

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature
21st Day

Monday, March 21, 1977.

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to, on behalf of my seat-mate, Mr. Bailey, the Member for Rosetown-Elrose introduce to the Assembly through you, 25 Grade Eight students from the Rosetown Division 3 School. They are seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Torwalt, and Mrs. Corronet. A member of our caucus will be meeting with them this afternoon. On your behalf, Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend to them a very warm welcome and I hope their day is interesting and informative and we wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Legislature a group of 72 Grade Eight students from the Weyburn Junior High. They are sitting in the west gallery with their teachers Mr. Jim Nedelcov and Mr. Larry Balog, and the bus drivers, Mr. Dwayne Anderson and Mr. Gary Baniuck. I hope to meet with these students at 3:00 on the second floor, Mr. Speaker. I am sure it is our wish and the wish of the Members of the Legislature that their stay here proves educational and pleasant and certainly that they have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature a group of 55 Grade Eight students from St. Anne School located in Regina North East Constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Moski, Mr. Bernhauser and Mr. Kerster. I do hope that their stay this afternoon in the Legislature will be a pleasant and rewarding experience and will assist them in their Social Studies. It is my intention to meet with the students at about 3:15 in the Members' lounge. Again a warm welcome to the students and teachers.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

BEEF MARKETING BOARD

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — A question for the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in light of the massive rejection of the beef marketing board concept in neighboring Manitoba, where 77 per cent of their beef producers rejected this concept, will the Minister give

this House the assurance our beef producers will have a direct say by means of a free vote as to what system they may or may not desire prior to implementation?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I think I have indicated quite clearly what we are prepared to do. We have said that the farmers in the country are now discussing the problem and they will be making representations to me eventually. If they do not, I would expect that they wouldn't expect any action. When they bring some proposals to me, we will look at them and see what our activity would be.

MR. BIRKBECK: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you have indicated that you have had discussions with various farm organizations. Can you advise this House which farm organizations if any, have endorsed your beef marketing board concept?

MR. KAEDING: — We have never, Mr. Speaker, got to that specific point. We have had a large number of discussions with a number of farm organizations and they are discussing various methods which they might look at marketing. To this point, they are looking at marketing boards, they are looking at commissions and at other methods of improving our marketing situation. I think that is as it should be.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. You have continually imposed programs on farmers such as the Land Bank, the Hog Marketing Commission, and the Load Limit Policy without giving the farmers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, I'll take the next question.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. The Minister just indicated that discussions are going on with various farm organizations. Will the Minister tell this House, one organization that you are presently discussing a proposed marketing board with, specifically? Is it the Stock Growers' Association, is it the NFU, is it the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool? Let's get down to specifics. To whom are you talking?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I think I am open to representations from any group, any farm group which wants to discuss the marketing situation with me. At this point in time I know that there are a number of farm groups out there which are looking at various ways and means of handling a different kind of marketing agency. They have not to this point brought anything to me. Although we have had general discussions with them, we have not been discussing with them any specific plan.

MR. THATCHER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister in essence telling this House that rather than asking them for proposals, are you inviting proposals?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I think that I have made that fairly clear in the past, that I have asked farm organizations to bring proposals forward. I am waiting for those proposals.

LABOUR DISPUTE - CORY MINE

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation. As Mr. Speaker will be aware there is labour dispute at the Cory mine. I wonder whether the Minister would indicate whether it is the intention of the Government to use the grievance procedure which is written into the contract which would permit the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to obtain damages against the union for this illegal wildcat strike? As the Minister no doubt is aware with exactly the same union Dominion Bridge followed that course of action recently on a similar wildcat strike and obtained damages against them. I wonder if the Minister is contemplating that kind of action, or whether as a result of the Government involvement and perhaps the approach of the Government being involved in the union that you reject that proposal as a possible way of resolving this matter and bringing some labour peace and getting back into production.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Potash Corporation): — Mr. Speaker the Government is not at present contemplating any action. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Management is handling the dispute with the Steelworkers, they haven't made any such recommendation to me. I don't think that the Dominion Bridge pattern is one that the Government of Saskatchewan would necessarily or even likely follow.

MR. MERCHANT: — A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, would the Minister then not agree that the, as he puts it, "the Dominion Bridge pattern" is the pattern that private enterprise would follow as they try to do the best job they can, running the company, to do as well as they can for their shareholders. And that because the Government is involved, with a particular political bias, that as a result of that you are precluded from taking certain kinds of actions that private enterprise would take. I wonder if the Minister would not also agree that this is just a sign of some of the disadvantages of government being involved rather than clipping coupons the way private enterprise would.

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think if one examined the disputes of a similar kind between private companies and trade unions, one would find in the vast majority of circumstances that private companies did not follow the example set by Dominion Bridge.

MR. MERCHANT:— Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I think the Minister would find from people within the trade union movement that Steelworkers was the only union in the by-election to support the Government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I'll take the next question.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I would like to follow-up and ask of the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. Could he please tell me what he considers to be the public interest in this dispute, the protection of some \$130 million investment of the people of Saskatchewan, or the protection of the union itself which is now involved in a wildcat strike and is illegal?

MR. COWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is quite obvious. The public interest from the point of view of the Government of Saskatchewan as the shareholder in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is to make sure that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan works in the best interest of the people of this province. It may be that the Member has a different view as to how that best interest can be served. It is a grievance that the union chose to strike on rather than to take up the various options that were open to them within the contract. Obviously the management there is considering the options which are open to them. Certainly if the management has some recommendations to the Board of Directors or to myself as chairman, we will consider them. At this time I am not directly involved, neither do I intend to become directly involved, until such time as the management have a proposal for me.

MR. MacDONALD: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that this points out the dilemma that faces the NDP Government of Saskatchewan, a marriage with the trade union movement in a political sense and the dilemma of protecting \$130 million investment which demands maximum production in order to repay that and to derive some kind of a profit on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with the Member opposite that there is any dilemma there. I don't see any dilemma at all any more than an entrepreneur such as the Duval Corporation when it was the owner of that particular mine faced similar problems from time to time and I may say they sometimes acted in ways I agreed with and some I didn't. The matter of union negotiations and labor management relations is a complex one and I think that the Member opposite suggesting simple solutions and simple political attacks upon the corporation demeans this Legislature and himself.

POTASH CORPORATION OF SASKATCHEWAN - CORY

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — To the Minister responsible for the Potash Corporation. There were allegations made by the union involved of poor management in the PCS Cory. I am advised by the industry that in the four month period that the Government has taken over PCS Cory that their sales are less than 50 per cent of those of Duval in the previous four month period just before the Government purchased. That, in fact, the Government potash mine is running into severe market rejection of PCS potash

that is not the lack of concern of the Government something to do with the fact that PCS Cory has seriously overproduced, and I shall give those figures, and that at the present time storage capacity is being fully utilized and that a shutdown is in fact beneficial to PCS Cory?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I disagree with those statements. I think if one checks the figures I maintain that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has maintained its fair share of the market and further that the inventory position of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan compares very favorably to other Saskatchewan producers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary.

Would the Minister not admit that figures of comparing the two four-month periods from July 1, to October 29, the time of the takeover and then October 29 to the end of February indicates that PCS Cory, in the four-month period, produced approximately 40 per cent more than did Duval in its four-month period prior to takeover. That in fact there was serious overproduction and perhaps the union is correct in its allegations of very poor management of PCS Cory?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is obviously no. On the one hand we have the left or the right wing as the case may be of the Conservative-Liberal Party over there arguing that we are incompetent and can't produce and then we have on the other hand the Liberal-Conservative Party over there saying you are doing a terrible job, you produced 40 per cent more. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Members opposite had better get together. They had better tell the same story, because you can't be incompetent for not producing enough and incompetent for producing too much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — The Member for Qu'Appelle, say ah ha!, I'm comparing the four months from October 29 to now versus the four months from July 1 to October 29. Everyone knows that shipments in the fertilizer industry are cyclical. If the Member wants to make a fair comparison he would compare October 29, 1976 to now versus October 29, 1975 to now. If the Member chooses not to do that he is playing with figures.

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister.

Would the Minister not agree that the current labor dispute at the Cory Mine, while perhaps over a relatively innocuous matter, could not be construed by the labor movement involved in the potash industry as being a test case to see just how the Government is going to react in such a situation and indeed what leverage the Government is going to use on the Potash Corporation if any, or whether they are going to come out in favour of their well-known supporters of the trade union movement?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member opposite is embarrassed because of the lack of trade union support for his party, but I want to tell the Member that I think that all trade union disputes are viewed by the trade union movement, particularly that involved with any industry as in a sense a test case. If one wants to take that general approach, obviously it's somewhat of a test, as every dispute is a test.

MR. MALONE: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I will move onto the next question.

RURAL MUNICIPAL BOUNDARY CHANGES

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy).

I wonder if the Minister would assure this Assembly and the people of rural Saskatchewan that he or his Department will not bring about any changes to the boundaries of rural municipalities unless these changes are asked for and agreed upon by the local government involved?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, neither the Government nor the Department have any plans whatsoever for municipal boundary changes. I think I responded to that question earlier in this House. I understand, however, that SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) at their convention in Saskatoon did pass a resolution to do a study on boundary changes and I think that our position is that it's a matter for them to look at and we are leaving it with them and will look forward to the recommendations of the study.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I understand the RMs did pass a resolution that they wanted no government interference and that they would look after their own study. Has the Minister any doubts at this time what the real feelings in rural Saskatchewan are as far as rural boundary changes or load limits after the results of the SARM convention?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

BEEF MARKETING BOARD

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, if I might direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding).

The Minister I am sure has done a great deal of work upon the feasibility of a cattle marketing board. I wonder if the Minister would inform the House on the percentage that the Government believes cattle marketing would cost over and above

the current sales system? The Egg Marketing Board, for instance, costs about 10 per cent and I wonder if you believe that cattle marketing would be in the 10 per cent range?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I think the Member asks a hypothetical question. There is certainly no way that I could put a dollar or a cent figure on that kind of a question. I do know though that the figure he talks about of 10 cents extra for marketing eggs is not a valid figure. It is certainly one that some opponent of marketing boards has put in his mind and is certainly not valid. And I know that our studies have shown that we could very well provide greater revenue for our provincial producers through a marketing board than without one.

COMPARISON PRICES FOR POTASH

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I should like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for potash.

You asked for a comparison. You thought my previous figures were not fair. In the same period of time Alwinal Potash Mines produced approximately 290,000 tons of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I'll take the next question.

BAYDA INQUIRY

MR. MALONE: — A question to the Minister in charge of Mineral Resources.

Mr. Minister, there is an article in this morning's Leader-Post in connection with the comments you made, I gather over the weekend, about the Bayda Inquiry and upon reading the article I think the proper inference from it, if you were quoted correctly, would be that the Amok Development would likely proceed notwithstanding the findings of the Bayda Inquiry, and I ask you now whether you were quoted correctly in this particular story, if you have seen it. If that is the case would you not agree with me that you are to a great deal undercutting the Bayda Inquiry and what they can be doing if on one hand you are saying notwithstanding what the Inquiry says Amok can proceed?

MR. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Well, Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I do not believe that any statement that I have made as Minister of Mineral Resources has any influence on the ability of the Bayda Inquiry to carry out its delegated responsibilities. I did state, I have not seen the statement that the Member refers to in this morning's Leader-Post, but I did state that the Amok Mine was in a different situation than with other proposed mines in the province, or other activities of exploration that may lead to mining ventures in the province. I say that because the negotiations and the discussions between the Amok operations and the Government of Saskatchewan have been going on for quite a number of years. They have been fully aware that the position of the Government is to hold an inquiry in

regard to the establishment of these kinds of operations. The inquiry during those discussions was limited to identifying environmental concerns, safety concerns and then undertaking to make recommendations to the principles of the operations, in this instance Amok, the safety or precautions that would have to be taken in order to guarantee that this operation would not be detrimental in any way to either the environment or the safety of those who live in the community or work in that mining operation. When the Bayda Inquiry was structured it went beyond that jurisdiction. It also made reference to broader implications which may bring about some observations in regard to the continued expansion of uranium mining in Saskatchewan, a moratorium if you wish.

My statement was that with the Amok operations, because of the investments and because of the groundwork that they had achieved up to that point that any moratorium or discontinuation of expansion of uranium mining in Saskatchewan would have to be treated differently in their regard, not necessarily other proposed or assumed uranium mines.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Have you had communications with Amok in that regard, that is, written communications, and if so are you prepared to table the communications that you have had?

MR. MESSER:— No, I have had no written or verbal communications with Amok. In fact, I have not conveyed to them - and Mr. Speaker I want to say that this whole situation is hypothetical, we are assuming that there may be some recommendation from the Bayda Inquiry which may bring about a reason to consider moratoriums or discontinuation of uranium mining in Saskatchewan. That is purely hypothetical, therefore, I have not had a discussion with Amok in regard to what the Government's position may be if such a recommendation came. I conveyed to the press that if, and their inquiry was, if a moratorium came about where would this leave Amok. I conveyed to them as far as the Department of Mineral Resources and myself as Minister was concerned I would have to recognize that we did not talk to them about any such implications during the development of the mine up to this point in time. I think that they have to undertake to surmise from that whatever they wish. I believe that at this point in time they have decided, as the Member is aware, to delay further development until the recommendations of the Inquiry are known to the Government.

MR. MALONE: — A final supplementary. Mr. Minister then is there any agreement between Amok and the Government prior to the introduction of the Bayda Inquiry as to the development of resources in Saskatchewan, that is, is there any written agreement between the two parties and furthermore are you in a position, or have you considered your position if the Bayda Inquiry does recommend the moratorium on the development, as to whether you will be paying damages to Amok for the investment that they have already made, which I believe is something in the order of \$35 million?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, let me say firstly, that there is no formal agreement. I believe that there is an understanding

between the Government and Amok, that they are to oblige themselves to recognize the recommendations of the Bayda Inquiry or for that matter, the recommendations of the Government in regard to environmental and safety concerns. That, I think, is the understanding that they have. There is no agreement nor understanding in regard to what might happen if the proposed moratorium is to be considered.

Further, I have to say that I have not nor has the Government turned its attention to what obligations the Government might have, if any, if there is a moratorium declared on uranium mining. I recognize, fully, the \$30 some odd million plus that Amok have already expended in regard to that particular mining development, but I do not believe it would be wise at this time to allude to what the position of the Government may be, because, again, I say it is purely hypothetical to assume that a moratorium will come. The Government, I think, would have to consider that after it came before it would consider what its position may be.

URANIUM EXPLORATION

MR. MacDONALD: — I should like to direct a question to the Minister. The other day he got up in this House and bragged about the \$20 million, if I remember correctly, that the Saskatchewan Mineral Development Corporation is investing in uranium exploration. What will be the position, or why will the Government make a commitment of \$20 million in the uranium industry in northern Saskatchewan, when the Bayda Commission Report is not in, when they might recommend very serious environmental hazards, and what will the Minister do with the Government's \$20 million commitment if the Bayda Commission recommends a moratorium?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Member had been listening yesterday when I gave second reading to the Sask Mining Development Corporation speech I said that we would be undertaking to expend \$20 million in exploration and development. It should not be assumed that that will all go to uranium exclusively. There will be an exploration and development program for other non-renewable resources as well. There will, yes, be a significant amount of that \$20 million directed towards exploration development this year, a good percentage of that, if not all of it, was already committed. In other words, the exploration and development had been instituted in previous years and commitments had been made with other private individuals or parties that we were joint venturing with to carry out a certain level of exploration and development to a certain stage. My officials informed me that if we were to make a decision to curtail all exploration for uranium because of the Bayda Inquiry, it would quite likely cost us as much, if not more, to undertake to renegotiate or break our agreement with some of the other people who were involved in this exploration program. So at least, for this year, it would be financially prudent to undertake to continue to explore until we reach the termination of agreements that had been agreed upon prior to the announcement of the Bayda Inquiry.

COMPARISON PRICES FOR POTASH

MR. G.J. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister

had asked for a comparison that on comparable terms Alwinal produced just slightly less in the same period of time as PCS Cory and Duval, but sold approximately 40 per cent more in the same period of time; that of the sales that PCS Cory has made they are, as I have said, less than 50 per cent of comparable sales by Duval and in fact of the mines production, two-thirds of the sales are by Duval. Is the Government aware of the very strong market rejection of Government potash and if so what action is the Government taking?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the Member before I don't know where he is getting his figures from but undoubtedly there are some in the potash industry who would like to cause as much difficulty, I am sure, for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan as possible. I am sure that the Member for Qu'Appelle is nothing more than one of their agents. I want to say to the Member that I don't accept his basic premise, that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is meeting a strong rejection or, indeed, much rejection at all or much animosity in marketing its potash and, therefore, his question is unanswerable because the basis on which it is made is incorrect.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise us . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I take the Member for Shaunavon.

ROLL BACK OF LEASE FEES

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Because of the many requests from the advisory committees of the community pastures and depressed cattle prices, have you considered rolling back the lease fees to the 1975 levels?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, the lease fees on private leases are reduced substantially from 1976.

MR. ANDERSON: — A supplementary. I didn't mean on the community pastures. From the advisory committees of community pastures that have written in saying that they feel that community pastures grazing fees and whatnot are too high and I am wondering if you have considered rolling them back?

MR. KAEDING: — No, Mr. Speaker, there has been no intention of moving back community pasture rates. I should like to point out to the Member that our costs in community pastures are increasing all the time and we have held the rate, this year, to the same rate as last year. You will notice that the Federal Government PFRA pastures increased their rates by 3 cents a day and we didn't do that.

BEEF MARKETING BOARD

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the Minister not agree that cattle marketing will only be effective in raising a return to the cattle producers if it is possible to pass on higher costs to the consumer. I suggest to the Minister, in the other example of total control, the Wheat Board, we have seen as a result of the national cheap food policy, wheat sold for less than the cost of production for many years in this country. Would the Minister not agree that we might be putting ourselves under the control of that kind of cheap food policy and, secondly, does the Minister not feel that this kind of legislation might be in contravention of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, again, he is talking about something hypothetical, because we have no plan yet that we are proposing and to this point I don't have any recommendations for such a plan.

MR. MERCHANT: — What about GATT?

MR. KAEDING: — Under the GATT arrangements we could, if we had a national meat marketing agency, we could very well deal with the GATT situation. In the present situation we cannot, because GATT does not permit us to set prices differently in Canada than it does in another country unless we have a supply management program. If we had an organized beef program in Canada, then we could overcome the GATT problem.

SECOND READINGS

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — moved second reading of Bill No. 67 - **An Act respecting the Restraining of Animals from Running at Large**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to accomplish several purposes including the following: Firstly, it protects property, be it land, buildings, crops, grain or feed, shelter belts and so on from destruction by animals that may be unlawfully running at large. It streamlines the administration of the Act by providing more latitude in the appointment of pound keepers and the disposal of animals in line with the present day practices and needs. Furthermore, it charges RM secretaries or administrators with the actual administration of the restraining and impounding procedures and relieves pound keepers of the responsibility of accounting for public funds. It prevents harbouring of stray animals by requiring if the animals are restrained by a finder that their discovery be reported immediately. It ensures the proper and humane care of animals that are restrained and impounded.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the original stray animals Act grew out of the customs of the early settlement period in the province's history. At that time open range was the rule, but with the influx of settlers and with the development of farmsteads the demand to restrict the movement of livestock under the sensible and prudent premise that open grazing should be utilized and it would have been a waste of a valuable natural resource not to have grazed unused areas where possible. During these early settlement days a great deal of land was

also vested in the Crown and was considered free to those who could utilize it for open grazing. The original Act provided that all lands within the provincial boundaries of the province be declared open for grazing subject to the wishes or requirements of individual municipalities to place restrictions within their own boundaries. It was designed to accommodate herd owners with primarily horses and cattle when animals running at large did not constitute a serious inconvenience or hazard to others. Conditions today have changed greatly, most of Saskatchewan's land is now utilized for one purpose or another. The density of cattle is much greater and there is need to place more onus on the livestock owner to confine his animals on the property of which he has control. At the same time it recognized that there are certain areas of the province in which it may be desirable to permit free grazing seasonally or even permanently. The new Act provides for this possibility.

A recent survey revealed that more than 90 per cent of the municipalities of the province have exercised the option available to them under the present Stray Animals Act to declare the areas within their boundaries to be closed to livestock running at large. In response to this evidence the new Stray Animals Act will restrict livestock running at large in all areas within the boundaries of the province but will provide authority for individual municipalities to declare open herd areas where such action is in keeping with the wishes of the ratepayers. The new Act is therefore, more in keeping with current farming practices. At the same time the new Stray Animals Act will give more authority to municipal councils and municipal administrative staff. These agencies will not only be responsible for the appointment of pound keepers and the designations of places to be used as pounds but will also be responsible for the disposition of strays found within the boundaries of that municipality.

Under the present Act pound keepers are difficult to recruit because of their duties which involve record keeping, posting of notices, collection of fees, sales advertising and auctioneering when unclaimed animals were sold. The new Act places the administrative duties on the municipal secretary or administrator who are responsible for impoundment and the eventual disposition of the stray. Unclaimed strays may be transported to the most convenient market and sold through the facilities there by auction at the end of a 14 day impoundment period. Moneys received become the responsibility of the municipality to be distributed through the municipal office.

The new Act provides an opportunity for the finder of a stray to report the discovery to the owner and to attempt to come to a satisfactory arrangement for the removal of the animal. It also provides protection for the owner of the stray in that the finder is required to report immediately to the owner upon discovering of a stray. If satisfactory terms cannot be agreed upon by the finder and the owner, the finder must notify the secretary of the municipality and ask to have procedures initiated for impoundment and eventual disposition of the animal. If the owner of the stray is unknown to the finder then the finder is required to notify the RCMP at the time of discovery in addition to notifying the secretary or administrator of the municipality.

During the period of restraint between the time the stray

is discovered and is either removed by the owner or is impounded, the finder may assess a fair charge against the owner for expense incurred during the period of restraint. In addition the municipality may level a penalty against any owner who is negligent in removing a stray to lawful premises when requested to do so by the finder. On the other hand protection is afforded to the owner in that the finder is required to deliver the stray to the owner upon receipt of payment of the assessed charges any time during the period of restraint. This section will provide an opportunity for the finder and the owner to arrange for a satisfactory solution in the recovery of a stray without resorting to the inconvenience and embarrassment of impoundment procedures.

The new Act provides for greater flexibility in the appointment of pound keepers. Subject to the consent of the finder, the finder may be appointed pound keeper resulting in less inconvenience where several animals may have to be transported a long distance. In areas where it is not really possible to appoint pound keepers or to designate a place to be used as a pound, arrangements may be completed to provide for impoundment of animals at the nearest livestock auction market. This has significant advantages in that facilities are designed to accommodate confinement of a number of animals and staff is available for care and feeding duties.

Communication procedures are streamlined with current practices. Notices may be sent by telephone rather than by registered mail, providing for a simplified and more rapid means of communication between the finder and the owner.

The new Act will provide for a series of routine penalties. It will also be an offence to harbour, transport or sell a stray in a manner that is not in accordance with this Act. This is simply rustling and I am sure no one likes to condone that practice. The major concern is to prevent unreported strays from being offered for sale with animals which are legitimately being offered for sale.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the support of many farmers and several producer organizations, notably the Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. I am pleased therefore, to move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments in regard to this particular Bill. I was quite happy to listen to the Minister's comments in this regard. I would, however, ask leave after a few brief comments to adjourn debate on this particular Bill because there are a number of things which I would like to check out, particularly in regard to Section 35 in which the repeal of the Stray Animals Act and The Open Wells Act will become effective.

Many aspects of the Bill are certainly welcome. Speaking as a grain producer much more so than a cattleman, the fact that there will now be a closed herd law throughout the entire Province of Saskatchewan is certainly welcome. I have had an opportunity to talk to some of the members of the Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association and other ranchers throughout Saskatchewan with regard to this Bill and as the Minister has

said they are generally in agreement with the content of the Bill.

Some of the aspects of it that I am not clear on and that they are not clear on is the fact that the Minister can overrule a decision that is made by a local RM Council. I am speaking in regard to the authority that is now put into the hands of RM Councils throughout the province that they can now determine as to what will happen in regard to their particular municipality or section of their municipality as to whether the herd law is open or closed. I would like to check this out further. As well what is the position in terms of the municipality, the rancher and farmer in regard to property that is owned by the Crown such as provincial highways and municipal roads? Does the council have jurisdiction over this or is any animal which accidentally crawls outside of a fence and finds himself on highway property or municipal property, automatically considered a stray or does any preceding by-law passed by the municipality authorizing open herd law rule that animal out of being classed as a stray in case that should happen.

As well the liabilities which may occur to the owner of a property in case that particular municipality does agree to pass a by-law enabling open herd law would certainly mean that the farmers involved within that particular municipality are going to have to spend a considerable amount of money to protect their particular property in terms of granaries, farm buildings, dugouts and wells and so on. So the onus again would then be upon the farmer to ensure that his property is adequately protected from any animal that may wander on to his particular property if the RM does pass open herd law. Here again the cattleman is not held liable for any damage that is done and if the fence is not constructed according to what the Act reads as a lawful fence the property owner then of course is liable for any damage that happens to his particular property as well as the damage to the particular animal.

Possibly many of these questions can be answered once we get into Committee of the Whole. However, I would like to have the opportunity to consider the Minister's comments and the Bill a bit further and beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — moved second reading of Bill No. 57 - **An Act to amend the Public Service Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill that is before us today contains a number of amendments to The Public Service Act which as Members will know legislates a system whereby Provincial Government departments and agencies administer the salaries and working conditions of their employees. Because the performance of our public service employees is a prime factor in the importance of maintaining good government, we have introduced a number of important and positive changes to improve the legislation which affects them.

Under the new provisions of the Act people between the ages of 60 and 65, Mr. Speaker, will be eligible for work in the public service on a permanent basis and will therefore, receive the full range of benefits which accrue to all other

permanent government employees and we regard this as a major step forward, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that in days gone by a person over 60 was not able to become a member of the full time public service. They will now be eligible to receive vacation leave, sick leave, superannuation benefits and most important, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to advance to a higher position. Up to now these people have been employed on a temporary basis and have not been eligible for such benefits. We are therefore, deleting Section 20 of the Act which we feel discriminates against those people who are still of a great benefit to our society and have a generous contribution to make.

Mr. Speaker, in another positive move we have removed legislation under the Act which requires all new Government employees to take a medical examination at their own expense before they can be placed on permanent staff. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that after an employee has worked in a position for a pre-determined probationary period that he or she has already demonstrated his or her ability to perform the duties of that position. We have therefore, amended the legislation to provide that an applicant or employee will take a medical examination only when there is some doubt that he or she is unable to perform those duties. In such cases, Mr. Speaker, an employee who is asked to take a medical examination will be able to select a physician from a list maintained by the Public Service Commission. All expenses for the examination will be paid by the agency that requests the examination. I am sure that the Members will agree that this is a more efficient and more equitable method of handling medical examinations.

Mr. Speaker, we are also amending the Act to provide for flexible probationary period within the public service. We have decided that present legislation requiring probationary period be of six months or one year duration is too rigid and it doesn't give consideration to the amount of time required to learn a particular job. Discussing these matters with the union that represents the Government employees it became clear that these probationary periods must be made more flexible. It became obvious that some provisions in Government were just so complex that all duties could not fully be learned in a six month or even in a one year period. The proposed amendment will therefore, provide for longer or perhaps even shorter probationary periods and will also provide for the extension of a probationary period in certain cases. This latter change will be particularly important in cases where employees have not met the minimum requirements for his position after the normal probationary period but he would likely do so if he were given a little more time.

Mr. Speaker, we are also deleting Section 17 of the Act because this Section is outmoded and provides Government employees with special concessions such as free-housing accommodation and living-out allowances. This provision has not been used I am told in the memory of those people on the Public Service Commission at present.

Section 15 of the Act, Mr. Speaker, is also being amended to comply with current methods used by the Public Service Commission to determine pay ranges for out-of-scope employees within the public service. This is presently done through consultation with the Public Service Commission, with department

heads and groups of employees within each department in order to reach a satisfactory salary arrangement for out-of-scope employees.

The current reading of the legislation requires that the Public Service Commission in arriving at salaries for out-of-scope persons must deal individually with each employee in each case. This method, Mr. Speaker, was found by employees and the Commission to be cumbersome and was a cause of long delays in reaching settlements and agreements. The new legislation simply allows the Public Service Commission to consult with groups of employees rather than with each individual employee.

Another amendment would delete subsection (2): — of Section 15 of the Act which states, “that all salary ranges for in-scope employees must be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council”. However, Mr. Speaker, since section 58 gives a designated Member of Cabinet the authority to enter into collective bargaining agreements for in-scope employees on all matters, including salary ranges, ratification by the Lieutenant-Governor we believe is unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, Section 37 and 39 of the Act deal with dismissals or demotions of out-of-scope employees and their right of appeal. Under existing legislation an employee who has been laid off or demoted and whose appeal has been upheld by the Public Service Commission has a right to be re-instated or to be employed in another position. Under the new proposed legislation these employees may now be eligible for additional forms of settlement such as a lump sum cash payment.

Mr. Speaker, the re-wording of Section 35 in the printed Bill states that if there is a shortage of work in a department the department head may lay off permanent employees. However, in order that the Public Service Commission can make every effort to re-employ these people, present legislation requires that a list of all dismissals must be submitted to the Public Service Commission 30 days before the dismissals take place. The new legislation no longer requires the Public Service Commission approval for permanent lay-off. However, it will still be a requirement for permanent heads to provide a list of the employees laid off as early as possible in order to facilitate the employees' re-employment rights.

Changes under Section 27 states that the department heads are no longer required to report the hiring of people on a casual basis. This merely confirms what is actually happening in terms of existing practices.

Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the Act as it stands, casual employees may work a total of only 26 days in a two-month period. Because of the short-term nature of the casual work we feel it is unnecessary for these cases to be reported to the Commission.

For the information of Members opposite a new subsection is being added to Section 5 of the Act. This is basically a housekeeping amendment which will allow the chairman of the Public Service Commission to formally delegate a number of his duties and powers to one of his employees. The legislation simply gives to the chairman of the Public Service Commission the same powers given to any head of any government agency namely, the power to delegate to others in his department the signing of certain documents and letters related to daily

routine matters.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Section 42 is being amended simply to tidy up the wording of the section and will not in any way alter the powers given to the Public Service Commission. Mr. Speaker, this is a general revision and a tidying up and making more workable and readable the Public Service Commission Act, and I think there are incorporated in the Act a number of progressive amendments to the Public Service Act. I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Would the Minister permit a question before he takes his seat. Is the effect that the temporary positions will in fact become permanent positions, is that one of the effects of the Bill. I didn't pick up what you said about the temporary, could you explain it to me, I am somewhat confused.

MR. SNYDER: — I am not sure that I have the question, Mr. Speaker. The Bill does not say expressly that . . . you are talking about the age 60 provision . . . Those who are in excess of age 60 may now become permanent employees who were unable to become permanent employees, enjoying the benefits of sick leave, superannuation and the like. It is between the ages of 60 and 65.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say much and I don't propose to adjourn the debate. I think that the legislation could be divided into four categories, not in order of presentation in the Bill. But there are some minor technical changes and what the Government chooses to do as an employer in dealing with its employees certainly is up to the Government it seems to me.

Secondly, I approve of the change regarding the medical examination, and third I of course approve of the change regarding employees from 60 to 65. We are beginning too much both in private enterprise and in public service employment to have a prejudice almost against employing the elderly, which is a dangerous practice that seems to be developing.

The one area that concerns me and concerns me even more that this Minister would be presenting that argument, is the increased length of probationary period that is contemplated. I wanted at the same time, Mr. Speaker to address a few comments to the way the Government when people move from one area to another within government subject the employee to working through a new probationary period in that new employment. I find it frankly surprising that that Minister a Minister out of the trade union movement would be attempting to justify for the Government an increasing length of time required for probationary periods.

If the Minister thinks about exactly what he said, I think he may start to feel that he is sounding like some of the more reactionary businessmen with whom he was dealing from time to time. It is a bad employer and a reactionary employer who suggests that they need lengthy probationary periods. The Minister said that there may be occasions when period of longer than six months or a year may be required. Those longer

periods may be required because it takes longer than that for people to learn the job. That's the kind of argument that employers from time to time will adopt and they tend to be the employers who get into the most difficulty with a trade union. A probationary period, Mr. Speaker, is not designed to train somebody on the job. A probationary period is designed for the employer to decide whether that employee will be capable of functioning in the job, doing the learning that is required and then going on to being a good employee. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that periods in excess of six months which are probably the longest probationary periods I have ever heard of, I don't think that periods in excess of six months and in excess of a year should be necessary. I am surprised to see an NDP Government suggesting that they should be.

It really comes down, Mr. Speaker, to the Government thinking, well the employee need not fear anything from us because after all, we claim to be employee conscious and we'll deal with our union in a fair and honest way. But that's exactly the same argument that any businessman would give that any employer would give, because the perception of what is fair is always different from the point of the view of the employer as opposed to that of the union and the employee.

Mr. Speaker, the other area that works from time to time great disadvantage to people within the public service, is that they are persuaded for one reason or another to leave a position where they have tenure and where they are protected by their agreement and they take a promotion or they move to another department. Then in that other department, they get into a personality dispute, perhaps they get into problems with the deputy minister or whatever, and they get fired from that other position. They find themselves fired during a period of time when they were on probation. Within private enterprise and where the union is perhaps more aggressive in dealing with the company, once you have gotten through the probationary period you can move from one area to another and you continue to be protected. The Sask. Gov't Employees Assoc. for whatever reason has not been able to negotiate such protection for its employees. Again, I suppose the Government would say, well, we fired them because we were being fair and because the man wasn't trying to adjust. I know for instance, Mr. Speaker, of a couple of examples that have now gone to litigation, and I have had something to do with some of those actions.

Those people then find themselves faced with a technical legal argument. Even though they have been employed for 10 or 12 years with the Government, they find themselves told that you were just on probation in that new position. I ran into a case the other day of a person who for over 20 years worked for the Grey Nuns Hospital, has now been fired, by the Government after the Grey Nuns Hospital changed ownership. He was persuaded to switch to a different area, persuaded to give up the security that he had, was on probation and was fired during the probationary period. He really doesn't have the protection that was intended to be afforded to them. Because Mr. Speaker, the SGEA tries very hard to get along with government, I think that government, the employer particularly with this government in power, has an extra duty to bend over backwards not to take advantage of the employees that work for them. I think that the probationary

changes are very bad changes that it indicates a government as employer and indicates employers who aren't able to decide as quickly as they should, a person should not be left hanging for a year or more to decide whether he is going to be able to get along with that employer or not. A good employer can make up his mind more quickly than that. It is not a question of whether or not he has learned all the job, the question is whether the employee is capable of learning. A good employer and a good department should be able to decide more quickly than six months, never mind elongating that period of indecision.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, just a couple of comments on the Bill, I don't share the same views as the Hon. Member to the right. I think that the Commission should have the discretion of determining what is a fair probationary period on a particular job to be performed. I can see positions in the public service which are extremely technical, requiring specific expertise. To assess that person, six months may well not be enough. I would hope that the practice does not follow on the other side that we are moving in the majority of cases to eliminate or reduce to a nominal amount the probationary period because, should that happen obviously the number of civil servants in the province is going to increase dramatically.

In 1972, I introduced a Bill in this Assembly to prevent discrimination by reason of age. It was rejected by the Members opposite, perhaps such legislation would have made certain provisions of this Bill unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I think that putting the people into the permanent civil service at age 60-65, may in fact prejudice their hiring. If a manager in government is faced with certain budget restrictions that may be where he tightens up. I think that assuming this section to be passed that in fact there may be greater difficulties for those over 60 being hired, than is at present. I think the answer to the problem quite frankly is as I suggested in 1972, and that is an amendment to the appropriate legislation to prevent discrimination by reason of age. I think it is time for it and time for it in this province. I think it would be incumbent for the Government opposite to take that approach and establish it in our legislation preventing discrimination.

We of course ignore a very basic problem, with the age 65, one that we are going to have to come to grips with in the province, and that is, whether or not we even maintain a compulsory retirement age. We in Saskatchewan have the highest percentage of senior citizens in the ratio of population, per capita population in the Dominion of Canada. We are going to have to deal with that problem and it may well be that it would again be in order for the Government to consider legislation reviewing any compulsory retirement age at age 65.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the Conservative Opposition to support this legislation in principle.

MR. SNYDER: Just a brief word or two in closing the debate, Mr. Speaker. I think in general any specific questions of a detailed nature can best be handled in Committee. I must say that I was rather surprised that the Member for Wascana

(Mr. Merchant) was surprised that I was bringing forward some amendments to the Act which he believes are somewhat out of tune with the previous thinking that has been expressed in this Legislature by myself. I have to say to him that I don't believe that any attitudes being expressed at this point are inconsistent with those that have been expressed by me in the past. I don't believe there is any intent, Mr. Speaker, to do anything other than that which I had indicated when I delivered my second reading speech in terms of providing the person who was applying for a job and filling the job during a probationary period the opportunity to more properly learn that job and regardless of what the Member for Wascana says, there have been select cases where the employee given a little more time would have been able to adjust to the job to do a job which was acceptable to his superiors and accordingly a somewhat longer probationary period would have been in order. But at that point in time it was necessary for the permanent head to make a judgement as to whether that employee would be kept on that job on a permanent basis or whether he would be dismissed. We think in a number of instances this has worked to the disadvantage of the employee, and accordingly he was released from the job during his probationary period because he had not had sufficient time to convince his immediate superior that he had the skills and the aptitude to fill the job on a permanent basis.

I should tell the Member also that there has been some rather extensive consultation with the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association, and my understanding was that they registered no particular concern with respect to the extended period during probation. I say it is not inconsistent with the views that I have held in the past.

I think it is a good Act. As the Member for Qu'Appelle indicated, it brings forward some messages that I believe are becoming more and more important in Saskatchewan in terms of providing greater opportunities for those people who might be regarded to be nearing the end of their productive years by still allowing them the opportunity to become gainfully employed in a department of government and make their contribution. I think it is a good Act, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — moved second reading of Bill No. 71 - **An Act respecting Boilers and Pressure Vessels and Steam, Refrigeration and Compressed Gas Plants.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a rather routine Bill which has some changes in it which will be directed to the House, but it is a piece of legislation, which replaces the former Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act. It is an attempt to reorganize and to update a traditional piece of safety legislation so as to make certain that our provincial standards continue to reflect both a genuine concern for safety and the proper utilization of our ever changing technology.

The Boiler and Pressure Unit of the Department of Labour which administers this Act does so as part of the Occupational Health and Safety Division. Its purpose is to provide minimum safety standards with respect to the design, the construction, the installation, and operation and maintenance of most boilers

and pressure vessels in the province. As such it is dealing with various gases and fluids and solids which may be flammable or toxic or explosive and therefore, require close regulations and guaranteed high standards in their handling.

The Boiler and Pressure Vessels Unit periodically inspects all pressure vessels and boilers in Saskatchewan. All new designs including designs for related equipment are approved by the Unit before they can be installed.

In addition to this all power engineers and fireman who will be operating the equipment are examined and also licensed by the Unit. This represents an extensive instruction program and this is indicated by the fact that during the fiscal year which ended in 1976, over 11,000 inspections were made. Included in this number were 370 new boilers, 1,374 pressure vessels, 37 refrigeration plants, which were installed in the province. In addition to this every new design of a boiler or a pressure vessels is checked for compliance with the regulations before it can be constructed. Last year this meant checking plants for 295 new designs.

The program of inspection of equipment, plus this systematic examining and licensing of operators has proven reasonably successful over the years. I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that any one accident is one too many, but I think that it is a credit to say that in Saskatchewan, last year, there was only one major accident in which one person was injured as a result of a failure to control equipment.

I should like to describe, very briefly, the kinds of changes which appear in the Bill that we are considering this afternoon. A great many of them simply involve clarification or rearrangement so as to make the provisions more easily understood. I see no particular need to deal with those changes in detail.

There is a new Section added to the Act covering what is known as a guarded plant. This refers to a boiler or a steam plant which is equipped with protective devices that shut down boilers when troubles develop. They have audible and visual alarms, which automatically signals to those who are protecting the plant. This new Section takes this modern technology into consideration and will allow plants with this type of specific automatic control to operate with less personal supervision than has been the case in the past.

A new Section 3 is concerned with the calculation of capacity for boilers, steam plants and refrigeration plants. As with so many aspects of our lives these days we see the invasion of the metric system. Virtually all measurements have been rewritten in metric terms and instead of horsepower we have less colorful, but practical kilowatts; instead of square feet we have square meters and so on.

Several Sections of the old Act have been deleted from the new one because they are more adequately covered elsewhere. Certain safety regulations, such as those dealing with the location of adequately equipped first aid kits, for example, now appear in the Occupational Health and Safety Act and they are no longer necessary in the Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act.

March 21, 1977

Another reason for some of the deletions is that the regulations in codes are often more practical ways to cover details such as working pressures and hydrostatic tests.

A reworded Section 24 appears in the new Bill, Mr. Speaker, designed to allow an inspector to use radiography examination for checking out a weld rather than cutting a section out of it to test the unit in that way. This is another example of technological advance.

A Section which deals with the scope of the various certificates granted to operating engineers have been revised to include refrigeration qualifications. In the past, steam engineers received separate certificates, one indicating competence in the techniques of managing heating systems and in another using much the same methods, being directed towards refrigeration systems. Since the training courses are thoroughly compatible, this kind of amalgamation will not only simplify training, it will also ensure that more competence standards are maintained.

The Section of the Bill dealing with of fences and penalties has also been updated, bringing them in line to those comparable to the Federal Boiler Act and to the Alberta penalty provisions and with other provincial jurisdictions also.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier this Bill is an updating of some traditional safety legislation that has been about the province for some time. As you know the Department of Labour has responsibility for administering a number of these Acts which are designed to reduce the risks associated with such things as fire and radiation hazards as well as the installation of gas, electrical and elevator equipment, plus The Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act, which we are discussing today.

These are all part and parcel of the Occupational Health and Safety Division's responsibility to protect the health and safety of people at work. It is our policy to keep all legislation under continuous review so we may be certain that it is relevant to safe and healthy working conditions as well as relative to current technology. This latest Bill is a further example of the Government's continued concern for the welfare of its citizens.

I am pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 71.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. E. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — moved second reading of Bill No. 60 - **An Act to amend the Partnership Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this legislation containing the provisions to amend The Partnership Act is necessary because the registration of partnerships and trade names will be transferred to the Business Names Registration Act, 1977. The amendments contained in this Bill are the minimum required in order to effect the transfer. The purpose of this is to have The Partnership Act complement, but not duplicate the requirements under The Business Names Registration Act and the amendments are designed to achieve that objective.

Both this Bill and The Business Names Registration Act, 1977, will, if enacted, come into force on January 1, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments are basically consequential to The Business Names Registration Act and I would, therefore, move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — moved second reading of Bill No. 69 - **An Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act, 1968 (No. 2)**

He said: Mr. Speaker, under The Municipal Hail Insurance Act, 1968, the Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association has been limited in the amount it may appropriate from its reserve funds for the purpose of replacing its office building. The amount was established many years ago at \$200,000. The Association has acquired property on which it plans to construct a new office building this year and has asked that the Act be amended to make funds available for that purpose.

The amendment relates the amount which may be invested for the purpose to five per cent of the book value of the assets of the Association. The amendment is similar in this respect to that applicable to insurance companies under the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act of Canada and under The Saskatchewan Insurance Act.

The Association's total assets exceed \$16 million, which will allow the Association to hold real property for office purposes up to a value of up to \$800,000. Any appropriation, however, may be made only after a resolution for the purposes approved by two-thirds of the delegates present and voting in an annual general meeting of the Association.

Mr. Speaker, before moving second reading of this Bill, I want to indicate that the people from the Municipal Hail Association have been talking to me and asking if we could move this Bill along as quickly as possible. I don't want to rush it through the House if some Members have some questions or wish to debate it, but I will ask if it is approved for second reading today, whether or not by leave we can move into Committee of the Whole. However, I want to indicate that I have made obviously no commitment on part of the Members. If it is possible it would facilitate the Municipal Hail people, if not we will bring it up as quickly as we can get to it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 69.

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should just advise the Minister that we will consent to second and third reading today if it is the Minister's wish.

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Caucus will certainly facilitate in any way we can to help this Bill through.

Motion agreed to and Bill read to a second time.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health): — moved second reading of Bill No. 70 - **An Act respecting Ophthalmic Dispensing in Saskatchewan.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to explain the principles incorporated in The Ophthalmic Dispensing Bill.

I should like the House to know that The Saskatchewan Guild of Ophthalmic Dispensing requested the Government to develop some legislation to legalize and regulate the practice of ophthalmic dispensing in this province. The Bill before us is the result of very extensive discussions between the formerly organized Ophthalmic Dispensers of Saskatchewan, who are represented by the Saskatchewan Guild of Ophthalmic Dispensers. In addition the Department of Health heard a large number of independent ophthalmic dispensers; those dispensers who are not in any way aligned with any large national or international companies. Further, many discussions were held with the ophthalmic dispensers, in our province, with the Saskatchewan Optometric Association and the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

This Bill is supported by all of the groups I have mentioned. The licensing and regulation of ophthalmic dispensers will provide some needed protection for the residents of Saskatchewan as they receive eyeglasses and contact lenses.

Perhaps the public is not generally aware that in Saskatchewan at the present time anyone off the street may decide to call himself an optician or an ophthalmic dispenser or an eye glass specialist or a contact lens specialist and this individual may establish a business to fit and sell individuals eye glasses and contact lenses. This person may have no qualifications whatsoever to undertake those activities. The public has no protection against any malpractice of those individuals. Indeed, at the present time the dispensers of eye glasses and contact lenses are technically an “illegal” health discipline in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In the interest of the public the Government believes that all dispensers of ophthalmic goods should be subject to examination, appropriate educational standards, licensing and some discipline.

The rules for dispensing eye glasses and contact lenses should be spelled out in law and regulations and where necessary ophthalmic dispensers ought to be subject to appropriate supervisory mechanisms.

We hope, also, that by legalizing ophthalmic dispensers and by setting reasonable standards of performance and examining for those standards by providing educational upgrading courses and other forms of continuing education, the ophthalmic dispensers of the province will be much better able to evolve as a health discipline into closer working relationships with ophthalmologists and optometrists in the province.

In years to come we hope to see an eye care team emerge in our province rather than having three individual health disciplines working independently and sometimes at odds with one another.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice in this Act that we have separated the dispensing of eye glasses from the dispensing of contact lenses. All of the health disciplines who participated in developing this Act believe that there should be more precautions and stricter rules applied to the dispensing of contact lenses than to eye glasses. We believe that an ophthalmic dispenser should first be qualified to dispense eye glasses. In the case of contact lenses, after an individual has the credentials as a qualified dispenser of eye glasses he may write a special examination and ascertain whether he is qualified to dispense contact lenses. If the dispenser passes these examinations he will be known for the purposes of the Act as a contact lens technician.

He will be permitted to dispense contact lenses when they have been prescribed by an ophthalmologist, an optometrist or other legally qualified medical practitioner so long as the contact lens technicians abide by detailed dispensing practices which will be outlined in regulations pursuant to the Act.

The Department of Health has been discussing the detailed regulations with all of these groups in the province and has been doing so for many months.

I have been told that work is well advanced and the development of reasonable but strict rules for dispensing contact lenses. There are a number of special problems with respect to bringing ophthalmic dispensers into a full self-regulating state. There has to be a transition period where some board is established to oversee the initial development of the examinations and licensing process until sufficient ophthalmic dispensers are licensed to form their own governing association.

This Bill proposes that during the transition ophthalmic dispensers will be regulated by a transitional governing board appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The transitional governing board will be responsible for establishing licensing requirements, standards of practice and for otherwise governing and regulating the practice of Ophthalmic dispensers.

In the interim period during which the transitional governing board is functioning, all ophthalmic dispensers in Saskatchewan will be examined. Those who immediately satisfy licensing requirements will be awarded full licences. Those who require further training will be issued provisional licences valid for no more than two years. These provisional licences would allow dispensers to practice under strict controls while they are obtaining the qualifications necessary to obtain a full licence.

The reason for these provisional licences is that no grandfather clause has been built into this Act. A reasonable time has been provided for ophthalmic dispensers to become educationally upgraded so they may be fully licensed.

Nevertheless, if an ophthalmic dispenser requires educational upgrading before he has a full licence to practise and if he is unwilling to take this upgrading after two years, he will not be eligible to practice in Saskatchewan at all.

We should mention that the Department of Continuing

Education will make available to the ophthalmic dispensers the necessary educational upgrading to enable all ophthalmic dispensers to be fully licensed. After a period of time which cannot exceed more than 18 months, a sufficient number of ophthalmic dispensers will have acquired full licenses and the transitional governing board will be able to turn over its responsibilities to an organization to be called Saskatchewan Ophthalmic Dispensers Association. Only holders of full licences will be members of that association. Ophthalmic dispensers will then have reached full self-regulation status. Even when the self-regulating association comes into existence, this Bill does provide that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may appoint one or two persons from the general public as full members of the council if it is considered to be advisable.

This Bill contains important other features that ensure the practice of ophthalmic dispensing will be regulated in the public interest. Licensing will be by examination only. Examinations will be conducted by an independent examining board. The transitional governing board will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Regulations enacted by the transitional governing board and later by the Saskatchewan Ophthalmic Dispensers Association will become effective upon approval of the Minister.

Further the Minister will be empowered to request the transitional governing board of the council of the Saskatchewan Ophthalmic Dispensers Association to make, amend or repeal a regulation. If such a change is not achieved in 60 days of the request, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is empowered to impose such changes as are necessary.

The Act provides important safeguards for ophthalmic dispensers. In examining and licensing, all ophthalmic dispensers will be treated equally. Ophthalmic dispensers requiring upgrading training will be provided with such training on a fair and impartial basis. Ophthalmic dispensers who are initially unable to fully meet licensing requirements will not immediately be denied the right to practise and will be allowed a reasonable period of time in which to obtain full qualifications. Appeal procedures for ophthalmic dispensers right through to the Court of Queen's Bench have been provided in the Act.

Mr. Speaker, I should tell you that I have received letters and other communications from some ophthalmic dispensers in Saskatchewan who are not affiliated in any way with one or another of the large firms in Canada which deal with optical supplies. These dispensers are concerned that one or another of these large firms might take control of the Saskatchewan Ophthalmic Dispensers Association and the examining process, in order to drive out business of these independent operators. I would like to assure the independent ophthalmic dispensers in our province that this Bill does indeed contain many features that protect their interests. As this Bill has been developed and altered, I have been very conscious of the need to protect independent dispensers to provide features in this Bill to ensure that it will be administered fairly and impartially.

To illustrate some of the features which will ensure impartiality and protection for those independent dispensers who are anxious about the motives of the largest firms in the ophthalmic goods industry, I would like to list a few of the

safeguard features.

An entirely new dispensers association will be established as a regulatory body replacing the present Saskatchewan Guild of Ophthalmic Dispensers. For an eighteen-month period, prior to the new association assuming power, the Act will be administered by a transitional governing body with the seven members on the board appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The transitional governing board will establish the first examining board and will oversee the initial examination process. This board will also establish the first licensing requirements and conflict of interest regulations. These regulations and those which will follow when the Saskatchewan Ophthalmic Dispensers Association comes into effect will become law when the Minister has agreed with the regulations and publishes them in the Saskatchewan Gazette.

Furthermore, if regulations made by the transitional governing board or by the Saskatchewan Ophthalmic Dispensers Association are considered to be contrary to the public interest, these regulations may be overturned or amended by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Licensing will be by examination only and there will be no grandfather clause. Licensing examinations will be conducted by an independent examining board. Dispensers who fail to meet initial licensing requirements will be allowed to practise for two years under provisional licences while they are undergoing upgrading training programs, offered by the Department of Continuing Education.

Dispensers, I note again, will be entitled to appeal. This appeal will be made to the special three member tribunal, headed by a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the legitimate concerns of the independent ophthalmic dispensers in our province have been protected in this Bill. These dispensers need not fear biased treatment which might be directed at them, by large national companies which try to influence our Saskatchewan licensing process.

I'm confident that The Ophthalmic Dispensers Bill represents an important achievement in the establishment of co-operative relationships between all members of the eye care team.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore, move that this Bill be given second reading and be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I have not too much to say on this Bill because there are many clauses I should like to discuss in the clause by clause study. I want to discuss very briefly two or three of the major principles and say first of all I have no objection to the Bill. The reason I have no objection to the Bill is, I think, a rather obvious one. It would appear to be in the public interest to upgrade the ophthalmic or whatever it is that the Minister of Health tries to pronounce, that I have been unable to pronounce any better than he has. It

would appear to be in the public interest to upgrade the dispensing of eye glasses and contact lenses etc. in the Province of Saskatchewan. In fact, in some cases I think that perhaps the Bill doesn't go far enough. But I think it's a good beginning and a good initiation of a policy to try and ensure that people who go to ophthalmic eye people, will receive at least a basic requirement for general protection of themselves and their children from the services that are supposed to be provided.

I also want to comment on the provisional licence. In most cases a bill of this kind provides for a grandfather clause. And, of course, the reason for the grandfather clause is rather an obvious one, that people who have been in a business or have been in a service for 20 or 30 years and do not have the paper or academic qualifications as required by a new act or a new piece of legislation, but have learned by experience over a period of service, and are usually granted an exception and permitted to practice under the Act. However, I kind of like the provisional licence in this case, simply for the fact that because it is health, because it is something as important as eyes, it does provide the opportunity for these people to practise provisionally for two years, with the idea or the concept that they will then be forced to upgrade themselves through the services provided.

I'm interested to hear that the Department of Continuing Education will provide for courses and classes which will make the upgrading possible. In other words that it will be provided by the Continuing Education and the Government will finance this so that it will be no privation for those who do obtain a provisional licence and not force them to go elsewhere, outside the province or to some other jurisdiction in order to ensure that they can obtain the upgrading required to pass the examinations.

I think too, he did comment on the independent, the concern of some independents and the fear of some of the large chains. I think perhaps the independents have a cause for concern and in most cases and this particular one, I think the appeal procedures are adequate. I think after a period of time if they are inadequate, I'm sure that the Minister and the Government or whoever is responsible for it, will certainly have a look at the Act and ensure that these kinds of provisions or safeguards are provided for those individuals.

As I say there are many technicalities in the Act. I want to discuss the licensing procedures. I want to talk about the makeup of the council and the disciplinary powers that are contained within the Act, but I think the best place to do them, Mr. Speaker, would be in a clause by clause study. Therefore, I want to tell the Minister I will support the Bill in second reading.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a few comments in regard to this Bill, The Ophthalmic Dispensing Bill. Right? That's exactly what I said. I notice that the Minister said that the permanent council of ophthalmologists may include certain public representatives, as appointed by the Minister. I would just hope that the Minister would go a little further and assure this House, that there will be public representation

on this board. I really think it's imperative. The reason I say that is, because I know that the field is actually dominated by one company, and I think it would be in the public interest if he would give us assurance there will definitely be public representation on the permanent board when it is set up after the transitional board has had a go at it.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, just a couple of comments. I might advise the Assembly my understanding is that perhaps the Bill doesn't have complete and unanimous support of those in the industry. Our critic has not finished talking to all of the various groups who are affected by the Bill and I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON Bill No. 69 - An Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act, 1968 (No. 2).

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 16 - An Act to amend The Conservation and Development Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 17 - An Act to amend The Saskatchewan 4-H Foundation Act

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 18 - An Act to amend The Horned Cattle Purchases Act

SECTION 1

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — What will this change in Bill 18 cause to happen? Does this give the Minister more power or not?

MR. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — No.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is The Horned Cattle Act the Bill that covers the fund?

MR. KAEDING: — Yes, it is.

MR. KATZMAN: — Could you give me the Horned Cattle Advisory Committee - I realize it is not on the question, but if I understand correctly you will be paying out on their behalf as they request.

MR. KAEDING: — Would you repeat the question please?

MR. KATZMAN: — That you will be paying out as that Committee requests. Is that all it is giving you authority to do?

MR. KAEDING: — The Committee generally will

advise me as to what the fund should be used for and I would accept their recommendations.

Section 1 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 49 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Research Foundation Act

Section 1 and 2 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 53 - An Act to amend The Pest Control Products (Saskatchewan) Act, 1973

SECTION 1

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Just one brief question with regard to this Bill. I think I will cover it under Section 1 instead of as we go through it. Section 16, dealing with inspectors in Section 17. Does this involve inspectors appointed or hired by the Provincial Department of Agriculture or inspectors hired by the RM councils throughout the province?

MR. KAEDING: — They could be appointed by either the RM council or if the RM council chose not to appoint one, we could appoint one from our department.

MR. WIEBE: — If one was appointed from your department, say in the event that an RM council didn't appoint one, salaries would then be paid by the Department of Agriculture, would they then be the responsibility of the Department or would the RM be assessed for that salary?

MR. KAEDING: — I think they would be covered by our Department.

Section 1: agreed.

Section 2: amended, agreed.

Section 3: Section 6, amended, agreed.

Section 4: Section 8, amended, agreed.

Section 5: New Section 16, agreed.

Section 6: New Section 17, agreed.

Section 7: Section 23, amended, agreed.

Section 8: agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 30 - An Act to amend The University Hospital Act

Section 1: Agreed.

Section 2: Section 4, amended, agreed.

Section 3: Section 16, amended, agreed.

Section 4: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 27 - An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Development Fund Act, 1974

SECTION 1

MR. S. CAMERON (Regina South): — I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many employees there currently are in this corporation?

MR. ROBBINS (Minister of Health): — Five.

MR. CAMERON: — Are you able to tell us what proportion of the investments made by this corporation are made in the province?

MR. ROBBINS: — The last figures I saw, I would say approximately 40 per cent.

MR. CAMERON: — Can you also give us some indication of the 60 per cent of the investment made by this corporation outside Saskatchewan, where are those investments taking place?

MR. ROBBINS: — Most of those investments are in things like investment certificates, in trust companies, banks and things of that nature. Organizations which do have offices within the province but do not have their head office here.

MR. CAMERON: — By way of general comment, Mr. Chairman, we consider this to be one of the more foolish legislative provisions of this Government.

Let me tell you why I say that. You established a Saskatchewan Development Fund Act for principally two purposes. One is to provide for investment by Saskatchewan people in Saskatchewan companies and in Saskatchewan resources. Secondly, to give people themselves some additional opportunity to invest money in Saskatchewan by way of Registered Retirement Savings Plans and various other kinds of plans.

We say it is foolish for two reasons. In the first place as the Minister has just indicated, 60 per cent of the investment of this corporation is done outside the province. As the Minister knows it is done in respect of utilities, banks and things in the west coast, Alberta, some of it eastern money. So that the original purpose of the Act in that respect is being thwarted. Sixty per cent of the investment taking place outside the province.

Secondly, as it is designed to give people, Saskatchewan people, an opportunity to invest in other things such as Registered Retirement Savings Plans, to put money away in that respect and so on. Here again we have a whole plethora of

services of this variety that are available to people. Many companies and many people operating in this field are providing good service and providing good competitive service and that includes a lot of credit unions and co-ops as well as some peculiarly Saskatchewan investment houses such as Houston Willoughby.

The Minister will also, I think, indicate in fairness that this corporation and the investments made by this corporation are in fact subsidized by the taxpayer of the province to some extent. Just pause and think to yourself how foolish in a sense this is. We are talking here about people who have surplus income to invest. We are not talking about the poor, we are talking about the rich or the near rich. Those who have money to invest in something like registered retirement savings plans or other investments. The taxpayer of the province is being asked to subsidize therefore, the rich or near rich, in an area where all sorts of competitive service is available to them. We indeed think this is so foolish that it is our belief here, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to be striking out this Bill in total and withdrawing it and disbanding the corporation and saving the money that is being spent on the employees. As I say it is a measure to duplicate a service which is already provided by many people and provided very well, including as I said, some co-operative trust companies. Secondly, a service which is available only to that small proportion of Saskatchewan people who have excess income to invest and we are subsidizing that investment.

It is our view, Mr. Chairman, that this is one of the more foolish measures brought forward by this Government and one that we would think you would be anxious to clean up by repealing the Act in total.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the privilege of responding to the Hon. Member.

He says this is one of the foolish Acts, it had the best return last year of any fund in Saskatchewan, 19.36 per cent on a net basis; and 14.58 per cent on a gross basis.

These are the same people, Mr. Chairman, who talked about SGIO being a foolish arrangement. But it has kept \$50 million in terms of investment inside this province rather than having to go down East. And a similar situation is beginning to arise with respect to The Saskatchewan Development Fund.

I reject totally the idea that it is being subsidized by the taxpayer, it is not. It has an advance from the Department of Finance in its initial stages, it is an equity advance which will be fully repaid in time.

MR. CAMERON: — At what interest rate?

MR. ROBBINS: — No interest, it is equity. When the Hon. Member puts equity in a private business he doesn't expect a guaranteed interest return on it, does he? I noticed that the Member mentioned Houston Willoughby, I think the law firm he is connected with, Balfour, MacLeod acts for Houston Willoughby. I have nothing against Houston Willoughby. I had a lot of dealings with them when I was acting as the general manager of

the Saskatchewan Co-operative Superannuation Society. Incidentally, Houston Willoughby act as agents for the Saskatchewan Development Fund and did a good job for us in terms of advertising it last year.

The other comment the Member made was with respect to the large amount that was invested outside of the province. Surely the Member realizes that this is a new organization, it has only been operating a little over two and one-half years. It is in the process of getting more and more money invested into Saskatchewan and I can tell the Member that a good deal of the money is now currently going into mortgages in Saskatchewan, when we couldn't get Saskatchewan money into mortgages before.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that anybody who suggests we should repeal this Act is not facing up to the reality of the situation. He talks about lots of others being in that field. They are people who say they believe in competition in the field and this perhaps gives them a bit of real competition.

MR. CAMERON: — The Minister indicates that there was a good return on the fund, I don't dispute that, in fact, I think there was. But let me ask the Minister who benefitted in turn? The people who benefitted were not the people in the province who most needed that kind of benefit, and you know that. Government has a justifiable place in providing for people who have some difficulty in income terms. I ask you, what place fundamentally has government handling the investments of the rich or near rich in Saskatchewan and I say to you in a subsidized way. You say it doesn't amount to a subsidy.

Here is how this corporation is subsidized. You know very well the initial funding for this corporation came from the Government of Saskatchewan, money that went to it, sure, by way of equity, but what return on that money. It wasn't a loan drawing the usual rate of interest, which one would have to do if one were going into business apart from government. Therefore, this corporation is receiving the equivalent of eight or nine or ten per cent of interest on that initial start up money. The Minister indicates it is equity. But what are we deriving as the shareholders of the corporation being the people of Saskatchewan from that equity? We haven't derived one cent. I say to you that that is in effect a subsidy for those people who have invested in this investment corporation.

May I say by way of correction my law firm does not act for Houston Willoughby, I don't know where you got that notion from.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we intend to continue to oppose this Act. It has no relation whatever to Saskatchewan Government Insurance or indeed any other Crown corporation which is established in a different field for quite a different purpose. If a Crown corporation is established for the purpose of providing a service which is not otherwise universally available at or near cost, then you have every justification for the creation of a Crown corporation. Where you have a field which is well occupied, very competitive, having all kinds of service available to people, and we are talking about a small class of people here, then there is no reason for a Crown corporation to be established at the expense of the taxpayer. Your parallel between the SGIO and this corporation,

I say to you is a nonsensical one.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, I reject that approach because in time the Saskatchewan Development Fund will have increasing sums of money invested in this province. That trend is already there. I am sorry that I made a statement with respect to the law firm you are connected with being advisors to Houston Willoughby, I suggest they show good judgement by getting somebody else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBBINS: — The Member talks about the rich and the near rich. I could take you to many people whom I know who have invested \$100, perhaps that is all they had to invest as an initial start in the Saskatchewan Fund. They have certain reasons for doing that, admittedly. I would be one of the first people to admit that the growth of the fund hasn't been as big as we would like to have seen, although it is beginning to take on a much more progressive growth now, particularly with the results that were obtained last year. I see nothing wrong with the Saskatchewan Development Fund participating in a competitive way with the others involved in the field. I don't think that Co-op Trust is worried by the fact that it has credit unions competing with it in terms of investment funds for RRSPs and things of that nature.

Section 1: Agreed.

Section 2: Amended, agreed.

SECTION 3

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, are we not in fact extending to people outside of the province the right to invest in the fund and that's getting away from the original intent of the Act for Saskatchewan residents. Now the explanatory notes say "and others" and they refer to domiciled in Saskatchewan but resident elsewhere and I suggest that the actual wording in the Act extends it beyond domicile to anyone really who wants to invest in the Saskatchewan Development Fund.

MR. ROBBINS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said in the second reading debate it was not the intention of the Corporation to seek investors from outside. We do have people who have made investments in the Saskatchewan Development Fund and have since moved to other provinces and they wish to continue to make investments in the Saskatchewan Development Fund. Essentially this is set up on that basis to accommodate those people.

MR. LANE: — You've got to admit though that it is not narrowed to those specific purposes. That in fact with this amendment anyone who wishes to invest in the Saskatchewan Development Fund, wherever he may reside, will now have the right to do so.

MR. ROBBINS: — We have some instances where people who may be domiciled in Saskatchewan and work all the time in Alberta, like Lloydminster is an example of this or you can take the Creighton-Flin Flon area, and to some degree this was designed to

accommodate those people who had a desire to make investments in the fund. Now you are using the argument I believe, that “and others” gives scope for others. I suppose to some degree it does, but it is not, as I said before the intention of the fund to seek those investors, it is simply to accommodate those who have already expressed a desire to make investments in the fund and could not under the present regulation, or those who had made investments and had moved to another location but wished to continue to make investments in that fund in addition to their initial investment.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Minister, will you then be prepared to accept a House amendment that in order to bring the amendment in line with what you have just said about domicile, that the words to be added after “others” domiciled in Saskatchewan. Would you be prepared to accept that if it is moved?

MR. ROBBINS: — Not until I can check that. I don’t know the legal interpretations of it, I would have to check with legal counsel.

MR. C P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Minister, I should just like to point out that what you are doing by this, you’ve always indicated an aversion to money going across the border, and you turn around and permit somebody from across the border or in Eastern Canada to invest heavily in the Saskatchewan Development Corporation, those great profits will be going elsewhere and not staying in Saskatchewan. You are aware of that, of course?

MR. ROBBINS: — I’m not sure that your interpretation is a correct one.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — As a matter of fact his interpretation is quite correct. You can conceivably tell the Minister I have residence in Ontario . . .

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order. I think the Minister moved that the Bill be stood until he could get a chance to check this out, and I think we should deal with that motion first.

MR. CAMERON: — On that Point of Order, Mr. Chairman, I didn’t hear any such motion, and I don’t think in fact the Minister is aware of the motion and if he intended to make it he didn’t.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, I said that I asked the Bill be stood until I could get legal opinion with respect to it. I so move.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order. We didn’t hear the Minister. He certainly has the privilege of making the motion again so that the Chair and Members of the Assembly hear it, but in the meantime please don’t interrupt the Member’s opportunity to speak and when he is finished if the Minister wishes to rise and stand the Bill that’s his legitimate right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order please. I think the Minister has stated that he is prepared to stand the Bill. Is this agreed?

MR. CAMERON:— May I ask, that is the subject of some debate as well. If he wants to stand the Bill he has to have the approval of the Members to do it. And I want to indicate to him before he takes the Bill back that I tell him that this is a fact that residents from outside this province could invest in your Saskatchewan Development Fund where you ask ‘what’s in it for you?’ And I say that ‘what’s in it for you’ applies not only to Saskatchewan residents but you could have some from Ontario invest in the Saskatchewan Development Fund and receive in the same way others do, a subsidized investment in Saskatchewan at the expense of the Saskatchewan taxpayer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN: — It has been moved that we report progress. Is that agreed?

Progress reported on Bill 27.

Bill No. 28 - **An Act to amend The South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act, 1974**

SECTION 1

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments and the same comments I made originally when these Bills to change the reporting date were changed, as I presume, to the fiscal year. I also read in The Hospital Standards Act, and months from the third calendar month immediately following the end of each fiscal year, which means the end of the fiscal year is March 31, and if I understand the corrections, subsection (3) of Section 8, that means the end of April, the end of May, end of June before any reporting is required. This means, Mr. Chairman, that this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan, as I indicated, would perhaps be more than a year behind in the Government reporting to the Assembly and to the public about the fiscal affairs of the hospitals, the University Hospital and the Plains Hospital, in the Province of Saskatchewan. I say that this is a bad principle to get into even though I can appreciate the Minister wanting to standardize it with across Canada, but I am really not the least bit interested, that the accountants of the Department of Health or the hospitals, or the accountants wherever they may be may have an easier and a more streamlined and a simpler method of reporting. What I am interested in, is this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan being given an accurate report on an up-to-date, current basis so that it can be discussed and argued in this Assembly and plaudits can be given for good fiscal management and an opportunity for the Members of the Assembly to criticize if there is something gravely wrong. But coming in a year later, again as you well know, Mr. Minister, by March 31, the end of the fiscal year, the Department of Health Estimates could be completely finalized in this Assembly. We would have no opportunity whatsoever to discuss them. Supposing this Bill was now in effect, and all the criticism that the Minister has suffered and the Government

has suffered about the cutback of hospital beds, about the reduction of staff, about the failure to purchase equipment, about the limiting of the quality of service, we would have no opportunity to peruse the documents which would verify or negate these arguments that are being presented to the people of Saskatchewan. And as I say, I am concerned about this, and I brought it up in second reading. I should like the Minister to comment as to his feeling about this, does he agree that a year later is a sufficient time to report on the public affairs of the hospitals of Saskatchewan?

MR. ROBBINS: — I'm not completely clear in my own mind whether the points you raise are good ones or not. I can understand some reason for concern perhaps, but I want to make it very clear that this is a decision not only made by our Government, but all the governments across Canada, including the federal authority, who feels that in terms of the rating procedures relating to hospitals the hospitals are in a far better position if the fiscal years of the governments concerned and the hospitals concerned are standardized and that's the basis on which this is proposed. In other words, hospitals in the current year have operated through January, February and into March before the budget comes down, before they have any idea where they stand. If in fact the budget comes down usually in March, not too long before the first of April, and the fiscal year starts at the same time as the government year starts they feel, and we feel, and all of the jurisdictions across Canada feel, that this will be a more logical and reasonable approach. I frankly think that you are worried unnecessarily, but I can't prove that one way or the other.

MR. MacDONALD: — One other little point I would like to bring up, Mr. Minister. Each province and the Federal Government has a different time for the sitting of their Assemblies. Each individual jurisdiction has a different approach to estimates and financial reporting. But in Saskatchewan it is tradition that we sit in the Spring before the commencement of the agricultural industry, and, therefore, I find that this will be a particularly onerous problem in Saskatchewan as compared to other jurisdictions. I bring that to the Minister's attention, and I think he would agree with me. For example, Manitoba usually sits in June and July; British Columbia sits for a large portion in the fall; Alberta normally sits about a month before we do. But in Saskatchewan we normally sit in the spring before the agricultural industry commences spring seeding and therefore, that is a particular problem with us and Mr. Minister I once again repeat, because of the problems in hospitals this year, I think it incumbent that we do have an opportunity to peruse this and as I say, I am going to vote against it simply because I don't necessarily agree that we have to march in lock-step with other provinces and the Federal Government in the reporting of our financial affairs. I object very much not to being able to have a current, up-to-date report.

MR. ROBBINS: — I would think, Mr. Chairman, that the situation that holds true in Saskatchewan with respect to the sitting of the Assembly would also be true to some considerable degree with respect to Alberta and Manitoba, both of which have substantial agricultural industries and it would obviously have some

bearing on both these provinces as well. I disagree, of course, with the Member when he talks about all the things that happened in hospitals. We attempted to restrain the rise in the costs of hospitals, but you look at the actual attained statistics and you will find that there has not been, a cutback. There were more occupied hospital beds in 1976 in Saskatchewan than there were in 1974.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — The hours of staffing for people in hospitals is higher today than it was back in 1971, appreciably higher. That holds true in terms of nursing staff as well. That's not to say that there aren't some problems related to it and there obviously are going to be problems because of the very difficult field of rapidly rising costs. I again say that the Health Ministers and the governments across Canada came to the conclusion this was the logical approach and on that basis we support it.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Minister, I am not going to argue any more, I'm just going to say you just gave me the exact reason for my argument. The statistical figures will prove me wrong. You are trying to deny the statistical figures by this particular piece of legislation until a year later and if you are so proud of the achievements and you want to demonstrate that then you should want the statistics on a current up-to-date basis in this Assembly.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, statistics, of course, are available to the Assembly and the Member is arguing that they will be coming to the Assembly later and therefore, create some difficulty, but that's not the conclusion that Conservative and Liberal Governments across Canada came to, as well as this Government.

Section 1 agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 47 - **An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act**

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am going to vote against the Bill for the same reason.

Section 1 agreed to.

Section 2 and Section 3 amended agreed to.

Section 3: Section 5 amended agreed to.

Section 4: new Section 8 agreed to.

Section 8, the audit fiscal year and hospital agreed to.

Section 5: Section 23 amended agreed to.

Section 6 coming into force agreed to.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 62 - An Act respecting the provision of Financial Assistance to Municipalities and Non-Profit Societies for Capital Works Projects involving Recreation and Cultural Facilities

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

SECTION 3

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — My only questions on the Bill, is it the intention of the Department to assign the \$25 million in equal segments each year?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Department of Culture and Youth): — Not necessarily. It will be assigned and we will be better able to do it after a year's experience on an estimate of the draw-down which no doubt we will be able to do according to the indications we get from municipalities.

MR. LANE: — Do you have the estimate now, an indication of the demand on the plan so that you can make your projections?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We have some, I think it is safer to say 'guesstimate' at the present time. We have \$4 million budgeted in this 1977-78 fiscal year. We anticipate somewhere in the area of \$6 million next year; \$8 million the year after and \$6 million, in the final year. But those may change depending on the experience of this particular year which is really the year in which I think we will be able to get the clear indication because communities will have been able to have assessed what their needs are and have been able to have spoken with the various groups in their communities and have been able to make a better determination of what their needs will be and what they may be planning over the next period of time.

MR. LANE: — The one thing that has concerned me about the Bill is not the intent or the good that it can do, it is the fact that the expenditures under the Bill can be directly related to the election pressures that the Government may find itself under. In other words, the Minister has already given the figures, it's 4, 6, 8 and then down. I think that we can look at an election about 1979, which would be the \$8 million a year, \$6 million being the biggest expenditure prior to the \$8 million as we work our way down. Now what can the Minister tell us about the Act that is going to ensure that the expenditures are distributed fairly within each given year and then, secondly, that the expenditures, the total expenditures in each given year are in line with the goals of the Act and that is perhaps to create employment. I can see, for example, the reverse, that if there is a downturn in the economy that perhaps \$8 million should be spent this year or next year to take a bit of a cushion off the downturn.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That's why I prefaced my

answer to the last question with the qualification that it should not be taken that the figures I gave you as an indication of where we might go to sort of be enshrined in stone because we will not be determining in the Government the demand out in the country, the demand in the communities; the communities will be determining that demand. I think that is one of the greatest merits of this program, we are providing an allocation of a per capita grant to every municipality in Saskatchewan. They then, in turn, will determine the kind of project they may want to develop. They will also determine within that four-year period of time when they want to develop that project. Although I am not arguing with the point that you make that in the event that there is at some future time a downturn of the economy it might be useful to be able to generate more capital construction that is probably a good point, but we certainly are not going to be saying to a municipality you have got to spend your money year X or year Y in order to qualify. That is why we said it is a four year program to give the appropriate time for planning, putting together a project, consulting all the interest groups in the community who may have an interest in some portion or maybe all of the facilities.

MR. LANE: — What liaison does the department have, the branch that's administering this with other Government agencies? For example, the Department of Municipal Affairs I am advised is doing a study on the so-called bedroom communities around Saskatoon and I have argued in the Assembly before of the specific problems that such communities have. A study has been indicated by the Department of Municipal Affairs on that specific problem. Now surely within the broad framework of handing out the moneys you don't want to hand moneys to somewhere where in fact it may not do that much good. Now what rules and what criteria have you established aside from the economic as to the allotment of these funds? Can you explain them in detail?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We recognized that there have been communities in the past that had some difficulties in beginning and progressing with a project because there are a number of channels or various departments or agencies that they have to be in contact with, Municipal Affairs, Culture and Youth, etc. If they are interested in connecting with an educational concern in their community, it could be the Department of Education and so on. In order to expedite this process we are establishing as you will find when we get to it under Section 4, a committee which will have representation from the various departments concerned including the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Culture and Youth and a number of others who will make certain that all of the requirements are met so that the community doesn't feel that after they have made an application and it has been approved that they have met with all of their requirements but then find on the last moment or the last day that they have not gotten the approval of some agency or have not been in touch with some agency that they should have been. I think that that will also be of great assistance to the communities.

MR. LANE: — But I asked you a question, what the criteria will be. You answered by saying that there will be a committee established.

Are you saying that the criteria have not yet been established?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am sorry that I didn't quite get the question. We are not providing criteria for communities so firm that it will take away from them their local decision making exercise. So there are no criteria that say you have to do certain kinds of projects. We are urging, of course, and once again it is only a suggestion because I think it is important and I think most communities and most people would agree with it, that they consider planning on the multi-use kind of facility, that they consider all of the needs that they may have in the community before they make the application. We will talk to them about that but they will have to finally make that decision. We are not going to strait jacket any community into a particular project that somehow my officials or I or the Government or whatever feels that they ought to do.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about one aspect of the Bill. Here we are creating a massive slush fund for the Government. I say that in all honesty, I know that the pressures that the Minister can undergo when he gets \$8 million to distribute to communities in Saskatchewan. I notice he has got a committee here. He doesn't tell who the members of that committee will be, whether or not they are independent or not and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move a motion, an amendment, and because this particular fund deals with the municipalities of the Province of Saskatchewan I think it is very important that municipalities in this province be represented on this committee. It may well be the Minister's intention but for his own protection and to ensure fair play I would like to recommend that there are three people put on that Committee. Number one is a representative from the Urban Municipal Association because we will be dealing with the municipalities of Saskatchewan. They will be making the decision as to what recreational facilities will be developed in their particular areas. Second, a member representative of the Rural Municipal Association who will also be very vitally concerned in the allocation of their grant moneys to the dormitory communities as my friend on my left has indicated. Notice I use that term loosely. Third, some independent chairman and I would suggest the Dean of the College of Education or some individual of that kind and then it would be the Minister's job to appoint two members from the Government, perhaps the secretary from those who are involved and perhaps two of the other departments that might be involved and I might suggest Municipal Affairs perhaps and Culture and Youth. I am going to save this motion, it is not the time or the place now until we get to Clause 4.

I do point out to the Minister that I have been involved in the allocation of funds. I've seen the Youth Agency, one of the most important concepts of the Youth Agency when it was established was to set up an independent board with representation from the communities of Saskatchewan for the allocation of the funds involved in the Youth Agency. Because when we get into recreation and youth facilities that is important. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister's comment on that and I would also like to suggest that I will be moving that amendment when we come to Clause 4.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I obviously will not be supporting the amendment. What the Member is asking and this may be the wrong place for me to make comments on it, but what the Member is asking is that there be worked into the committee or into the approval process certain delays. I am not arguing that the representation that he is talking about would not be available, I am sure it would be. The fact of the matter is the committee meets twice a month and to ask someone from an organization like he talks about would mean that the committee might meet once a month. I think that there is sufficient consultation with the communities involved to have their input into this. It is incorrect to call it a slush fund, how can it be a slush fund when the expenditure of the money that the Government is providing is on an unconditional basis which is the approach that we have been taking in most of our funding to municipalities in the last several years. We don't determine, the Government doesn't determine the expenditure of the money, the municipalities will and so they should because they are the ones who can best determine whether in those communities, as the Member for Qu'Appelle talks about, there is the need of a recreational complex and the people in that community are the best ones to determine that. They can go to their municipal council and their recreation board and talk about it and be assured that these types of things will happen.

But having said that I think one of the things that the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley asked was what departments have officials represented on the committee. I can tell him that it is the Provincial Library, the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Culture and Youth, of course, with Mr. Tuck and the Department of Social Services, because all of them in some way could be involved in a program that provides funding for the construction or renovation or repair or improvement of cultural or recreational facilities.

MR. MacDONALD: — Well, I think the Minister has just answered the very concern I have. When to the Government of Saskatchewan I guarantee by this fall, there will be requests to the Department of Culture and Youth for something in the neighborhood of \$10 million or \$12 million worth of construction and I think your deputy will agree with that. All of a sudden you are asking five people from the Government to make that decision where \$4 million of grants will be approved for \$10 million of requests. What we are here witnessing is that the Government is going to determine the community responsibilities and the community decisions and the community priorities because those five people are going to decide where the grants are going to go. They are going to decide which particular community is going to get the grant, which particular community is not going to get the grant. They are going to decide which community project will go ahead and which community project will not go ahead. All I am suggesting to the Minister is that one person from the Government and a subcommittee set up of the Government to co-ordinate the Government in all those five departments and report to him and please don't tell me SUMA or the SARM are not going to be interested in the investment of \$25 million in their communities. They will make the time, they will certainly appoint the people.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Certainly they are going to

be interested, that is taken for granted. That is why we have met with SUMA and we have met with SARM and we will continue on an ongoing basis to talk about the way the program is going. I don't know that there is going to be \$10 million, the Member maybe can know better than I. I don't know if there is going to be \$10 million of request, I doubt it, but we will see. When those requests come then we will be in a better position to determine the level of funding that we will need to provide again next year. There is enough flexibility in that to accommodate that kind of a situation.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Minister, will you not admit though that a municipality can approve its particular project, can argue the need for the project, it might be a vital project to the particular municipality but it is still in order for the Minister to say, no, the funds have been allotted for the year. You still have that right, will you not admit that?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — If there is an X number of dollars in the budget we certainly will be able to say that maybe the project has to be deferred for a year, or allocate an additional amount of money which I don't anticipate we will have to do.

MR. LANE: — If two municipalities come in with valid projects, all approved for X number of dollars you can say to one municipality, you can proceed and you could say to the other one, you can't proceed because we are out of funds, the other municipality got the last for the year. Is that not true?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Theoretically I guess that is a possibility but in the practical sense I don't think that that will be the case. You have to keep in mind that with a program like this which is a four-year program there are going to be a number of requests and I suspect quite a large number of requests from municipalities not to do any one project completely in the one year which will very likely, in most cases, be something that will be continued over a two- or three-year period of time, therefore, helping the distribution of funds over the four year period of time.

MR. LANE: — Are you not admitting the very question raised by the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley that in fact the full discretion as to the allotment of funds rests with the Government?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Just like the establishment of any appropriation in the Budget of the Government of Saskatchewan as any government, whether it is provincial, federal or municipal in the total allocation of total funds, that rests with the Government of course. During the budgetary review process the Government will allocate a certain amount of money to the budget in this particular subvote and that decision, as the Member say so, yes I can't disagree it is something that the Government will decide, but only we will decide on the basis of the indication that we get from the communities when the program is working.

MR. LANE: — I would like to raise another matter and I would

like to do it at this time, I think it will be another Section 5 if I can digress and cover them at the same time. I indicated at the outset, I don't like the idea of just an open-ended approach to grants to local governments and I would think that it would be incumbent upon the Minister to supply this Assembly and I ask if he doesn't have the criteria on which he would make his decision. And I urge the Government to take the fair approach that very specific criteria be established. I don't care whether you use a point system or whatever, that the thing be weighted so that municipalities know what their chances are, they know what type of project would be fair, and I think it is incumbent upon the Government to give to the municipalities some indication. I suppose one could take the normal concern any time the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes): — is involved in anything you've got to be a little skeptical about how the moneys are going to be spent, but aside from that I would think it would be fair for the Minister to have some pretty fair guidelines established. Why would you make, if you have the power to make grants to non-profit societies, would you be able to make grants to non-profit societies that have nothing to do with municipalities? Would you entertain an amendment that non-profit societies to obtain a grant must have the approval of a municipality?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Every application that comes to the department must have the approval of the municipality. We state that in the information that has been provided to every municipality in the province. It will be stated in the regulations. It is true that a non-profit organization can qualify for the funding but it will have to be the municipality of Regina. If it happens to be in Regina, or the municipality of Humboldt, they will have to give that approval before in fact it can take place. It's a decision that the locally elected municipality or municipal council has to make. We have made a point of making sure of that. Our regional services people in the regions are in constant contact with the municipalities so that there is a constant dialogue on the program and the municipality needs out there.

I am a little surprised, really, somewhat shocked because I have always heard the Conservative Members opposite talk about local autonomy. It is another contradiction that we are hearing over there from the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). Do you really believe in local autonomy? Do you really believe that a municipality should be able to make its decisions on the people's needs? Obviously you don't believe it. You say one thing out in the country and to the press but in here you are sort of fuddling around. You are saying that we should set specific criteria, specific regulations, specific terms of reference and tell the municipalities, boys and gals, you do this or you don't do anything. Well, that may be the policy of the Conservative Members over there, but it is not the policy of this Government.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, and in fact the very thing that we are concerned about is the attitude of the Minister in that he is taking away all discretion from the municipalities of Saskatchewan and by the provisions of this Act, the decision rests solely with the Government and that is what concerns the Opposition. It is not the fact that the municipalities have to have criteria or anything else. I think the only way to

ensure fairness to the municipalities would be that the overriding discretion that you have taken in this Act, is to lay down some rules so that they know what kind of game they are playing. And if it is purely a political game as to where the moneys are being spent and how much is being spent, then, at least, tell them so. If you have guidelines or whatever you want to call them, to let the municipalities know what the rules of the game are, fair enough, then I have asked you on three different occasions today and you haven't given them to me.

Our very concern is that the municipalities don't in the final result have the right to determine that there are several factors which stop them from determining: (1) The committee; (2) The amount of money that the Government decides that is going to be spent in any particular year; (3) The allocation of the funds within the province in a particular year. These are three controls that the Government has built in.

On the second point if you really want to advocate the rights of municipalities, so to speak, then why did you reject the proposed amendment of the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald)? You can't have it both ways, you can't argue for better discretion on the one hand and protecting municipalities on the other hand, because the municipalities know full well that is not the way your system works.

Again, on the second matter, you have indicated that your forms for nonprofit societies would require the support of the municipality through the approval of the municipality. It is not in the Act. I think the Minister will admit that. I am quite prepared to take his assurance that that will be the case.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — If it will be of any assistance, and I won't go into any debate on that, but if it will be of assistance to the Member opposite, I only have one form and we can probably get another one for the Member on the Liberal Caucus, I will send over a Saskatchewan Recreation Culture Facilities Grants outline of the program, which provides, also, some indication of what the Member, I think, would agree is called "Project Criteria" and it may be of some help to him in better understanding the kind of information that municipalities have, which I think he will agree when he has looked at it, meet the kinds of things to some extent that he talks about.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Chairman, I didn't understand. Is the Minister indicating that there is a section in the Act that requires an application by a nonprofit society to be approved by a municipality before it can be entertained?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It is not in the Act, it will be in the regulations. It is in all the information clearly spelled out that we have sent out to municipalities, all of which have them.

MR. CAMERON: — Well, speaking for myself, Mr. Chairman, I am not quite so willing as the Member for Lumsden to take the Minister's assurance of that fact.

Again, and you have done this time and again, you now again

bring before the House a program under which you can spend \$4 million. You might not think that is much money, but that is a very great deal of money, as a matter of fact. What kind of an Act have we got that authorizes the expenditure? It is two and one half pages to spend \$4 million. I tell you that again, it is nothing but a skeleton piece of legislation. All that you are bringing before us is simply this: 1. Let's have a program and 2. I will spend the money. No criteria whatever spelled out in the Act and indeed you partake of yourself the power to define all the expressions used in the Act. What is a nonprofit society? It has some simple little definition in the Act and if you don't like it you simply go to the regulations and define it as you will. That is the kind of legislation which is so insulting to Members of the House, because we here are the lawmakers, not your people making your regulations.

I think, again, that it is a contemptuous attitude to bring a piece of legislation before the House which is going to require the expenditure of a lot of money and you put before us a two and a half page little simple Bill that says absolutely nothing. I think that is highly contemptuous in terms of attitude.

Look, again, at the power of regulation under this Act. The points that have been taken by the two Members are very good ones. Now where is the control? The control of these programs has to lie with this Assembly, not simply to bring before us an Act that says, "empower us to make all the regulations we will to administer this grant program as we will."

You say that you will give us an assurance that in the regulations there will be a provision that a society has to have the consent of the municipality before the application will be approved. Why isn't that in the Act? That is very fundamental. And there are a whole lot of other things that ought to be a matter of legislation instead of a matter of regulation, including I respectfully suggest, the amount of money. Because, again, you are asking us to make large scale approvals here with no sort of rules and regulations spelled out. Everything is left to the discretion of the Minister and his Department.

Perfectly good suggestions here that you have a committee made up of two members from SARM, one from SUMA perhaps the Dean of Education to pass on these applications. At least give us those kinds of protection because you know, as these Members have indicated, that this kind of a fund with no regulations spelled out in the Act, limiting or spelling out the way in which the funds can be allocated and to whom they are given, it is open to abuse and no doubt there will be some political abuse in respect of that.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I think the Member knows that everything is not written into law. If we wrote everything into the Bills that we have in the Legislature we would get so bogged down that governments and departments would never be able to respond to the needs of people and the kind of things that the people of Saskatchewan should have. It shouldn't have to go through a complicated procedure in order to be able to qualify. Regulations are gazetted which everyone can see.

The Members get the Gazette, as I do on a regular basis. It is spelled out in Section 9, the kinds of things that the regulations will be able to cover. I think that the Bill is really a good piece of legislation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Minister, the fact is we are really going to the American system of legislation which is okay. We will have a program to feed millions and there it goes and the government bureaucracy is established from then on and in fact what is happening is that slowly we are losing our rights as legislators to oversee the expenditure of public funds. We all agree, and we have agreed in principle, with a need for a program, financial assistance, for capital works projects involving recreation and cultural facilities. I think all Members of the House agree to that and the parties all have in second reading by approving the principle. But the fact is that this is so broad and so open-ended that in fact we will never be able to determine whether in fact the goals as established by the government are being reached. For that, I think, the legislation is wrong although the principle is welcomed by all Members. I think the approach taken by the Government is one that is not to be condoned. Certainly we agree with the Minister that there are needs for delegation of authority and delegation of legislation. But to merely come into the House and legislate \$25 million and we the Government will spend it on recreational and cultural facilities, the Government will make the decisions, I don't think is quite fair in the parliamentary tradition that we have in this Assembly and I think the Minister is wrong in that particular point.

Section 3 agreed to.

SECTION 4

MR. C.P MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, this is the Section that I wish to move amendment. Once again, I am not going to repeat the arguments. The Minister talks about local control and local decision-making and this will ensure that this takes place; that it will not be in the Government and that the Government will not make the determination as to the allocation of funds.

Moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Cameron that Section 4 of the Act be amended by adding thereto Clause 3 as follows:

The Committee shall consist of (a) two persons recommended by the SARM; (b) one person recommended by SUMA; (c) the Dean of the College of Education, of the University of Regina; and, (d) one person appointed by the Minister.

The debate continued on the amendment.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I have already made my comments on the Motion when the Member earlier talked about it. I am sorry that he left out the Dean of the College of Education in Saskatoon. If he is going to cover the field he should cover them all I guess. But I am not going to argue about that.

I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that I don't think this is a necessary amendment. Every municipality now will determine how

it is going to be expending the money that is allocated to it on a per capita basis. When they make the application it will be approved and I don't know what other way there is to go to municipalities in Saskatchewan, on an unconditional basis, as I think we ought to do and say, here is the amount of money that the province can provide under this program. You decide how it is going to be expended. That is what we have done. We also have gone so far as to provide some consultative assistance through the staff in this Branch, to help particularly smaller municipalities do their planning. We have established a committee of representatives from various departments which might be involved to assure that there be a rapid approval of the application. The Members say that we should build a bigger and larger committee and I think we all know that the larger the committee, the slower the progress. I would suggest the Members defeat this motion.

Amendment negatived.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Chairman, perhaps if the Minister is not prepared to go along with that I think the Minister will concede that there has to be some provision here for us to see to it that the allocation of these funds, a sizeable amount of money, is done fairly and not in a political sense, which is one of our largest concerns. Perhaps as a minimum device the Minister would agree to permitting Members of the Assembly, at all reasonable times, to have access to the files in respect to which applications are received and processed.

So I want to move, seconded by my seatmate, Mr. MacDonald, that Section 4 of the Act be amended by adding thereto, Clause 3 as follows:

That the Minister shall at all reasonable times, on the request of the Member of the Legislature, make available to such Member, all information respecting applications made under this Act and the disposition thereof.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Chairman, before this amendment is considered and amendment put if that is the wish we could leave it aside and rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:08 o'clock p.m.