temporary, \$4,275; casual, \$1,000; honorariums (these are for aide-de-camp and this kind of business), \$3,800, and a special living allowance of \$9,240 plus 7 per cent anticipated additional expenditures totalling \$41,280.

On the contractual side these are broken down roughly: rent of office equipment, printing and binding, \$1,500; xeroxing, \$200; repairs to office equipment, \$250; CVA (central vehicle agency rental) rental, \$12,000; phone bill, \$4,100; and telegraph, \$500, for a total of \$18,600. That's how the detailed breakdown looks. We do not have information as to how it compares to other provinces.

I can tell the hon. member that I do know what he says, however, about living accommodations. If you go to some of the other provinces, the living accommodations are, indeed, very much more substantial(if I may put it that way) or more historical than

those of the Lieutenant-Governor in Saskatchewan. British Columbia has, virtually, a mansion in Victoria which is on a hill. It's a very beautiful place for the permanent residence of the Lieutenant-Governor. I can't make any more commitments, obviously, than the Premier has given the hon. member. I know this question was raised in the Premier's estimates. I happened to be listening to them at the time. All that I can do is to say that I endorse his comments, the substance of which I take to be that they'd be examining what we could do for other future living accommodations.

I have not been to the current Lieutenant-Governor's accommodation. I don't know what kind of accommodation it is or isn't, but it certainly is not in keeping with some of the other places.

MR. TAYLOR: — I would just suggest that I am sure the Attorney General, in his words, realizes that the accommodation is not adequate. This person does a lot of entertaining. Certainly these are the things that I think we should be providing in the province of Saskatchewan. As far as comparisons, for example, there certainly was a longer British tie with Newfoundland, as we all know, until 1949. But the difference in Newfoundland is a fine residence and, I believe, a budget of about \$250,000. Now, I'm not suggesting that maybe we ought to go to that, but I think we have to be looking at the situation here. I think if we look at the budget in Alberta, and the residence there, we would see it as quite a bit more than that of Saskatchewan. I know, from visiting Manitoba, that the Lieutenant-Governor has a nice house in which to entertain dignitaries who come to that province. I think this is certainly something we should be looking at in Saskatchewan. So I will just leave it at that. Perhaps it would be advisable, seeing this is under the Provincial Secretary's department, that a comparative study be looked into, Mr. Attorney General, to just see what the accommodations are like in the other provinces and what the expenditure is. I would trust that Saskatchewan does not continue to lag behind.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I think this is a useful suggestion and I will ask, on behalf of the minister, for the department people to undertake that. I think it is useful to carry out that kind of an inventory, to analyse it, and see how we can work it into our budget and our lifestyles (if I can put it that way) in Saskatchewan.

MR. ANDREW: — I have one question. The executive administration budget is increased from \$156,050 to \$206,800. The other subheadings are the office of the Lieutenant-Governor, which I suppose could be transferred some place else, and the provincial inquiry centre which obviously serves its function. Why is the increase required in the "executive administration" part?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asks why the increase is required. There is an increase of one position, and this is essentially, I am advised, to cover, in addition to some of the Provincial Secretary duties, some of the other duties which the minister is responsible for. Now, just one moment, maybe there's some other information here. Perhaps you could just turn off the mike.

I'm sorry, I think it's even less complicated than that. I am advised that this is a transfer of the position of deputy provincial secretary from "administration," as it was in last year's vote, to "executive administration." Therefore, it really represents no actual total departmental change, but it does show an increase under the subvote "executive administration."

MR. TAYLOR: — I have a question here. (We have to share the book.) I notice that the

provincial inquiry centre was transferred in under the Provincial Secretary this year, supposedly from another department. I think we all understand what the provincial inquiry centre does, and I would say I think there is satisfaction with this service. The grant for the Lieutenant-Governor was transferred from another department. The administration, whatever that was, where there were 35.8 people last year, has gone somewhere. Was it to the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs? My question is why does this department continue to exist, and what do you do other than run the provincial inquiry centre?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, in reality, the historical strength and value of this department is well-known by hon. members. Historically it maintains the position of being exactly as the words indicated — Provincial Secretary for the province, i.e., keeper of the Great Seal, documentation, and things of this nature. At one time it was expanded when I was the Provincial Secretary, to be in effect a quasi-department of consumer affairs. What is happening here in government generally, with our government in any event, is that we are trying to streamline and to redefine the functions of various departments, thus Consumer and Commercial Affairs has redefined itself. We'll see some of the functions for the Provincial Secretary splitting off to that.

You will see, for example, provincial inquiry coming into the Provincial Secretary's department, based on a bureau of management improvement (BMI) recommendation. It is an internal bureau of management efficiency unit trying to get the various departments more efficient and doing the functions which they're geared to do. So, provincial inquiry, on their recommendation, slides over to the Provincial Secretary. It is a department which will always remain, or continue to remain, short of doing away with a variety of statutes which require a minister to be responsible for many things. They include keeping the Great Seal of the province of Saskatchewan, and other functions such as provincial inquiry and other related functions which take place. Don't forget we also have Mr. Earl Saunderson, who is the superintendent of insurance and he carries out that function, too.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You had the \$766,000 last year under administration; you're not suggesting that was the administration for the office of the Lieutenant-Governor? What administration was it? Was it a combination of several things?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — It was deputy minister's office, corporations office branch, real estate office branch, and insurance. That's what it was; all of these now have been reorganized, as the member has pointed out, to the Department of Consumer Affairs.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The unfortunate part of the way that you have done this . . . It should be of some help if you were to make the comparison of what the combination or the split-out of all of this \$766,000 is this year. What does it represent in dollars and cents in the 1981-82 subvote, since you have it in several other places now?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how we can change the form of the blue book. Perhaps we can still improve it. This blue book has undergone a lot of changes in my years, and, I think, to the better. I still don't understand person-years, for example. And the detailed breakdowns and the changes — don't anybody ask me. I don't understand that. But, generally the blue book is very informational.

Specifically, on the administration side, this has been all broken out to consumer affairs and covered off by consumer affairs, with the exception of executive

administration, as I pointed out to the hon. member for Kindersley. Now you say, "Can we not devise a mechanism which would identify where that goes when we're dealing with a department that loses it?" All I can say is that it would make sense. It would be helpful to me, too, if we could do it. I can just undertake to tell the member that I will bring that to the attention to the Minister of Finance and his department people, and maybe in the revised blue book next year we can arrange something.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Frankly, it would be very simple if you were to make a note at the bottom (and you've got blank space on that page) and say, "Well now, that department this year is covered in four other areas, and those four other areas added up to so much money." And that would be all there is to it.

MR. TAYLOR: — One last question. You're confused with those "people-years." I'm confused with those "people-years." Is there any way that there could be a suggestion that we revert back to "people"?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I don't think so.

MR. TAYLOR: — You don't think so.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 and 3 agreed.

Vote 30 agreed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW (SUPPLEMENTARY)

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 30

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

Vote 30 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 54 — An Act respecting Electrical Wiring and Inspection and the Sale and Installation of Electrical Apparatus and Material

Section 1

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you and I have discussed this bill several times. I realize that it is replacing a former act and rewriting a new act, bringing it into more modern times. I think you know I'm concerned. Unfortunately I didn't have time to contact some officials in your department, but I understand from conversations with you that this will not affect a person who is in one profession non-related to the industry, and is working as an apprentice within the industry, trying to become a journeymen on his own. Correct?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Yes, that's correct. The only restriction that is placed upon a person is that he shall not be a journeyman working for another contractor (shall we say, moonlighting) because we have had a large number of sad experiences with respect to people who have been contracting as well as being employed by another contractor. The experience has been such that it's intended that the arrangement be made, first of all, for them to hold a journeyman's licence for two full years prior to being issued a contractor's licence and, secondly, if they are in the employ of another contractor, they will not be granted a licence. But it doesn't prevent, for example, a farmer who has a journeyman's licence from going out and contracting to do the kind of work that is normally expected. There is no restriction placed upon him under those circumstances.

MR. KATZMAN: — Let me assume that somebody is working for government services as an electrician. Is he also barred . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Journeyman electrician. Government services is not a contractor and does not have a contractor's licence to my understanding. Pick any other government corporation you want that isn't a contractor. Could he have a journeyman's licence? Could he have a contracting company or is he also barred?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Well, he could have a journeyman's licence but if he is working for an employer he would be restricted. The definition of employer is 'a person who employs one or more journeymen in his business or premises he owns or occupies, a municipal, provincial, or federal building or plant,' so this would exclude that person who is a journeyman working for, let's say, the advance account of the Department of Government Services from having a contracting licence of his own. So, yes, it would, under those circumstances, preclude him from getting a contractor's licence and, I think, properly so.

MR. KATZMAN: — I think we all know that a contractor starting out has a very tough time and he may be working for government for a short period. You are now outlawing the chance for him to better himself, in his opinion, by going into private business on his own. He must cut the line (this is what you're saying now with this bill) before he will get a contractor's licence.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Those are the very circumstances that have caused all the problems that we've had drawn to our attention — circumstances where a person who has gone into the contracting business and has come upon hard times, and found himself in a position where he has gone to work for another contractor, has neglected that business to the point where, in many instances, jobs have been left unfinished, and the \$2,000 bond that has been posted has been insufficient to repair a large amount of the work that was left undone with correction orders outstanding. Accordingly, the very case that you mention is a valid one. I think, in terms of preventing that from continuing as has been the case in the past, it is an attempt to correct the problems that have been created by those circumstances.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I'm divided on this particular issue. I understand what you are doing and I agree with what you are trying to do, but I also think we are stopping a person from trying to advance himself. Unfortunately, as you have indicated, people have tried to advance themselves, and the person who ends up being burned has been the consumer who thought he had a journeyman who was going to finish the job. The guy ran into hard times, went back to working for the other guy, left the jobs behind, and the consumer ended up paying the price. And that's the reason your bill is here, and I

agree with you on it. But there is the other side. And we're back to the same argument that you and I have had several other times in the labor field — with privilege, goes responsibility.

If you want to be a contractor, you have the responsibility of making it on your own, is what you are saying. If you want to be a working man for someone else, you choose that. I have sympathy with the man trying to better himself, but I can understand the protection. And with every right, goes obligations. For that reason alone, I can go with your bill, even though there is some hesitation for that concern.

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2 to 6 inclusive agreed.

Section 7

MR. KATZMAN: — On the Crown — that means the Government of Saskatchewan and not the federal government?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — As it applies to the Crown, I understand our jurisdiction is only over the provincial government and the inference is that it applies to the Crown, which will mean it will apply to institutions such as correctional institutions in our province, which have been formerly exempt. It's been made to apply to the Crown for the first time. This act has not applied to the Crown previously.

MR. KATZMAN: — What about the federal penitentiaries? No? Fine.

Section 7 agreed.

Sections 8 to 19 inclusive agreed.

Section 20

MR. KATZMAN: — On the limited contractor's licence. What is a limited contractor's licence?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — A limited contractor's licence is one that is provided for a person who does not have a journeyman's licence, but it offers (and I don't want to nail myself down to the precision that you are asking) to a contractor a licence to work within a certain given radius — not within the confines of a city, but within a given radius. You'll find it in a large number of rural areas people are granted a limited licence when they have been able to satisfy the chief inspector that they're competent to perform that work. The reason that those limited licences are provided is that there are some difficulties in rural areas in having a journeyman close at hand without bringing him from a populated centre. Sometimes they have to travel a considerable distance in order to reach a place. Accordingly, an element of flexibility has been allowed by the electrical inspection branch and particular effort has been made by our inspectors after the installation takes place by a limited contractor to inspect them more diligently than would be the case with a bona fide contractor.

Section 20 agreed.

Section 21

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, is there any thought to requiring a higher bond for contractors?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Yes, later in the bill. My recollection is that the bill does provide by regulation for increasing above what is now (I believe it's \$2,000 at this stage) defined by regulation. It's intended to increase that bond considerably because the difficulties that we've had in a number of instances of correction orders that have been put in place because of shabby work; on occasions the contractor has walked away from the job and the bond that he has posted has been insufficient to do the corrective work, and once again the consumer suffers in the process. So I believe it's intended to be defined by regulation. It's not spelled out in the bill but it's intended that that bond should be increased from the present figure of, I believe, \$2,000.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well under 21, Mr. Minister, it indicates that you have a bond but it doesn't give an amount. That's why I was questioning it.

Section 21 agreed.

Section 22

HON. MR. SNYDER: — I can offer you a brief explanation, Mr. Chairman, to sections 22, 23 and 31. The House amendment is intended to apply to each of those. You'll note that presently The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act and regulations provide the ratio of apprentices to journeymen shall be one to one. That is, if you have five journeymen on your payroll, you're entitled to employ only five apprentices. It was intended, with the drafting of this act, to provide that on the job site it would be permissible to allow two apprentices to work with one journeyman. But it would still require that there be a ratio on the pay roll of one to one. That ran into some static and it's not a major issue. Accordingly, we determined that a House amendment should be brought forward to spell out specifically that on the job site the ratio of a journeyman to apprentice shall not exceed one to one. So, if you have one journeyman on the job site, he's accompanied by one apprentice only.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, suppose somebody is working with an apprentice and he has another fellow with him and all he does is drill the holes and pull the wire through. Is he an apprentice or is he just a laborer?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Oh, he'll probably be a laborer. You only become an apprentice when you enter into a contract with your employer. That is to say, you become indentured to your employer. You sign a legal contract with him which says that he will employ you and allow sufficient time off after you received the appropriate training to go to a trade school and then when you return you pick up your apprenticeship status. It implies also that the wages that you receive as a first year apprentice shall not be as great as in the second, third and the fourth year. So, not just by drilling holes or working with a journeyman do you become an apprentice. You're apprentice because you become indentured and enter into a contract with your employer.

MR. KATZMAN: — So, just to make it clear, there is nothing in this act (the way I understand it) that would refuse me, as a journeyman, to have an apprentice with me and five guys drilling holes and pulling wires, as long as they aren't touching the wires and hooking them up and the rest of it. Good enough, that's fair.

Section 22 as amended agreed.

Section 23 as amended agreed.

Sections 24 to 30 inclusive agreed.

Section 31 as amended agreed.

Section 32 agreed.

Section 33

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I am a little concerned on this one. Here is what it is: quite often an electrician is asked to manufacture something on the site for a specific purpose. For example, somebody wants a string of lights. So he cuts out a board and puts in 10 little Christmas tree-type holders and puts the bulbs in. Is that allowed by this? It is not certified by any lab or anything and yet quite often he is asked to put up that special row of lights or something along that line. That's the concern.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — The only way I can respond to that is to refer to the definition section which says:

- (i) "electrical equipment" means any apparatus, appliance, device, instrument, fitting, fixture, machinery, material or thing used or capable of being used, in or for the generation, transformation, transmission, distribution, supply or utilization of electrical power or energy.

The definition section defines electrical equipment as being quite broad. So, I presume that when it prohibits the manufacture, then it would prohibit the sort of thing that you are suggesting, I would think, with good reason, because the manufacture carrier with it the requirement for CSA (Canadian Standards Association) approval to manufactured equipment sold in the province; accordingly, I think the intent of the section is clear for that very reason — preventing hazardous materials being brought into the market without any inspection.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you don't have your officials, so I am not going to be too technical. But I understand that, if he takes approved parts and puts them into some type of apparatus, he is okay. It is when he totally invents the parts (like the part the bulb goes into and those areas that aren't approved) that the problem may arise. In other words, if it's the part that's carrying the current it has to be approved, but if it is some kind of a holder or a box for it, it doesn't have to be approved under the present act. I would assume that the present situation will continue in this situation.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Well, as the section indicates, if the equipment has been approved or certified by a prescribed testing laboratory, then it is authorized to be used; if it's not, then it's not authorized. I don't know how I can be any more precise than that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KATZMAN: — Let me put the question differently. The old act is pretty well the same. So, everything that was legal under the old act is now legal.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Yes, that's right.

May 13, 1981

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay, that's all.

Section 33 agreed.

Sections 34 to 52 inclusive agreed.

Section 53

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I have a question on section 53. When do you expect to put this act into force? We may proclaim it within the next day or two but when will it take effect?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Well, it comes into force on the day of assent. I guess when his nibs gives the bill the royal nod it come into force. When royal assent is given, it comes into force, as section 53 indicates.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just using the days off work, for example, the two days in a row — that still isn't in force even though his nibs gave his nod almost a year ago. So this bill will go into force as soon as he gives his nod?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Unless there is a provision which proclaims sections of the bill separately, the entire bill comes into force upon royal assent; there's no exclusion from it.

Section 53 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979

Section 1

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I have one question concerning Bill No. 83. I understand that what it does for benefits really doesn't go that far back. It's really for the future. It doesn't cover the people who had accidents many years ago, as we discussed during your estimates.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — No. As a matter of fact, that is not the case. It is intended, first of all, to increase the level of payments to injured workers, some of whom were injured many years ago. And it will provide that those injured workers who were 100 per cent disabled, and were previously receiving a minimum of \$505 a month and are not yet 65 years of age, will receive \$580. If they were injured back in 1932, and their pension was quite small, the minimum they could have received prior to the passage of these amendments, which will be retroactive to last January, would have been \$505. Such a person, if he is under 65 years of age will receive then, as a minimum pension, \$580, or an increase of \$75 a month.

If the persons is over 65 years, and is in receipt of other pensions, such as OAS (old age security) and Canada Pension, it is based on the income maintenance objective. Accordingly, the increase will be from \$505 to \$530 or an increase of \$25 a month. So, it does take into account, particularly, those people who were injured under the old act. That's one of the ingredients.

MR. KATZMAN: — That's strictly since January 1, 1980 — not prior to that?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Either I'm not understanding you or you're not understanding me. It will take into account all of those workers who were receiving a pension of \$505 a month or a portion thereof. But any payments to them will be made retroactively. It will be January, February, March, April and into the month of May. They will receive retroactive payments to January. But anyone who was injured in 1932 will receive the benefits also, and they will be retroactive to January of this year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Thank you, you've now clarified for me. Basically, as is done on a lot of pension plans, this bill is saying that you can't have the benefits of old age pension as well as workers' compensation to get you over a certain amount. If you get a senior citizen's pension, we deduct your pension by a certain figure, and it can't exceed a certain figure. Am I correct?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Well, you'll know when we pass the new act, The Income Maintenance Act. We arranged for an integration of CPP (Canada Pension Plan). Because we're talking in terms of income maintenance and because the employer is the only contributor to workers' compensation, he alone pays assessments to workers' compensation. In addition, the employer makes a contribution to Canada Pension Plan. Accordingly, if they were not integrated, it would appear as though he were being charged double, and the emphasis at this stage is on income maintenance rather than a reward or a payment to a person as a result of percentage of disability that he suffered as a result of an industrial accident. It's a new emphasis, which is devoted particularly to the purpose of providing for income maintenance.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I have just one other comment here. I'm with you on the bill. I understand what you're doing. The maintenance idea is a good one. I've argued against some pensions which use the deduction system, but I can understand why you're doing it here. The one concern I have relates more to the fees charged to employers than to this particular bill.

I suggest when we have a surplus in the fund that we do one of two things. The process now has been to increase the benefits to the injured worker, if there are more funds available. But we should also start to look at other categories, where you may have one excellent employer who has no claims, and another employer who has many claims, grouped together for a schedule. I realize it's difficult to do it any other way. The only thing you could do is give a benefit to somebody who is considered a safer employer. Now, it's a judgment decision, very tough to administer, and you will probably have headaches when you try to administer it, because somebody's going to say, "Well, I've never had any," but, wham, he has a bunch of them. How do you handle it? It is a problem.

I suggest that your department in its study of the situation, when there is a surplus of funds and it is not necessary to put benefits out, see if there's a way to bring the lot of the workers' compensation pension up to a better standard, because he's falling behind. We should consider a benefit to the employer who is really making that effort to save us all money by being extra cautious and extra safety-oriented. I think it may help decrease the number of accidents, if the employer gets a financial benefit for being a good employer and making sure his men are safe.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — I thought the member was aware of the fact that we had

incorporated into the whole arrangement, something like a year ago, a merit rating system. Employers had the opportunity, as a result of a three-year period of good performance, to qualify for a 25 per cent rebate of assessments paid by that employer. That's in place at the present time, and it's under close examination, because it carries with it some hazards too. Perhaps in some circumstances an unscrupulous employer might be inclined not to report accidents or attempt in some way to keep his accident reporting down, and accordingly enjoy the benefits of a lower assessment. But you'll appreciate that any assessment that is lowered is lowered on the basis of a collective element of responsibility because of the need to group employer categories together. So, by the magic of numbers, they can share responsibility. Otherwise, a small employer could be wiped out, virtually, as a result of a disaster where, for some reason, a dozen of his employees were killed and he was required to pay that assessment on his own. So it is a system of collective liability and I don't think you can escape from that.

You'll know at the same time that because of the health of the fund, because of the earning power as a result of high interest rates, there have been a large number of substantial reductions in the assessments that have been paid, not only from the standpoint of a good record of performance but also because of the records of performance of the fund and the earning of the fund. We raised it from a position in 1971-72 of being desperate to the point of being financially buoyant at this stage. We are able to not only provide increased benefits but also lower assessment to employers even in a time of inflation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you were on a radio program and your gentleman in charge of workers' compensation was on a radio program. I believe it was CBC "Open Forum" it was called. The question was put to you about opening the files of workers' compensation people as has been order in British Columbia. I know that Mr. King made the comment that in some due course that may happen in Saskatchewan, but he was concerned with medical information being on the file as well as injury information. Is there ever going to be a time when the form will be designed so that kind of medical information will not be on it but strictly information re the injury? Maybe the advocate outside your office, be it the ombudsman or somebody else, will have the right to look into the file other than just the staff of the workers' compensation?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — I expect that may happen sometime. I'm somewhat reluctant to see it happen right now for all of the reasons I have discussed on other occasions in this House. Let me give you an example of a worker who believed that he was suffering as a result of a back injury when he was diagnosed as having terminal cancer and both his family and his M.D. believed that he was not emotionally suited to be given that kind of information. If he had records made readily available to him, I suppose he might have suffered some trauma that both his doctor and his family believed he should not have been subjected to. I think it has some really difficult features to it.

I suppose at some stage in the game if the member for Rosthern decides to screw up his courage and make an amendment to the act on his own saying that medical records should be made available to the injured worker, I might have to consider it but I think both you and I have some real qualms with respect to making them available. I think if I had the full support of all members of the House, I might be inclined to agree.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, even I agree with you but there are some things that are there. That's why I asked if the time will ever come that the form will be written in such a way that that fellow with cancer, which his doctor hasn't told him about, will not be on the record of workers' compensation and therefore he can see his workers'

compensation record. I agree with you. It's a dilemma and it is a tough position to put your people in and that is why I suggest maybe there is a way to allow a third person in but not the employee of workers' compensation. A third person may be the first step we take, bring in the independent person. I don't know if that is the answer because it is a tough thing and I don't mean the advocate. I mean a third person who is not an employee of workers' compensation either directly or indirectly. It's a suggestion that I leave to you. That's the last of my comments here and maybe down the road there may be a system — the ombudsman or somebody else.

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2 to 7 inclusive agreed.

Section 8 as amended agreed.

Sections 9 to 11 inclusive agreed.

Section 12 as amended agreed.

Sections 13 to 22 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 74 — An Act to Amend The Income Tax Act.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 101 — An Act to Amend The Personal Property Security Act

Section 1

MR. LANE: — My comments (and I've advised the Attorney General of this) . . . He has given me the courtesy of allowing me to discuss the amendments with his officials, for which I've thanked them in the past. I've also suggested to the officials and the Attorney General that my co-operation may be ending, if we're going to be bringing in significant substantive changes to this bill in the future. It's a very significant change to personal property security in the province of Saskatchewan. It's a tremendously complex field. I know that practitioners are going to take a year or two to get their minds around how it operates and the effect of it. I know the Attorney General understands this.

I'm just very concerned, when we have a bill of this complexity which affects so many people, that we are not in the position of making substantive changes every year because that's not good for anybody. If we can't do it correctly at the outset, then perhaps it would have been better to leave it for a year or so. It's a bill (as I've indicated) I'm prepared to co-operate and expedite proceedings, but there comes a time where I think everybody's going to be ill-served if we start with the attitude, "Well, every year we can bring in substantive changes, and they're going to go through." I just don't think that serves anyone well to get into that habit.

I'm going to make a suggestion to the Attorney General and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. There has been a group of people that I believe has been

missed on the training for the implementation of this bill, and that is not just lawyers, or those involved in the financing industry (I include in that the banks). To date, by and large, we have been dealing with officials of the lawyers themselves. And there are a great number of staff — secretaries, finance officers, and so on — who are not concerned with the concepts or the legalities, but are concerned with the procedures. Under the act I would urge the Attorney General and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs that officials hold the same meeting to brief other people who may be interested in the act. I think you would be well-served to do that. I am suggesting a change in concept; in other words, all that they want to know is how it operates, what forms they have to fill out and why. And I strongly suggest that a series of those meetings be embarked upon.

I would also make another suggestion to both ministers. Once the bill starts to operate, there will be questions like those that arose from the meetings of a year ago and through to the meetings that were held recently. People started to become more familiar and started to have different questions that they missed the first time around. I suggest to you that by September you're going to have a significant number of new questions coming out from practitioners on this bill, and I think that you would be well-advised to hold a series of meetings again in September and October for practitioners and, again, those concerned with the operation of the act.

So I'm suggesting two things: another series of meetings, because of the new problems or questions that will come up; secondly, a series of meetings for secretaries and those that are involved in the procedures of it so that they can become familiar with it.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member makes a good suggestion both ways with respect to this bill. I will do my best not to come back to this House with substantial changes to this legislation without having a very good reason for it. Even then it may not be sufficient. Secondly, on the question of training, I will take that up with my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs, and see what we can do.

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 97 — An act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed.

Section 10 as amended agreed.

Section 11

MR. LANE: — I wonder just on that if the Attorney General would be prepared for his estimates tomorrow night, in dealing with Court of Queen's Bench, to advise me tomorrow and bring the information with him as to the number of officials in the various registrar offices around the province, the amount of overtime that they're spending, and the change in the number of positions over the last couple of years. I gather there is a significant change in the number of staff and I'd like to proceed to question on that. I'd

like the Attorney General to be able to answer tomorrow night.

Section 11 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 105 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act

Sections 1 to 17 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 106 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 111 — An Act to amend The Condominium Property Act

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 98 — An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed.

Section 4 as amended agreed.

Section 5 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 99 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 108 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act

Sections 1 to 15 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Moroz is here. There is the assessment act, which went through. I don't want to push it, but if you have no questions about it, you didn't get very much . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, that's it. We're not calling it a day. That's good. Let's deal with The Saskatchewan Assessment Act then, by leave, and we'll get that out of the way.

Bill 109 — An Act respecting the Assessment of Real Property, Businesses and Special

May 13, 1981

Franchises

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed.

Section 8

MR. LANE: — Is there any change on section 8 with regard to who pays the cost of any assessment?

HON. MR. KAEDING: — No, Mr. Chairman, there is not.

Section 8 agreed.

Sections 9 to 48 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 54 — An Act respecting Electrical Wiring and Inspection and the Sale and Installation of Electrical Apparatus and Material

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments now be read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — By leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 83 — An Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments now be read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — By leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 74 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 101 — An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I move that this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 97 — An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — By leave now, I moved this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 105 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 106 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 111 — An Act to amend The Condominium Property Act.

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 98 — An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — By leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 99 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

May 13, 1981

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 108 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act

HON. MR. KAEDING: — By leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 109 — An Act respecting the Assessment of Real Property, Business and Special Franchises

HON. MR. KAEDING: — By leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

DEPARTMENT OF TELEPHONES

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 38

Item 1 (continued)

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would you like to introduce your official?

HON. MR. CODY: — I'm the only guy here.

MR. LANE: — I think on April 7 the estimates were adjourned on item 1 of the Department of Telephones. There were several requests for information regarding the minister's foray into Brownsville, Texas, not too far from the condominium. I remember the condominium only because the recollection was jogged by reference to the condominium act tonight, otherwise I wouldn't have remembered about the minister's condominium in Texas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't own one in Texas. I wish I did now. I just really hope SGI isn't insuring them down there; that's all I ask. There are a lot of tornadoes, floods, sand storms, lizard infestations — all of which are not covered under the SGI policy.

The minister responsible for SGI says that turkeys are covered; Texas turkeys are covered down there; I hope that's now what he is referring to.

The question arose, of course, from the fact the minister's trip to Brownsville, Texas was in relatively close proximity to the minister's winter residence in Texas. So we asked you to supply us with certain documentation; we asked you to be able to tell us who arranged the meeting (so-called Amtrak meeting) in Brownsville; we asked you to supply us with the airplane tickets and the receipt vouchers and that's how the matter ended at 10:05 on April 7. Are you now prepared to supply the information?

HON. MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the question actually was asked of me to supply this information. At the time that the estimates rose at 10:05 on that particular day, I didn't happen to be the person who was responding; it was the Provincial Secretary. Consequently, I can't tell you whether the Provincial Secretary has supplied you with this information or not. I certainly don't have any additional information to give you, other than answers to specific questions you may have. If I can answer them, I will; if not, I'm not going to be able to do that. But I don't have any vouchers or anything like that. I think the questions were asked at the time when the Provincial Secretary rose to his feet and indicated that he may have additional information. I'm not sure of that. I haven't spoken to him for some time about that situation, so I can't answer the question for you.

MR. LANE: — Who would have the vouchers and the information requested April 7 — the airplane tickets and receipt vouchers? Why would have that information?

HON. MR. CODY: — Well, I'm not really certain who has it. I know that under the Department of Telephones I can enumerate the expenditures that we've had for last year. I don't see anything of that nature in the Department of Telephones estimates. I can enumerate to you, also, the coming year that we are estimating for. I can give you those figures, but they're not in there either. So, I can't really tell you who might have those vouchers. I think the Provincial Secretary may be able to answer that question, but I certainly can't answer the question for you.

MR. LANE: — I'm quite prepared to go through the whole scenario again about how the matter arose. The matter arose from a return filed by the Department of Telephones as to the out-of-province trip. That's where the questions arose in the Department of Telephones estimates. Now, the return came in; we asked for some very specific information with regard to the return. I'm quite prepared to adjourn the estimates again, until you're prepared to supply the information that we requested — the vouchers and the tickets. Now, they've got to be in the government somewhere because the return was filed by the Department of Telephones. The very fact that it may be late in the session is not an excuse (as far as I'm concerned) to come in here this time of night and not have the information requested on April 7 — well over a month ago.

HON. MR. CODY: — Well, again I have to just tell the hon. member what I said a moment ago. I answer for the Department of Telephones and the Department of Telephones has a very small budget, as you well know. The expenditure was not made out of the Department of Telephones and I cannot answer the question for you. The return, I think that you are referring to, was made by the House in last year's questions that you people put forward. It was made and put forward by the Provincial Secretary. He was the person who indicated to you that there might be a possibility of giving you some information. I'm sure that if he has information that he can give you, he will do so.

I certainly don't have any information in the Department of Telephones that I can give you. I don't think you can expect me to have that information when I, in fact, don't have it. It's not possible to give you that information when I don't have it. I can give you last year's expenditures, if you'd like to have them (in the Department of Telephones) and I'll give you all of the expenditures. They're not difficult to enumerate. There is no expenditure of this nature in here. I don't know how I can possibly be asked to give you a ticket or an expenditure of a trip which simply doesn't show up under Department of Telephones.

May 13, 1981

Outside of that, I can't do any more than tell you that if you'd like to have that information, I'm sure that the Provincial Secretary, who filed the return, will be quite happy to try and answer any type of question that may arise. I simply can't do more than that for you. If you wish, I will give you the expenditures for the Department of Telephones. If you want them, I can give them to you.

MR. LANE: — We'll certainly take them. You indicated that you are responsible for the Department of Telephones. I don't care how big the department is. The return which was filed indicated the out-of-province trip. I'm prepared tonight to adjourn the estimates so that you can talk to the Provincial Secretary and bring the information back tomorrow. If you bring the information back tomorrow, I'll give you the assurance that the estimates will go through in very short order. We requested that information, and I simply want the information. Now the minister has had ample opportunity, over a month, to give us that information.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I think what I'll do is call for the committee to rise in a few minutes and perhaps the Minister of Telephones and the Provincial Secretary, who had a response in this, can consult.

I don't know if ticket stubs or ticket vouchers are available. I know he asks for that. Perhaps what he really needs to have is definitive expenditures on that particular return of dollars, etc., because it would be the word of the government and if it proved to be erroneous or false, that would be very serious indeed. I think I know what he wants and under those circumstances, I'll have the two ministers consult.

CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

SASKATCHEWAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS — Vote 53

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 53 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:23 p.m.