

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

April 14, 1978

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would like, through you and to this Assembly, to introduce a group of 40 students from the Mildred High School who are situated in the Speaker's Gallery and while in numbers they perhaps don't make up the quantity of other groups coming, I can assure this Assembly that in quality they do. They have come in this morning and I will be meeting with them later for some pictures and some soft drinks down in the member's dining room.

I had the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of attending this school and talking to this group some time ago and I might say that they have pretty good taste because they invited me back to speak at the graduation exercises next month.

I hope they have a safe trip home and I am sure that all members will want to welcome them to the Assembly this morning.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF HOCKEY TEAM

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, this is not in the form of an introduction but I think it is newsworthy to all of us. It certainly is to the Weyburn constituency and I would like to, through your permission . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. If it is an introduction I will take it now. If it is some other matter I will take it on orders of the day.

MR. PEPPER: — It is not an introduction of students but it is the introduction of a championship hockey team.

I believe it was on April 2, Mr. Chairman, that the Weyburn Firestone bantam hockey team won the championship for the province of Saskatchewan by defeating the Saskatoon bantam team. I know they were enroute yesterday as well as today, by bus and by air, to play the western championship playoffs in Edmonton and I am sure that I am speaking on behalf of all of you when we wish the provincial Saskatchewan champions who come from Weyburn, the very best in this playoff which is being held over the weekend.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Agreement between Dairies and Unions

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head - Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Labour.

I heard some rather disturbing news this morning about the tentative agreement between the dairy producers or the union and management. As you know, on Wednesday last there was a tentative — a memorandum of agreement signed between the Teamsters' Union and the other union, the Canadian Food and Allied Workers' Union. The man who signed the memorandum of agreement for the union was Clarence Lyons of Saskatoon; the man who signed it for Palm Dairies was Norman Sweeney, the manager in Regina. I understand now that Burns Food Limited, the parent company of Palm Dairies in the city of Saskatoon has indicated that Mr. Sweeney had no authority to sign on behalf of Palm Dairies in Saskatoon, that he is refusing to live up to the agreement and from what I understand now the agreement is open again. They are meeting at 1:00. According to the union if agreement is not reached, or the Palm Dairies in Saskatoon does not live up to it, there is a real likelihood or danger that they may walk off the job again and we might be right back in exactly the same mess we were in Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. Can the minister indicate to me whether or not he has heard this disturbing news, if there is any truth to it and if so, what he intends to do about it?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Well, Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a repetition of some of the hysteria that members attempted to generate during the period of time when the discussion was taking place in order to resolve the problem in the first place. I think the member has given the information in a relatively accurate fashion, which in itself is a little surprising. My information is similar to that which he has indicated here, that is, that Mr. Bill Goetz from Calgary of Burns Foods will be in Saskatoon and meeting with the bargaining unit of Canadian Food and Allied Workers in respect of the Saskatoon Palm Agreement only. I am expecting that during the day they will have an opportunity to discuss the fine tuning of the contract and I am certainly hopeful that these parties that in the past have been capable of reaching an amiable solution, will be capable of sorting out the difficulty that exists at the present time. The member was right when he indicated that the manager of Palm, Mr. Sweeney apparently did have authority for signing for Palm in Regina but the management of Palm indicates that he did not have authority to sign for Palm in Saskatoon. I think in light of the fact that the agreement has been ratified in, I believe, all instances at this point and there has been a return to work. That this will be a very sobering influence with respect to the Saskatoon Palm operation. Certainly we are keeping on top of this thing on a minute by minute basis. We are not expecting that there be any need to dissolve the House or introduce a bill or ring the bells for two hours or anything of that nature. I hope we can . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. MacDONALD: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I too, and I am sure all members of the House hope that this will be solved in Saskatoon at noon. Can the minister indicate to me if the minister was aware when the agreement was signed that Mr. Sweeney was unable to sign on behalf of Palm Dairies in Saskatoon? Could he also indicate to me whether or not the mediator who did apparently such a good job from what the minister indicates, Mr. Walters I believe, has departed for Saskatoon? Is he going to participate in the discussions today at noon because, as I understand, they are of rather critical nature. The minister has seemed to indicate agreement with that particular viewpoint. Can he indicate to me whether or not Mr. Walter has gone and whether or not he was aware at that time that the memorandum of agreement was signed that Mr. Sweeney was unable to sign on behalf of Palm in Saskatoon?

MR. SNYDER: — I shall answer the last question first. No, I was not aware that Mr.

Sweeney did not have the authority to sign for Palm in Saskatoon. It seems rather obvious that the other parties to the collective bargaining agreement were also not aware that he did not have the authority to sign for Saskatoon. This was a question that was not raised prior to yesterday afternoon and certainly we were not aware of the fact that all of the parties who were signatories to the agreement that evening did not have the full authorization of their principals to sign for them. As far as I am aware, Mr. Sig Walter, the industrial relations officer who handled the dispute, is not in Saskatoon. I understand Mr. Lyons at this time is preparing to meet with Mr. Goetz and we are keeping in touch on a minute-by-minute basis. If it becomes necessary, certainly we will make arrangements to see that one of our industrial relations officers is there. At this point in time I regard that as being unnecessary but if the need arises we will arrange for something of that nature to take place.

Palm Dairies - Collective Bargaining

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — My question to the minister is quite simply this, who did Palm Dairies and management hold out in the collective bargaining agreement as their representative in the talks that were going on between management and labor and, if they held out Mr. Sweeney as their representative to the union and to the government and to the conciliator, has the minister checked with the Attorney General on the legality of them now saying that, if they held out this person as their representative and are now withdrawing on a strictly technical basis — What is the strict legality of the situation when he concludes an agreement of that nature?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Nipawin member's question, Palm Dairies did not hold out anyone. The representative of Palm Dairies at that meeting was, in our understanding of the situation, Mr. Norm Sweeney. We were given to understand, or at least we believed that Mr. Sweeney had the full authority to sign for not only the Palm organization in Regina but also in Saskatoon. I have not checked with the Attorney General with respect to the legalities of this thing. Obviously, if there is some need to do that, then that will be done as the need requires. I am not sure that the advice of the Attorney General at this point in time is needed, nor would it be particularly valuable at this point. I think the critical part of the problem is to ensure that whatever fine tuning is necessary will be accomplished as a result of the meeting this afternoon between Mr. Goetz and the Canadian Food and Allied bargaining unit which is meeting, as I indicated at 1:00 this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will take a final supplementary from the member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

MR. MacDONALD: — Can the minister indicate to us whether or not during the bargaining that went on, the marathon bargaining for the 28 hours, whether Mr. Sweeney or whether or not Palm Dairies had any other person there to represent the Palm management interests in the city of Saskatoon? Whether or not Mr. Sweeney was under the impression that he was bargaining on behalf of Palm Dairies in Saskatoon and that it was a Mr. Goetz in Calgary or the senior management outside the province that all of a sudden, took a different viewpoint? Was this the understanding of the parties at the table, including Mr. Sweeney?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, during the bargaining process, as far as I am aware, Mr. Sweeney was the only representative of Palm Dairies who was present and who took part in the actual bargaining process. I know that during that period of time, a

April 14, 1978

number of telephone calls were made by the members of the management bargaining team to their principals, and whether contacts were made by phone to people other than the Palm organization here in Regina, I cannot inform the member. I can say, finally, that I believe and I think everyone involved in the bargaining, believed that Mr. Sweeney had authority to speak for, and to sign for, Palm Dairies throughout — not just the Regina local — the Regina organization.

Cornwall Centre Complex

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — A question Mr. Speaker, to the Minister in charge of Sask Telecommunications about the Cornwall Centre Complex which seems to be a bit blotched and I ask the minister whether it is not in fact the case that you are unable to get anybody to go in to run a department store, but more particularly I ask the minister, by what authority Sask Tel has decided to go into the department store business and go into the rental and leasing business and is it the intention of Sask Tel when they establish other complexes and other Crown corporations to establish other complexes to go into the department store business and the retail leasing business?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question asked by the hon. member as to where did Sask Tel obtain its authority to go into the commercial retail space business, the answer to that, I am sure, would have been obvious to the hon. member. It was provided by an act of the Legislature, approved at the 1977 session of the Legislature.

With respect to — will Sask Tel be putting commercial space into facilities constructed in other centres, the answer to that question is the decision will be made in each centre in due course as the new facilities are planned.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, can we expect that the government's intention is to move into commercial retail space all over the province. I know that that's the intention in Weyburn. I see that intention manifested in Regina and I ask whether it is the intention now of the government to compete with retail commercial space operators, I suppose, and compete so actively in the direct business area? If I might without asking another supplementary, can the minister give us a guarantee that the old Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce building which both Heritage Regina and City Council wants to ensure will remain intact at least for the ..

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The minister of Telephones wants to answer.

MR. BYERS: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed at the hon. member for Wascana who rarely directs a question to the appropriate minister in this House. With respect to the development of the Cornwall Centre, clearly the development of that is clearly under the aegis of the Minister of Finance, who is in his seat. With respect to the Weyburn downtown centre the appropriate minister is in his seat, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCHANT: — Final supplementary. I started into the question about the CIBC facade which is part of the Cornwall Centre complex, can you give a guarantee to the House . . .

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

Education Bill 22

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. I see he has just returned from another hour's show, shall I say. Mr. Minister, are you still prepared at this particular time as the discussion looms throughout Saskatchewan to make the statement to the public in general that the concerns that are being expressed throughout the province, both by trustees and parents themselves, are concerns which are unwarranted concerns and do you intend in the near future to make a statement or to send out letters in some way to once again qualify your position on Bill 22 at this particular time?

HON. D.L. FARIS (Minister of Education): — I'm not sure I fully understand the member's question. Certainly it is our position that a lot of the concerns that are being stirred up, I may say, throughout the province are unwarranted concerns. We have been expressing the principle that the principles in the bill will stand, that some of the concerns which are being expressed can, indeed, be dealt with through amendments in third reading. I am still in the process of meeting with teachers, superintendents, parents, trustees, you know the whole spectrum, to get their points of view on the various matters that have been raised.

MR. BAILEY: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The questions I asked, I believe, last week in this House and were raised by my colleagues to my right as well, about there establishment of the Education Committee, to which you have remained firm that you did not prefer to call that committee and you had no intentions of calling that committee.

Mr. Minister, you have within your powers, however, as minister of this portfolio to establish an ongoing committee, shall we say, of this Assembly (there are ways of doing that, an intersessional committee perhaps). Have you given any consideration to using this Assembly and the members therein to establish an ongoing committee following the prorogation of this House to re-examine some of the issues with a committee from this Legislature, without calling the Educational Committee in?

MR. FARIS: — Well, Mr. Speaker I think there are real problems in that and the evidence I have for the real kinds of problems you would face are the kinds of ongoing mistruths and distortions and so on that have been made by some members in and outside of this House. For instance, in your caucus, unfortunately you are not (as I understand) the education critic, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland is. I encourage you to have a look at his contribution to the debate on this bill and see whether you think that kind of input would in fact advance education in the province.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. The minister raises words in his reply to my question, which are disturbing to me, and those are the misinterpretations and so, and I guess that's what I am trying to get at. Would you not agree, Mr. Minister that that in itself upon the trustees and parents and to members on this side of the House and obviously on that side of the House, the innuendoes going on a very important bill, would it not be better, Mr. Minister, as I mentioned before, to take out the political elements of this and sit down with the committee which you can select so that these things can be solved and we can introduce a bill which is a non-political bill?

MR. FARIS: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have clear evidence and I indeed invite the

member to read the speech of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland and see whether in fact that was a real contribution or in fact a very political kind of speech. I invite him to look at the comments of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, when on the steps of the Legislature he told a group of parents there that we had withdrawn Bill 43. We all know that to be incorrect. It died on the order paper. So that kind of political statement does nothing to enhance the discussion.

Banking Arrangements - Saskatchewan Potash Corporation

MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation.

I am led to understand (and I wonder if the minister would confirm whether this is correct or incorrect) that upon the purchase of the potash mine near Lanigan that the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation transferred bank accounts that had existed in the Royal Bank and in the Commerce Bank in that community and transferred their banking arrangement to the Toronto Dominion Bank in Saskatoon. Is that correct?

HON. E. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the banking arrangements, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan deals with two banks, primarily, the TD being one of them and we do our banking through them. We have one sales organization obviously. In the case of the Lanigan operation when it was in the hands of Alwinal it would deal with its own bank. Obviously, having one sales organization we deal through one bank. There may have been some change with respect to banking at Lanigan. I am not aware of which banks Alwinal dealt with and whether or not there was any particular change. But as I say, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan deals with two banks, the TD (Toronto Dominion) being one of them. Certainly I would anticipate us to follow that practice in the future.

MR. PENNER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister can appreciate that in a reasonably small Saskatchewan community the business done by the banking aspect of that community is pretty significant. I wonder how the minister can square a total government philosophy of attempting to keep small Saskatchewan town alive when at the time that they take over a major industry that is close to one of those small towns, they immediately pull the banking component out and put it in Saskatoon?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, that's simply not true. The banking we'll be talking about here is the banking with respect to sales. The banking with the biggest volume of handling which takes place is with respect to employees. For example, at Rocanville I know we continue to use the bank there that was used by the Sylvite operation when it was there. There may have been some change with respect to payroll etc. in Lanigan. I am not aware of it. As I say obviously with a sales organization we can't use seven banks, in seven different places. That doesn't make any sense and the member wouldn't suggest that I know. With respect to the Lanigan operation there may have been some change with respect to chartered banks. I am not aware of it. I'll take the question under advisement and will provide the member with the answer.

Valley Centre Training School - Moose Jaw

MR. BAILEY: — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, following the disastrous fire at Moose Jaw last year in which a portion of the Valley Centre Training School was destroyed, there was some doubt in your

department and some doubt among the advisors as to whether reconstruction of those facilities would take place. Now recently we have heard statements as to the fact that this portion of the building will be reconstructed. My first question to the minister, has that been solidified and are you now proceeding with the reconstruction of that building?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, as I recently indicated to the media, a proposal is being put forth from my department to the government. I expect an answer from the government some time next summer as to whether or not we will proceed. I said in all likelihood at that time that we would re-construct the program recreational area and also possibly the occupational therapy unit.

MR. BAILEY: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In your planning, and you have partially answered this question of mine in your first reply, Mr. Minister, in that that was the portion, the recreational part of the building was that which was destroyed. Along with the fire, of course, at that particular time it made it very important that there was a possibility, because there is a strong feeling within the province that many of these people who would normally attend the Moose Jaw Training Centre would be — the program would be decentralized into the smaller communities across Saskatchewan. Is that still your policy and may I ask, are you going to emphasize that policy even more despite the fact that you are considering the re-building of the fire loss?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, we still maintain that philosophy. We think wherever we can we should decentralize but I also indicated, Mr. Speaker, that right now I believe the enrolment at Valleyview is 790 or 800. I expect that to decrease over the next five years to about 600 or 650 and then stabilize. But the philosophy of the government still is that we want to decentralize the program and make certain that the individuals can be taken care of in their own communities as much as possible.

I also indicated to the media at that time that I did feel that an institution like Valleyview, maybe not of that magnitude but institutions like that, in my opinion, would probably be necessary for the foreseeable future.

Assistance to young dairy farmers

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the misunderstanding that seems to exist between Palm Dairies and the processors, if a strike were to be triggered, is the minister, or would the minister assure us that he would endeavour to assist the young dairy farmers in providing feed for their cattle if a strike is on? This is the problem of the high food costs with no income that the new farmer faces, and would you assure us that in this case you would endeavour to supply feed to them while the strike was on so they wouldn't have to disperse their herds?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I think that is a totally hypothetical question and one which we would have to deal with if the occasion arose.

Professional Status of Teachers

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — A question to the Minister of Education since he raised the topic of the speech which I gave on this matter the other day in the House. I would like to ask the minister, since I understand my speech has given him some trouble, what steps you are taking to improve the professional status of teachers in the province of Saskatchewan by way of offering to them certification and control of

their own membership, if any steps?

MR. FARIS: — Mr. Speaker, I must say that if I were a teacher in the province of Saskatchewan, and I have since your speech, talked to teachers in the province of Saskatchewan, they are very disturbed and concerned about your suggestion that they are not now a professional group. They are a professional group. They have very high standards; they are working to steadily improve those and we intend to work in co-operation with them towards that goal.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, I hope the member does not, if he is going to criticize anyone for misrepresentation, persist in that order, because I tell the member this and I ask him this question — my question was, and I put it to you again, what are you doing to improve the professional status?

Now, I spent a number of years in the classroom and so has my wife, and I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, what steps to improve ..Naturally they want to have professional status, naturally many of them act like professionals and wish to carry it on but you can improve the framework within which that takes place and offer to them full professional status. I ask you also, have you not read their policy book which asks for certification and full professional status and are you denying them that?

MR. FARIS: — We are working steadily in co-operation with the STF in the professional development of teachers. We just recently extended the training for teachers to a three-year period. You may not be aware of that. We are extending the internship period for teachers. That is a very significant move and we have added a lot of extra dollars into the training of teachers in this province.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Final supplementary. I see that the minister carefully avoided that topic. Let's try him out on another one. The minister has replied recently in response to the fact that there is a great deal of power centralized in his department, in his ministership: 'While we won't exercise that power or in fact we have given little bits back.' Now would it not be a defence to come in and say that I gave these little things back but I took it all back in here. If you don't need that kind of all pervasive power to allow you to change that - I'm asking the question - if you don't need that kind of all pervasive power to take every bit of control into your department then why do you . . .

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

Cable Television

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Telephones. I would like to know whether Sask Tel was given a directive or advice or a suggestion by the government not to abide the terms of the written undertaking given to clear channel 3? You understand that was either a decision of Telephones or a decision of the government and I want to know whose decision it was and what was communicated to Sask Tel?

MR. BYERS: — Well, Mr. Speaker, Sask Tel has for many, many months now been working very closely with the cable operators and CPN re an accommodation. It was certainly through the aegis of Sask Tel that the 45-day extension was negotiated and I think, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that this matter of the CPN use of channels is now before the courts, that the licensees - at least two or three of them I understand, I just got back this morning - have applied for an injunction against Sask Tel. This is not an

appropriate question to respond to in light of the legal action that is underway.

MR. CAMERON: — That's baloney that it isn't an appropriate question. You say to me that the dispute is now before the courts. My question to you phrased very clearly is simply this, did Sask Tel make the decision not to abide the clear undertaking it gave in the letter of February, which is tabled, or did the government give a direction to Sask Tel not to abide that commitment. That's my question.

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is not appropriate for me to respond to that question in light of the fact that legal action is now under way.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Role as Liberal Party Whip

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — I rise under Rule 6. I would like to ask the Speaker, I would have given you two hours notice of my intention to raise a point of privilege but as a result of the early morning session I was unable to do that. I would like to ask if the Speaker firstly would waive the right of notice?

MR. SPEAKER: — I believe it is customary to hear what the matter of privilege is that the member is prepared to state.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well I state the matter of privilege is a question of liable against myself respecting my role as a member in this Legislature and my capacity as the Liberal Party Whip in this Legislature. A matter arising on Wednesday last. The Speaker well knows I was absent yesterday and unable to bring this matter to your attention at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: — I wonder if the member could state specifically what the point of privilege is that he is referring to?

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) speaking outside of this House on Wednesday evening last making reference to undertakings that I supposedly gave to the Attorney General inside of this Legislature with respect to rules of the House concerning the dairy strike has stated that I had given certain undertakings to the Attorney General in this Legislature which I subsequently broke within this Legislature. The question of privilege is simple enough in the Speaker's mind if members of the House will realize that I was not even present in the Legislature last Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: — On the basis of what the member has put forward I would take it as notice. I am still a bit in doubt as to what the basis of the privilege is that the member states, however, I will take it as notice and bring the matter back at a later time.

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to try and clarify my point of privilege with you if you so agree.

MR. SPEAKER: — I have given the member two opportunities to put forward specifically what his point of privilege was and I am unable to grasp it yet. I think we shouldn't spend more time of the House at this time. It is unfortunate the member didn't have it clear

April 14, 1978

enough so that I could understand it.

MR. CAMERON: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. CAMERON: — My point of order, Mr. Speaker, was that the member was clearly, Mr. Speaker, wanting to raise the matter with you in a way that was completely in accordance with the rules, so he was seeking Mr. Speaker's direction in the genuine way to raise it. He is very exercised about it. I think Mr. Speaker must now give him the opportunity to lay before you the facts so that you can make the determination. It was only a sensitivity about abiding the rules, Mr. Speaker, in the way the member wanted to raise it that created the problem.

Mr. Speaker, surely, surely give him an opportunity now to tell you more fully what the facts are in respect of it.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — On the point of order.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, you gave the Liberal member an opportunity twice to state his grievance. The rules are clear. He should, under normal circumstances, give you two hours notice in advance. He is referring to a matter that happened Wednesday last. This is now Friday morning. I suggest you have been proper in handling this matter and that you do have the time to consider his request.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order?

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that what the member was doing was he was asking for leave and he thought that it was necessary to make a two-transit sort of request. The member has been accused of lying outside of this House and it is important that he bring about matters that went on in this House. He thought that it was necessary to have leave; he asked for leave, most deferentially. Now having received leave he says, now may I present the position to you, which I think you will find a very serious matter.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might reply to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would accept a comment on the point of order if the member has one.

MR. COLLVER: — I make the comment on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, outside this Legislature I made a comment about the member for Kindersley. I was mistaken and I apologize to the member for making that comment. My comments should have been made about the Leader of the Liberal Party who was, in fact, in the Legislature at that time. I referred, unfortunately, to the member for Kindersley but I should have referred to the Leader of the Liberal Party. I withdraw the remark as it applies to the member for Kindersley.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. First of all, now he has . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Can I just have some time here.

What we appear to have here is a request for privilege under Rule 6 which is quite in order providing the member has a point of privilege and I assume he had. I asked the member twice to state the point so that I could decide whether I would waive notice or not and, after giving the member two opportunities to specifically state what the point was, I still was able to grasp it. I am afraid I am ignorant of some of the facts that he is alluding to.

Then we have the situation of the member for Nipawin, who apparently was the person who had made the remarks, make an unqualified withdrawal of the remarks, as I understand it. We are now in the position of me still not knowing what the substance exactly is of the point of privilege is and having an unqualified withdrawal on my hands. Any progress is good progress I guess and I would ask the member for Kindersley if in fact the unqualified withdrawal that the member for Nipawin has made is with regard to the point of privilege he raises and whether it satisfies a point.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you are a better judge of that than I. If I can briefly try to make the facts clear to you, you may better be able to decide whether the member's withdrawal in fact constituted an unconditional withdrawal. The member for Nipawin, speaking in Kindersley at a nominating convention, accused me of having given the Attorney General the word of the Liberal Party, that we would allow proceedings of the House to sit during Wednesday evening, and then three or four minutes later going back on my word and causing an uproar in the Legislature. That, in fact, did not happen, because I was not present in the Legislature. I was therefore libelled, my character was damaged outside of this House supposedly as a result of things that took place inside this House. I consider that a breach of privilege and would like your views on that.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I thank the member for Kindersley for throwing some light on what the point of privilege was. Now that I have some basis on which to consider the matter, unless the member for Kindersley is prepared to accept the withdrawal, I will defer my decision on it and take under consideration the comments the member for Kindersley has made and the comments the member for Nipawin has made and refer back to the House at a later time.

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, I will accept the apologies and the unconditional withdrawal of the member for Nipawin for the comments he made about me outside this House, with respect to matters that supposedly took place inside this House.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well then I think we have solved the problem and I will not find it necessary to rule on it.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is difficult for you sometimes but the supplementary that I asked, which you cut off, was about the Cornwall Centre, an important matter to Regina. You may recall it dealt with the facade of the CIBC building which the government seems incapable of maintaining. I wonder if Mr. Speaker recalls why you cut off that supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes. I would be glad to supply the member with the reason. The member's question initially was, with regard to retail development in Cornwall Centre, the new construction, as it relates to Sask Tel, and his question which he posed as a

supplementary was with regard to the facade of a bank building, an original bank building in Cornwall Development. I just ruled that it was not sufficiently close enough to the subject to be a supplementary. I would have permitted the member a question later on but the member must understand that the first question was strictly with regard to retail development by Sask Tel in this particular development and the next question was separate and apart from that.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS — Vote 24

ITEM 4 cont'd

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — On Item 4, Mr. Minister, is this where the land use policy is being studied for the province of Saskatchewan, the pilot project for the land use study in the province?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — The land use studies that we talked about last evening are in the land development subvote.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, then am I on the wrong subvote again here? On the changing of the lands around the Last Mountain Lake (I think we questioned you last fall on that) about the subdivision of land around, — I believe it is around Last Mountain Lake.

MR. MacMURCHY: — It would be under this subvote, in fact the moneys for them are — these special planning area commissions are in this subvote.

MR. WIPF: — Under this special planning, Mr. Minister, last fall when I was talking to you, some of the people from around Last Mountain Lake were quite concerned over some of the agricultural land being zoned for recreational land, and they were supposed to be meeting with the department. I believe it was, at that time to straighten this out. There were some farmers who had not been involved in the negotiations or consultations. I was wondering if your department has met with these individual farmers or is it still in the consultation stage?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, to report to the hon. member, there have been a number of meetings, both with departmental officials and with commissions and the concerned farmers. I think I should point out to the hon. member that this is pretty much brand new for a number of the commission people who are doing the work. They are really just getting their feet under the table.

We knew that when the structure was established that the commission would have to make certain adjustments to that structure. They are now involved in doing that. I held a meeting with them some time ago with all of the commission members to talk about it. A further meeting is going on this afternoon which I had hoped to attend but will not be able to do so now and it will be followed up. I think, in talking to the commission members personally and in talking with the people from the broad community, we are on the right track in how to deal with zoning and development control in the Qu'Appelle. It is just going to take a little while to work out the best system.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, with some of these consultations that are going on with your people and the farmers in the area (I wish I could remember the name of the farmer. I haven't got it here) but some of them were very upset at the idea of having their land re-zoned. If these people are protesting this is there an opportunity or chance that you see at this time for them to have their land pulled out of that re-zoned area and leave it in

agriculture instead of the recreational area? It was apparently done without their knowledge and pushed in on top of them before they knew about it.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes and I think the great concern relates to land that has been zoned wildlife instead of agriculture and that's one of the obvious concerns ..the ongoing concern about country residential and recreational..which will always be a concern but with the farmers themselves. It is a wildlife issue and that's now being looked at at the commission level. So, very much so, the examination is taking place.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, you have \$53,740 set down for other personal services. How many part-time employees do you employ or how many part-time employees are you employing in that park?

MR. MacMURCHY: — None.

Item 4 agreed.

Item 5

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, there is one additional post, one employee for \$72,000. I know it is taking into account the raises and that, but \$72,000, one additional employee? That now makes 22. Can you justify..how do you justify that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Three reasons; one, last year since all the positions weren't filled the budget was only a partial coverage of the 21 employees. We were just in the process of getting that Urban Development Division started and while the total complement was expected to be 21 they were not all yet in place and weren't expected to be in place until during the year. The second reason, an addition of an engineer to bring the complement from 21 to 22.

MR. WIPF: — You did fill the 21 positions and you say at the end of the year you had filled the 21 positions but it took the 1977-78 year to do that, is that right?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

Item 5 agreed.

Item 6

MR. WIPF: — Again, on this one Mr. Minister, we have an addition of two people with an addition of \$67,000. Would that be the same reason — didn't fill the positions throughout the year? Same way?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — O.K. How many part-time employees do you have in this department, or this municipal development area?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Two.

MR. WIPF: — Where are they located?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Right now they are working on the establishment of special

April 14, 1978

planning areas on the abandoned rights-of-way and the hon. member for Rosetown and I had a discussion about that last night.

Item 6 agreed.

Item 7

MR. WIPF: — Under this one we have an increase of \$200,000 in our other expenses. Can the minister explain?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The \$200,000 in other services are frozen. The plan is to computerize the assessment.

Item 7 agreed.

Item 8

MR. WIPF: — Since this is a brand new department, what is its purpose; why have we set it up and what has it replaced?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The grants that are distributed from the department will be administered here; they will be doing the sort of designing of municipal forms, auditing and accounting regulations respecting municipalities; and a very important thing, the educational program that is being carried on by Urban Affairs will be handled from this particular division of the department. I talk about educational program, I'm talking about the work that is going on within the department and with SUMA in setting up seminars and that sort of thing for education with the villages, the councillors and their secretary treasurers and their staff. That is going to be operated from this particular management in Municipal Finance Branch.

MR. WIPF: — You say that all grants that have been paid out from under Municipal Affairs are going to be paid out from under this; the education is going to be done through this one department and you have nine employees in there. This is the total staff that you are going to need to do all this work?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the administration of it will be handled from there, the grants aren't paid out from there but the administration is handled from there. I am told also that there is a \$48,000 grant which goes to the Municipal Secretaries Association for a training program.

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — I just have an additional question about the same subject. Would you indicate where this was done previously, how was this done previously? I'm sure you must have had the same type of a situation.

MR. MacMURCHY: — It was done before but it was done under the Administration subvote.

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Chairman, if I might ask a few brief questions at this time about the - if the minister would be prepared to answer them - Saskatoon Riverbank Authority? I would just ask you this, could you tell us not what stage of proceedings in terms of relationship to your department, the city of Saskatoon has progressed in setting up a Riverbank Authority and if there are some definite guidelines in respect to funding from the provincial government?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I can give a very brief summary of what is happening there. I think there has been a decision to move with the request for the river edge development, or whatever you might call it, by the government in co-operation with the city of Saskatoon, with the involvement of course of the surrounding municipality. Two committees - I'll go back one step further - to sort of get things organized the government contacted Allan Gilmore from Ottawa, who is with the university there and who was involved in the Wascana development, to sit down and talk about it. As a result of that discussion Allan was hired as a co-ordinator of the project and through his efforts two committees have been set up. I don't know what they are called. I'll call them for our purposes the A Committee and the B Committee; the A Committee made up of the decision-makers, representatives of council, councils and Cabinet; the B Committee being the working committee. I think at this stage they've hired a planner to bring forward a plan for the committees to consider. I think that's about where that's at. I don't know who the planner is since there has been some shift in responsibilities for some of the Municipal Affairs work. As the hon. member knows, Mr. Smishek, who is pretty familiar with the Wascana Development as Minister of Finance, kind of following up on this particular project. But I think roughly that's where it's at.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Chairman, just one or two more brief questions. My understanding and I have not been able to find any way to verify this yet, but my understanding in terms of the Wascana Authority is there is a commitment for funding and that there has indeed been funding from the provincial government to the tune of about 75 per cent. I believe funding happens again at all three levels. I am not sure about that but this is my best information. I also believe that there is a 75 per cent portion of the tab that is picked up by the provincial government. Could you tell me whether I am correct in that statement, and if so, whether a similar kind of contribution could be expected with respect to the Saskatoon River Bank Authority?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know the figures of Wascana. I don't think there is any kind of a formula around at all. I think it is obviously going to be different, a different kind of a formula than Regina in that the university is extensively involved. I suppose that can be called public land. Of course the river is federal government jurisdiction and I don't know what involvement they will provide. Of course a lot of it is private land, particularly when you get away from the university. So it's a different kind of situation. I can't say what the formula will look like. I don't think they are even that far. Certainly there is a commitment from the government, this government, to become involved because we were sort of the ones to respond in a positive way by contacting Gillmore and getting Gillmore to co-ordinate this project. I think everyone is pretty happy about that decision and the efforts of Mr. Gillmore. He's a real pusher and he got a hold on the reins rather than push him. I think that's what is needed in developing a project like this. But the formula, I don't think anyone is even close to that.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister if any of his officials have the information as to the formula used in the Wascana Authority? Do you have that information available?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, we don't have it here. I think it would come under a different estimate. The information is obviously available but we don't have it here.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — I would like to ask just this one question then. The object of this is to extract a promise from you or a commitment that at least the government will commit itself to funding no less by way of their proportionate share of the financial burden to

the Saskatoon River Bank Authority than to the Wascana Authority. Now the minister has been through Saskatoon and certainly that area everyone that has driven through the area, that central core where the river bank has been developed is probably one of the most beautiful places in the world. The difficulties along the edges both ways, I am sure you have received some letters from the Saskatoon Environmental Society that indicate there is dumping of refuse along those areas and if they were maintained and developed .. I congratulate you for your initial commitment to get involved. What I want now is to extract a promise from you that your commitment will be, in terms of financial involvement, no less by way of the provincial share to the Saskatoon River Bank Authority than to the Wascana Authority.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I don't think I can make that commitment at all. I don't think the hon. member should expect that commitment since there is not even any plan and not even any proposal to consider. I am sure that once the plan is approved and the scheme is put in place that the people who are part of the 'A' committee are quite capable of putting forward a proposal on financing to the government, to city council and to the municipal council and then commitments can be considered and commitments can be made. But it is simply too early to make any kind of a commitment on that project whatsoever because of all the different factors that are involved.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the minister's difficulties in that regard. All I am saying that is, to give a lesser commitment to Saskatoon than to Regina would be to make the implication that the citizenry there are of lesser status. Let me ask it this way, at least is your department at the present time receptive to the notion that there should be some similarity in the event that this project proceeds in terms of funding in Wascana for the Saskatoon River Bank Authority?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well again, I can't make any further comment. The officials here can't make any further comment because the department here is not part of the working committee on this particular River Edge development. So the information I provided to the hon. member is all the information that we have available to us now. It may be if the hon. member wishes to pursue this he can pursue it during Finance Estimates.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, you mentioned there was a \$48,000 grant given to the municipalities, the municipal governments. Was that urban or rural municipalities that that was given to?

MR. MacMURCHY: — It involves both urban and rural. It's an educational training, an on-the-job training program that has been going on with the secretaries for some time.

MR. WIPF: — O.K. that's for the rural. Mr. Minister, is this the item here that the drainage of the waters of Duck Lake would come under? Could you tell this Assembly what stage that's at and if there are any problems? What is the problem, or is it going to go ahead this spring?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well I can't recall this department draining the waters of Duck Lake, nor can any of the officials here. Maybe Agriculture C and D would sound more likely, to be a project of C and D, but not municipal.

Item 8 agreed.

ITEM 9

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, we have no bodies in this department. What does it handle, what department is this handled from?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well there is one of the officials of the department — Mr. Pleasance it happens to be — who was assigned as secretary. The commission members are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. There are three.

MR. WIPF: — These commission members that are appointed, Mr. Minister, what are they paid under? They must get some honorarium of some type. Where does that come from?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well they are paid honorariums and the honorariums are covered under the \$16,430 or other personal services.

Item 9 agreed.

ITEM 10

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, under this item here we have four people that are permanent in the Emergency Measures. Where are these people located? Who are they?

MR. MacMURCHY: — In Regina.

MR. WIPF: — And the other expenses on here are roughly \$7,000 per person. Why is this so high this year compared with last year?

MR. MacMURCHY: — You are talking about the increase from \$1,300 to \$8,270 I take it, are you?

MR. WIPF: — Yes.

MR. MacMURCHY: — We are looking. Well the 1,300 was to begin classes on emergency measures, bringing people together to discuss how to handle emergencies. It is proposed, from the success so far, to increase the number and these are the extra costs related to that increasing number.

MR. WIPF: — Your grants for municipalities for emergency planning are the same as last year. Is there a reason that these were not increased or is this a requisition by the municipalities What is the reason for this?

MR. MacMURCHY: — These are just the straight grants and I think you will notice not..pardon?

MR. WIPF: — How was the formula ..?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The formula? Well, we do not have the formula with us, neither do we have Mr. Eaton, the director. What I can do for the hon. member is get the information for him and then provide it to him later on, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, when you are doing that, would you also give me a break down of municipalities and the amount of moneys they receive?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

Item 10 agreed.

ITEM 11

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, would you indicate to me what the total administrative costs are for collecting Homeowners Grants, or disbursing them, I mean.

MR. MacMURCHY: — There are five permanent staff involved and 26 temporary. Obviously you will understand the reason for the temporary because the sort of time frame when the applications come in. I suppose that, while we do not have the exact figure, it would be something like \$220,000.

MR. HAM: — What you are saying, Mr. Minister then, we would be saving the taxpayers of Saskatchewan some \$220,000 if we reduced their taxes at the local level rather than disburse Homeowners Grants?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I suppose the hon. member can make that argument but there is a significant counter-argument that I would suggest the hon. member should consider. He should consider it in talking with the farmers in his constituency if there are any and to the small businessmen in this constituency where, I suspect, there are quite a few. I understand that he is one of those himself. The vehicle that we are using is of significant benefit to the farmers and the small businessmen when they pay their income tax. I do not think they would support the hon. member in any suggestion that he has put forward on how to distribute the money.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Chairman, if I might just ask a question of the minister. Mr. Minister, really all that you said was that they way it was being handled was of a significant value to the farmers. How? How is that? Really. What we are saying here is that if you were to do one of two things, either reduce the tax at the municipal and urban level or have it administered at the local level at the municipal office in our rural municipalities or in the town office of our small towns, you could save substantial sums of money, like almost one-quarter of a million dollars. Now in reply to the member for Swift Current all you said was that the program was of significant value to the farmers in particular and to the urban dwellers as well in small towns. It would be just as equally significant in value, in fact more of a value, as they would get the same benefits through a tax reduction and not be burdened with the administrative costs of handling the program. Now surely, Mr. Minister, that makes some kind of logic, at least it does to me. Would you reply more specifically just why you feel the way you are handling this is superior to the way in which we are suggesting that you could consider?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the discussion, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Swift Current and I were having, related to the method. I think the hon. member for Moosomin is relating to the broad benefits and I was indicating to the hon. member that if he talked to his farmers and his businessmen, the method that we are using is better than the method he suggested because when they make out their income tax that becomes very, very obvious because they deduct on their farm expenses or their business expenses their tax, the tax that they pay. They don't show the property improvement grant as income.

Item 11 agreed.

Item 12 agreed.

ITEM 13

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you indicated and the previous one, if I might ask this, and the following several, there is no indication of employees. Could you explain that please?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't get the question?

On the Industrial Towns subvote?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes.

MR. MacMURCHY: — What was the question?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well I noted that on 11, 12 and thereafter there are no employees listed. Could you explain that please?

MR. MacMURCHY: — These are covered under, for Industrial Town; Grants to Municipalities under The Municipal Water Assistance: Grants to NIP are under the Urban Development Branch — on the top, so that would be subvote 5.

Items 13 to 18 agreed.

ITEM 19

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Minister, an increase in employees by five, an increase in expenditure, could you explain why please?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, that's a switch of responsibility and the Municipal Employees' Superannuation Commission staff were transferred from Urban Affairs to Rural Affairs in terms of responsibility.

MR. BIRKBECK: — What are the other personal services that you have here? Also the other expenses that you have listed. Could you tell us what those are?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think to get sort of a broad grip on those other services, generally the field operation of the rural affairs division, surveying, travel and CVA vehicles and that sort of thing required in the servicing of the rural municipalities away from the regional offices of rural affairs.

MR. BIRKBECK: — When you say surveying, are these students from the university that are doing the surveying?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We have about 34 permanent positions under labor service. Then during the summer about an equal amount from the universities come in to work with them on that work.

MR. BIRKBECK: — So then, Mr. Minister, what you are saying is that there is approximately 34 of these students that come in from university for survey work in the rural municipalities on a per annum basis. Is that correct?

April 14, 1978

MR. MacMURCHY: — It is just strictly summer time season. They would likely be from May 1 until the end of August.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, how much are these students paid for this work?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The basic salary is \$41 a day, plus expenses. The salaries vary in accordance with the years of training they have had at the university and the experience they have had.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, the work that they do, the surveys that they are involved in, can you tell me if they are projects which are going to be brought on-stream within one year, two years, three years or are they just surveys for the sake of surveying?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Their work is at the request of the municipality. I think generally it is the work that is going to be done either that year or the year following depending when the survey is complete. It will be main farm access now, and a bit of super-grid.

MR. BIRKBECK: — One final question, Mr. Chairman, on this. Does it also involve the surveying of gravel pits, provincial gravel pits that you have in the province?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I note a \$3,000 grant to SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities). Do you determine that amount or your department, or is that as much as they request.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, as long as I have been Minister of Municipal Affairs and as long as I have been in the government here, since 1971, it has been \$3,000. That's the grant to SARM. I think you will find in Education Estimates there is a grant to SSTA too. It was started some time ago and it has just continued the same. There is never, to my knowledge, any discussion between the association and the government with respect to the amount, they just know it's coming.

Item 19 agreed.

Item 20 agreed.

ITEM 21

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, are these ferries operating at a profit or a loss?

MR. MacMURCHY: — It is a service, Mr. Chairman, and with this Budget no charge at all for the use of ferry.

MR. HAM: — One question, Mr. Chairman. I note there are no employees listed here either. Can you explain that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I am sorry I didn't get the question.

MR. HAM: — I know it is the way that I present it sometimes. There are no employees listed under this subvote.

MR. MacMURCHY: — They are not classified as permanent positions; they are classified as labor service.

MR. WIPF: — How many employees are in that classification, Mr. Minister?

MR. MacMURCHY: — 67.

Item 21 agreed.

ITEM 22

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, how many of these districts are there in the province?

MR. MacMURCHY: — There aren't any LIDS left in the province. All them of them have been organized into rural municipalities. The agreement, as part of the organization between the government and the new municipalities, is that there would be a phase-in funding formula over five years. You will note that it is higher in this Budget than last year and that is because there are, in fact, ..the work is complete and we now have a better knowledge of the kind of formula that is acceptable. But they will receive funding from rural affairs, under this subvote, for the next five years and then they will be rural municipalities, full-fledged, in terms of coming under the revenue sharing formula.

They will receive their revenue sharing funding and they will receive this in addition to that.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Just very simply, just to clarify — what you are saying is that this item then will be phased into the new revenue sharing program? Is that correct?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, this item will disappear.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, but it will disappear, but will this amount of money not be available for any such improvement districts, or if there are none as you say, what is going to replace it?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Revenue sharing, of course, will replace it. There are, obviously, some organizational problems with this. There are, obviously, some mill rate adjustments that have to take place and this was to assist in the organizational and the mill rate adjustment for a five year period in order to let them, really, as RMs get on their feet.

Item 22 agreed.

ITEM 23

MR. HAM: — Mr. Minister, to what extent is the Housing Corporation involved with Metis building projects, and specifically in the Swift Current area, if you can break it out?

MR. MacMURCHY: — While we are sort of finding the answer to the question, as it

relates to Swift Current, I will introduce the general manager of the corporation, Stan Wilox. I will introduce Wayne MacDonald. I will also introduce the chairman of the board of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, Mr. Smishek.

Well, I think the hon. member is asking about the rural and native programs, I would assume. There aren't any in the city of Swift Current, since this program only operates in communities under 2,500 and we will see if there are any communities under 2,500 where we have some projects going on. Eastend, which is quite a way from Swift Current down in that country. And there are four going up in Waldeck. That looks, from the list I see here, about it.

MR. HAM: — I wonder if Mr. Minister might know or could comment with respect to these projects. Are the native groups being encouraged in fact, to certain areas of the province or are they back in fact, seeking places to locate?

MR. MacMURCHY: — There are two directions I suppose, from which requests come. One is from the native people (that would be the Metis people) through themselves where they look at the needs of a given area and two, the requests come from various councils themselves because it is a program for low income people to subsidize mortgage programs, the broad spectrum is eligible so they come from two directions — from councils and from Metis themselves.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, with respect to the total program and its control, to what degree or how, for example, will you oversee the expenditure for the materials and purchase of those materials in the billing process?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The houses are built in two ways: one, through the general contractors. They are also built by various non-profit Metis groups, and with respect to the Metis non-profit there are regular monthly financial checks and the books and records are established on standard accounting, so in the awarding of a contract to a non-profit Metis company there are some tight controls on the procedures that I have outlined within the contract.

MR. HAM: — Just a further question in that regard, Mr. Chairman. A non-profit Metis company I assume would be a group of people; the money if funded to them as a body I assume and disbursed from that group to those who are building?

MR. MacMURCHY: — It is disbursed to the building company under the terms of the contract.

MR. HAM: — Maybe I should finally ask, have you had any problems with respect to mismanagement or misuse of funds?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Initially, Mr. Chairman, we did but the early experience forced us to tighten up the accounting procedures and the terms of the contract. This is a federal-provincial program, CMHC, Sask Housing Corporation. One aspect of it obviously is to attempt to encourage participation by the people who are doing the work and to encourage participation and responsibility by the Metis people.

MR. HAM: — I wonder if Mr. Minister may be able to tell us and I assume that this is what is happening. The homes are built, I assume, to CMHC standards and inspected regularly by CMHC officials?

MR. MacMURCHY: — National building code — inspection once a month, minimum.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, you said this was a CMHC provincial grant. What percentage is CMHC money on this?

MR. MacMURCHY: — It is 75 per cent capital mortgage money and 75 per cent sharing on subsidy.

MR. WIPF: — What percentage of the Metis housing, (I know in my area there is a fair amount of it done) is done in the cities compared to the rural areas?

MR. MacMURCHY: — There isn't any in the cities. You wouldn't have any in the city of Saskatoon because the ceiling is 2,500 people and only in communities up to 2,500 will this program apply. There has been a lot of pressure from Metis people to raise that ceiling and we have tended to support that position, as a province, but so far we have been unable to get the federal government or CMHC to agree, but we are going to maintain the pressure on them. It is a pretty good program because it is an ownership program.

MR. WIPF: — What is the criterion that you use to get up to the 2,500. Why do you not go beyond the 2,500 for a city — to use a city status?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, it was established before my time as a federal provincial agreement, and I suppose at the time it was negotiated, the parties were pleased. But as the program has become accepted, then the pressure is obviously, to increase the ceiling and we support the increase, and to this point in time the federal government does not.

MR. WIPF: — Have you got any indication that, with the pressure you are putting on the federal government to fair up this housing program a bit, for these people if they want to move into the cities — have you got any indication of when, through negotiations that you have had or the pressure you have put on the federal government, when this would be possible?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the only commitment we have received from the Minister, is that he would look at — look at — increasing the ceiling from 2,500 to 5,000. So at least that is better than it is now, although of course it would not help the situation in Prince Albert — but at least they are looking at some change.

MR. WIPF: — What is the argument that the federal government use to keep the people, qualified for Metis housing, out of the cities? What is their argument and what is their reason?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well I think it boils down to simply 'We can't afford it'. I think their argument is, 'At this time, we can't afford it' because one, with you know, with the numbers of Metis people who are flowing in to Regina, Winnipeg, and so on, it has become a very, very expensive program for them. So I think basically, they are saying, 'Right now, we can't afford it'.

MR. WIPF: — I see, Mr. Minister. In my city, in Prince Albert, it is quite a concern because these people are moving into the cities and living in some of the poorer housing in the area, and I would appreciate any pressure you can put on the federal government to try and raise these up. But, there is another complaint that I am getting from the people

who are living in these homes and that is, the warranty work — it is so far behind — one year, one year and a half behind. People have withheld payments on their homes until the warranty work is done. Has your department stepped in and propped that up? I believe one of the reasons, Mr. Minister, is there was if I got it right, a Metis housing group who were doing the constructing of housing and now that is not a body any more — as of a year ago, I believe. They built some homes and they are not incorporated any more and some of these people do not know who they should be going to.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the terms of the contract with the contractors they would be, I think likely you are talking about the non profits, that is a one year warranty, and that they are to fulfil their obligations under that. If the hon. member is saying that, in situations that he has come across, the company has packed up and left then I would ask the hon. member to indicate to the housing corporation those specifics, so the corporation can take a look at it and see what best can be done. With respect to Prince Albert and the problem of the rural and native program we have attempted to operate within the programs that are available to us, through a program of purchase of existing housing, and the program of family housing. I think we have a fair number of those units available in Prince Albert, now that is rental, it is not ownership and there is some feeling about ownership, but to this point that is the best we can do.

MR. WIPF: — To be more specific, Mr. Minister, I was talking about some of the homes and the houses that were built right in Duck Lake, for the group. And if I have the name right, it was the Metis Housing Group, that was called the contractor that was doing their own building and that is not an incorporated body any more. They were having problems wondering whom they went to for their warranty work there.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I indicated that we would look into Duck Lake for the hon. member.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, something has just come to mind here. I wonder if the minister might be able to tell me — you indicate in the smaller centres in the Swift Current area, I don't know how you designate your areas — I am wondering if you can tell me how many homes the corporation is dealing with in that Swift Current general area?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I gave the figures for the rural and native housing program, at Waldeck and that was four. There is the public housing program and I can't recall how many units there are in the new high-rise that was opened there. How many are involved presently in family housing, then there is the non-profit program, we give those figures. For family housing there are 105 senior citizen and there are 20 family. Those projects were completed during the year 1977. That's right in Swift Current. I think the best way to answer this, Mr. Chairman, is to get a map of the constituency, the other communities involved and get the staff to provide the hon. member with the figures. We can do that.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I first should qualify your comment. I think you know my feelings are one of congratulations with respect to the senior citizens' high-rise in Swift Current. You may not be aware but there are now in excess, I understand, of 150 maybe even more than 200 applications for similar accommodation whether the department has now plans or is intending to build another high-rise or something similar in Swift Current?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think the hon. member might remember that when we were

down and opened the existing high-rise, I made the commitment that as soon as the need was necessary we would begin another project. That commitment is still there. If there are applications for 150 there will be a response. We had Swift Current on the list last year and the needs survey wasn't completed, it's on the list again. So I think the hon. member can expect a response by the corporation to the request at Swift Current. There is no question, as soon as the need is there, we will respond.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, on what basis do you consider a need, a number or how do you qualify that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I don't think there are really any hard fast rules, particularly in a community the size of Swift Current. Two things are required: the indication of the need and I think that problem it sounds like would be resolved. You are probably looking at as many as 100 units on the basis of those figures you have provided. It also requires a resolution of city council there because they are going to be committing 5 per cent of the project, both capital and operation.

Item 23 agreed.

ITEM 24

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, I notice a substantial drop in that subvote. Can you explain that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well that is simply because of the rising incomes in the province. By regulation the ceiling is fixed and we have fewer applicants, therefore, eligible under this program. We have not made a decision to increase that ceiling under the regulations of this program.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Minister, you say you have not made a decision. I assume by that you are going to be making a decision. Can you tell the Assembly about when?

MR. MacMURCHY: — If there is a decision made and a change made it will be announced.

MR. WIPF: — Who qualifies to get these grants?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The income ceiling is \$10,000. It is any new home owner. That's basically it.

MR. WIPF: — You say any new home that had an income ceiling of \$10,000, you want . . .

MR. MacMURCHY: — Income ceiling, yes.

MR. WIPF: — Income ceiling of \$10,000 eh! What is the ceiling on the price of the home that you are talking about? Is there a ceiling for that? Could you build a \$75,000 home and at that rate we would have probably 10 homes in Saskatchewan be built.

MR. MacMURCHY: — With an income of \$10,000 it would be pretty venturesome to build a \$75,000 home. However, there are some venturesome guys I guess and they would qualify for the grant.

April 14, 1978

MR. WIPF: — There is no . . . I may be one of those venturesome guys . . . there is no ceiling on the price of the home that you can build then?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

Item 24 agreed.

ITEM 25

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, again I congratulate you for this program and the increase in expenditure. My concern is, I am wondering whether or not what degree of protection you have built into the system to make sure our senior citizens aren't being taken advantage of by the possible rip-off artists with respect to renovations, home repairs?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well the supervision or control is established at the community level. The Housing Corporation appoints a series of local inspectors and these inspectors will not only inspect but they will sit down and advise the senior citizens on the project and on the contract and so on. Additionally, the grant isn't paid out until we receive the bills from the senior citizen indicating that they are happy with the work that has been done. If they aren't happy there can be contact with the senior citizen to see if something can be worked out. There is an attempt to assist the senior citizens in being, I suppose the word would be, taken to the cleaners by some fast talking contractors.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, further to that answer then I am wondering .. I assume they are part-time employees these inspectors .. how many inspectors would there be in total in Saskatchewan?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We will have to figure and send you the number, but it is a fairly extensive number. The system is that the village or town council or city council recommends some names, or a name and that is the person that is appointed. They are, of course, temporary and then there are some staff in the housing corporation - four or five - who go out as well.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Minister, does the cost of hiring these inspectors come out of that estimated subvote?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, that's the estimate of the grant and you will see the significant increase related to the changes in the program that are announced in the Budget. It is paid out of the Administrative Subvote.

MR. HAM: — How much would an average inspector be paid, or are they paid the same throughout the province?

MR. MacMURCHY: — They are paid on an inspection basis and it is \$6 if the inspection is done in town and it is \$9 if they drive out to the farm.

MR. HAM: — No more than that, Mr. Minister or Mr. Chairman? No more than \$6, there is no allowance for travel or extra - . . . but I'm wondering if there. . . .

MR. MacMURCHY: — In all cases they are local people.

MR. HAM: — Flat \$6 and \$9, no more.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Minister, we have about a 550 per cent increase in expenditure on this particular item. I would think by that amount then that somehow because of that increase what you've done is made a change in the eligibility and I'm going to ask that question, because it seems to me that if you're going to put that much more in you've changed the eligibility for those who can be recipients of these moneys, is that true? And if so, what's the difference?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes, there will be legislation coming before the House very shortly from the chairman of the Housing Corporation. But there have been two changes which make it significant: the increase in the eligibility ceiling and an increase in the grant itself; and instead of a once-in-a-lifetime grant, it's a grant for which you are eligible every five years.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Minister, what you've said then is that you've raised the amount available to the individual. My question is, have you changed the prerequisites for the availability of the grant?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Previously, senior citizens had to be eligible for the supplement. That's been changed now and the income ceilings which will be coming forward in the act, are \$7,000 for singles and \$11,000 for couples. The grant has been increased from \$500 to \$650 and everyone will be eligible instead of once-in-a-lifetime, five years. That's really roughly the program. I think the specific details will come forward in the loan.

MR. BAILEY: — These details are going to be made known in this session, Mr. Minister. Do you think you have enough money with those two changes to take place? It seems to me the amount of money, and I'm not quarrelling with the 550 per cent increase, that increase is there because of what you've stated at the two ends, you've made it more accessible to people as well as the amount of money to be spent. I congratulate you on that because most of the applications that came to me from homeowners, they simply weren't eligible and now you are taking more people in. I guess that's just a guesstimate figure because it would well be short from the number - you could be well short, you may have to have a 1000 per cent increase there.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Fine.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, have you received any applications from the Prince Albert-Duck Lake towns and cities that are going to be included in this huge increase that you've got here for more senior citizen home repair in that area?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The applications or the interest in the program comes from the individuals themselves, it has nothing to do with municipal government at all. It's a program for seniors. I don't know but since the announcement of the Budget I've had from my riding a very large number of requests for information on this program. We would have to look through the files to see if they are writing in to us. If they are, I'll look after them. I won't send them to you.

MR. WIPF: — That's on record I hope.

Item 25 agreed.

ITEM 26

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, who qualifies for low rental housing? Is that based on an income basis or how do you arrive at that position as to who qualifies?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think, to give an answer in the easiest terms to understand, the hon. member knows that in each community where we have public subsidized housing, low rental housing — most of it is senior citizens because that's been our priority — the local authority which administers the units within the community use two criteria: need in terms of income and need in terms of availability of decent housing and there is a rental formula which will apply in the income aspect.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I see the figure has doubled; it has increased by almost a million dollars. Is that because — Have you just expanded the program or is that because the need has increased from the time of the introduction of the program? Have there been more requests which have required the doubling of funds?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes, it is the expansion. Some 1200 units were built last year and it is expected to be the same amount again this year. As I indicated during earlier discussion, I think the pressure is coming off the smaller communities but there is still a high level of pressure in the larger communities, say, Moosomin would have a lot larger pressure than Wapella.

Item 26 agreed.

ITEM 27

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, one question on this. The moneys have not increased over last year. Again I would ask you if you could supply me with the formula you used for getting this figure and the reason why there is no increase? Would you do that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes. I can provide the information on the program.

MR. BIRKBECK: — On the same item, why is there no need to expand that program when you did in the subvote just prior to it? What is the reason for that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, because it is hard to 'guesstimate' I guess. This program is a response to public non-profit groups like the Lutherans or the Salvation Army, and all our program is straight 20 per cent capital. We respond to their efforts and they know our policy. We just estimate at the amount. It could well wind up higher, depending on the requests and how fast they move, but that is the program. I think that answers your question. It is a straight 20 per cent grant for capital for those programs.

MR. BIRKBECK: — O.K. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, we can assume then that what has taken place with these non-profit sponsors is that they are really not taking the full advantage of the program. That is to say that they could, say next year, file a great number of requests and this figure would increase substantially. Is that true?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. BIRKBECK: — O.K.

MR. WIPF: — What percentage of that \$1 million did you use last year?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The two projects that were under way last year were the Ukrainian Orthodox in Saskatoon, and St. Anne's in Saskatoon. The provincial grant, 20 per cent, totalled \$713,572 so we also had expenditures at Cornwall Village, Lutheran Sunset (that is Cornwall, Regina), Lutheran Sunset in Saskatoon, and Saskatchewan Elks Senior Citizens' Lodge, Viscount, with some partial cash flow because they were committed in previous years. So that gives you a picture of the activity and who the non-profit sponsors are.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I just have one or two questions to ask of the minister. The million dollar grant for a moderately priced senior citizen accommodation — What is the estimate or the assessment on the amount or number of units that that will translate into by the time you bring in the federal grants and the other moneys that are allocated to that program?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We cannot really give you an accurate figure but the 'guesstimate' is 150 to 200.

MR. COLLVER: — So, Mr. Minister, what you are saying to us is that approximately - now if I am correct in this assumption - approximately \$5,000 per unit is the allocation of the provincial government to this low-cost senior citizens' housing. If that is the case could you tell us what the allocation, approximately per unit, of the federal government is?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The federal government provides a 10 per cent grant and they provide mortgage money.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I was waiting for the minister's answer on that. If you don't mind, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, my attention was distracted as often happens with the minister and I would like the answer on item 27, if we could. I have a few more questions to ask on item 27.

MR. MacMURCHY: — My answer to the hon. member's question was that the federal government puts up a 10 per cent grant and mortgage money. I think the hon. member asked me what was the contribution of the federal government in this program. The contribution is 10 per cent grant and mortgage money.

MR. COLLVER: — And yours is 10 per cent as well?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Ours is 20 per cent grant.

MR. COLLVER: — So that is really the number that we are looking at; your assessment of the cost, I gather, of one unit of the senior citizens' housing under this program is \$25,000. Is that approximately correct? Is that the number that your officials are using?

MR. MacMURCHY: — \$25,000 to \$30,000.

MR. COLLVER: — \$25,000 to \$30,000 and that is how you came up with your 150 to 200 units within the province of Saskatchewan. That is the total number of senior citizens' housing that will be built under this program for the 1978-79 fiscal year. Is that correct?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Total estimate based on past experience.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, yes, so it is not going to be more than 200. Would you say that that was a reasonable assessment since you say it is \$25,000 to \$30,000 and no one is suggesting that costs are going down. So as costs go up that would mean fewer units, I would think. I notice that your official was listening to that rather attentively. The most it could be, if it was \$25,000 per unit, which is the minimum amount that you gave us as the per unit cost of this construction, \$25,000 per unit was the minimum number and that translates into 200 units from your \$1 million grant. Is that not correct, Mr. Minister? Is that not correct that at the minimum number per unit, the \$1 million translates into 200 units? Costs certainly aren't going down, they are going up so, therefore, the most that your government is committing to build is 200 units in the forthcoming year. Would that be a reasonable thing to say?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We can only estimate this program. The policy is a 20 per cent grant to non-profits and we respond with that 20 per cent grant to non-profits as they come to us for the grant. If there is more request, the non-profits get organized and get their projects under way to a larger degree than we have in the past, then the \$1 million will not be sufficient and we will have to seek additional money in order to support the program. It could be less but that we have to look at.

I indicated to the hon. member that last year two new projects were started amounting to \$713,000 in Saskatoon - two of them in Saskatoon, Ukrainian Orthodox and St. Anne's. There was some clean-up on projects: one in Regina, Cornwall Village, Lutheran Sunset Home, Saskatoon and the Elks' Senior Citizen Lodge in Viscount. So that used up the money. We are just looking at past experience and it is very, very difficult to estimate.

MR. COLLVER: — Yes, that is exactly what I was trying to get at, Mr. Minister. You don't get it both ways and that is exactly what I am trying to get at. You can't accept any more applications than for 200 units in the year 1978-79 if you allocate \$1 million to senior citizens' housing. Is that correct?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We can accept more than 200 units under this program but in order to accommodate them we would have to go for a special warrant.

MR. COLLVER: — Now, that is what I was getting at. The minister suggests that he is prepared (and is that government policy) that if legitimate applications are received in the year 1978-79 for this program of senior citizen's housing since the federal government allocation of mortgage money and 10 per cent is open-ended, in other words they will accept any legitimate applications processed by the government of Saskatchewan, by your department and by Sask Housing, they will accept them if you so required, so it is open-ended. Your allocation is only \$1 million and that translates into 200 units. Are you telling this Assembly today that if legitimate applications are submitted to your department over the next two or three months, for 500 or 600 units, that your government will process these applications and get these projects underway, even though you have only allocated enough here for 200 units? Are you making a commitment then to the people of Saskatchewan that if these legitimate applications are received that you will definitely process them by special warrant?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well in the past that's been the procedure, that if requests are

over \$1 million we have met the obligation.

MR. COLLVER: — No, no!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well don't say 'no' . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Well, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. MacMURCHY: — . . . and we will continue that practise, we will continue that practise in the future so far as this government is concerned.

If the legitimate applications and the projects are ready to go and the 20 per cent grant commitment is more than \$1 million we will fulfil our commitments and seek a special warrant. Now I don't know, I haven't looked at the federal budget with respect to housing. I don't know what ceilings the new budget has put on, if anything, but I think the hon. member will understand the position of this government with respect to that program.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I must beg to differ with the minister. I am sure his officials are there, so I would ask, (he has announced the four or five projects that under this program were proceeded with in the fiscal year, 1977-78), I would ask him to tell this Assembly then how many legitimate applications from organizations prepared to build this very kind of housing under this program were received last year and were postponed or told that there was no money in existence or no money available under the Budget and, therefore, the projects could not be proceeded with?

MR. MacMURCHY: — None. There were a number of inquiries, in addition to the ones that were approved, but the projects weren't developed enough, sufficient enough, in order to where the Housing Corporation could make a commitment of money.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, Mr. Chairman, according to his own words, he suggests they weren't developed enough. That's not the information given by those organizations that submitted those applications to your department. The organizations in your own booklet (and I thank the member for Regina South, for providing me with this information), there were nine submissions and 223 units last year that were not proceeded with. According to our information, at least certainly in one of them in the Nipawin area, they were informed that there wasn't sufficient money in the Budget to proceed and that they should resubmit in the following year.

Now my question to you is this, if these (and I am going to repeat again) are you making an open-ended commitment today that any legitimate projects with legitimate applications submitted therein that are submitted to your department under this program, are you saying that they will definitely be proceeded with this year with no budget constraints by this particular Budget, that they will be proceeded with on the basis that a special warrant will be obtained?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as is usually the case, the hon. member for Nipawin is mixed up. He's referring to applications under the Prairie Housing Development Program which is different from this Grants to Non-profit Sponsors and I repeat what I said before for the last time — none were received and none were rejected. There were a couple of calls and contacts, but the projects weren't developed sufficiently enough in order for the Housing Corporation to approve a grant. This is an estimate. If the non-profit organizations come forward, the Lutherans or the United

April 14, 1978

Church or the Salvation Army or the Baptists, or the Elk's or whatever come forward with requests for projects under this program and it costs more than \$1 million this government shall provide.

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I appreciate that commitment that you have made today. Would you include the town of Nipawin as a non-profit organization?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, not under this program. This program relates to non-profits in the terms of the broad list that I put forward and there are others to be added to it.

MR. COLLVER: — Would the minister like to suggest then — since the town of Nipawin did submit or did request his department with about 150 applications, legitimate applications, over and above those applications that the minister presently was processing of some 42 that were under construction I believe, under this program in Nipawin at the present time; they were prepared to put up the land and so on to any organization — would the minister like to suggest what organization they should give this land to and to go forward or would we just have to get that sorted out since that has already been submitted, under that other program?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Public housing.

MR. COLLVER: — I beg your pardon?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The town of Nipawin has requested for housing under public housing, not under non-profit sponsors. As I indicated to the hon. member last night, the application is under investigation at the present time by the corporation for the town of Nipawin.

MR. COLLVER: — Just one more question, Mr. Chairman. If an organization, or town or community, submitted an application to his department or to Sask Housing merely because they had one application form, if it was to be used by senior citizens or senior citizens' housing and if the evidence provided was under the auspices of senior citizens, would the minister not agree that it would be a good idea for Sask Housing and his department and his officials to suggest to them that perhaps under that program they were going to have some difficulty in this budget year but if they were to submit under another program they would not have difficulty in this particular budget year? In other words, what I am saying is, does your department have any official that understands all of the programs that are available to these areas and communities, to which any request for information or any kind of postponement of application might be referred in order that these organizations might be able to understand? Perhaps they could submit an application under several headings of Sask Housing and several programs in order that they can get the project under way one way or another.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the Housing Corporation staff is ready to advise any municipal body on Housing Corporation programs. I don't think there is any confusion there. All they have to do is pick up the phone from the municipal office and phone. The municipal offices to my mind have had no problem in understanding the programs of the Housing Corporation. The town of Nipawin knows that if it wants public housing for senior citizens they know what program to apply under, the town of Nipawin. Or if they want non-profit Prairie Housing Development housing they know what to apply under. If they want family housing, they know what to apply under. They are not confused. It seems to me that the only one that is confused is the hon. member who represents them.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — I don't know why we are dragging this particular item around so long. I just want to say that in respect of it, that this is one item and one area where this government and the federal government and the city government deserve a great deal of credit. This is a program which has worked. I was personally experienced with it and I say to the minister that he has done a very excellent job in respect of it. His government has done a good job. It's a program that brings benefits in the most tangible way. We have built in Regina, as you know, the senior citizens' high-rise. There is currently construction going on under this section in which the federal government pays 70 per cent, 20 per cent comes from the province and 10 per cent from the city. They work extremely well and every level of government in this respect is to be commended by the people who work on these projects. The great thing about them is that the local housing authorities are given a great deal of latitude in the decisions which they make. They aren't ridden day in and day out by their governments at any level. The city, the provincial government, and the federal government really turn over these projects to the local people. They make the decisions about where they are going to be built, how they will be built; they hire the architects and so on, in consultation with the governments but the authority really rests with the local organizations. I was the chairman of the Housing Authority in Regina for two years and on the board for some years — extremely good programs by all levels of government. We are often so critical about the way sometimes in which governments spend the money and some of the programs that they interfere with when people are proceeding with programs — but this is one area where the record of all governments, believe me, is extremely good — extremely good.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I was happy to hear the remarks from the member for Regina South. Perhaps he was just emphasizing precisely the difficulty that is being experienced by the rural communities and more specifically, the northern rural communities, in trying to assess programs that are pretty well applied by governments but mostly for the benefit of the urban centres. It is a very . . . (Inaudible interjection). No. Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the point. They are good programs and they are working but the people in the rural centres also want to see them work for them. It is one thing for the member for Regina South, as former chairman of the housing authority in Regina to say that he can use the officials of the city of Regina and to use the expertise available in the city of Regina, to dance through the myriad of government programs. The member for Regina South will attest to the fact that there are a great many housing programs of a great kind and description offered by both the federal government and by the provincial government. All of these efforts are good, all of these efforts are good — they are positive, they are steps forward. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the small communities and smaller centres and the people in the smaller centres, do not have this kind of expertise at their disposal. What they want . . . (Inaudible interjection) . . . Well that is nonsense too — that is not often an MLAs job and you know it. The fact is that they do not have this expertise and the minister and the Department of Municipal Affairs in the province of Saskatchewan was specifically set up to encourage development in the rural areas. They even have a separate rural department — and all I was asking the minister, without trying to appear to be political or rag a point, is that he should have an official in his department whose name is sent out to the rural communities, one who understands the broad spectrum of programs. For the minister to suggest that the town clerk in Nipawin understands all of the ways to submit, under all of the housing programs, provincially and federally, is absolute nonsense and he knows it — and he knows it. He does not have the expertise, he does not have the staff. The programs are

changed from time to time as the member for Regina South will well know and the officials in the cities, Mr. Chairman, have this kind of expertise and have this kind of back up. Our suggestion to the minister is quite simply, if you were to allocate a person or persons in your department so that the people would know who to phone, instead of being shunted from place to place, they could find out the broad spectrum and know how their needs could be met by these various programs. That is the suggestion and that is what they are asking for in Humboldt and in other parts of the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, I have to leave and I wonder if it may be possible to complete Municipal Affairs today. The remaining subvotes are housing subvotes and the Hon. Minister of Finance and Chairman of the Board can handle the questions just as well as I and we can perhaps continue and clean up Municipal Affairs before one o'clock. If not, we can continue on later. The opposition members can direct their questions to Mr. Smishek. Thank you very much.

Item 27 agreed.

Item 28 agreed.

ITEM 29

MR. WIPF: — One question, Mr. Chairman, why is there a cut back for this year in the building co-operative housing program?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Chairman, the reason for that is last year the program did not go as well as we had anticipated. For example, last year we had 117 starts compared to the year before of 310. We believe sufficient money is provided because of last year's experience.

MR. WIPF: — Just one other question, Mr. Chairman. What percentage of the money did you not or did you use out of that \$64,000?

MR. SMISHEK: — This is related to the number of subsidies that have to be provided. This is the approximate amount that was spent last year.

Item 29 agreed.

Item 30 agreed.

ITEM 31

MR. WIPF: — This is a new department — why was it brought in?

MR. SMISHEK: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is a new program and you will recall me announcing it in the Budget. This is an estimate that we make at this stage of the amount of guarantees that we will have to provide.

Item 31 agreed.

MR. WIPF: — A question on this, Mr. Minister. Throughout the estimates here we have found in several places that there was a large over-estimate of moneys last year; we found in several places that the number of employees weren't hired that had been

estimated for. What was the actual amount of over-estimate in the Department of Municipal Affairs last year, compared to the money that you used?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. You are asking a question in the overall department.

MR. WIPF: — If you can get that information and send it to me later on.

MR. SMISHEK: — O.K.

Department of Municipal Affairs - Vote 24 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

The Committee reported progress.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Second Readings

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. D.L. Faris (Minister of Education) that Bill No. 22 - **An Act respecting Elementary and Secondary Education in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I want to direct some comments to the bill. It is an important bill, the most important bill to come before the House in this session. The objective of what we are trying to do in respect to the bill is clearly a desirable one. That is to say, if one reviews the history of the various enactments with respect to education over the years you would find a great series of them which is confusing to say the least, so the objective of drawing all these together in one comprehensive enactment covering education in the province is a very desirable one. In that respect, in respect of that principle, I support what we're here trying to do with the bill. The way in which the government has done it, however, I think, is open to some question and legitimate criticism.

You had to weigh the desire to draw together under one comprehensive enactment, everything with respect to education, which was a good objective, against the circumstances in which you had sought to do it, and the atmosphere in which you sought to do it.

There are questions here; questions between trustees on the one hand and teachers on the other, that have long been before them and before the public and which have long been a source of contention between them.

When you set about to consolidate in this way you knew, at that time, that you would raise afresh the issues of division between the trustees and the teachers, and, of course, we have now seen that happen. It may be that when one had to weigh the desirability of getting a comprehensive enactment against raising again these divisions between the teachers and the trustees, that the proper thing to do was to await the situation in favor of the comprehensive bringing together like this. But you had to know when you did it, that you would raise afresh these divisions in the communities.

April 14, 1978

Where I would fault the government in the way in which it did it, was in its many changes of course over time, is ask yourself what affect that has on people who have a situation of tension to begin with. These questions that are before us in respect of this bill and that are now dividing the trustees and the teachers, and the teachers and the government and some parents, are issues that were there before; issues that have long been debated and issues in respect of which there has long been disagreement.

If you want to consolidate, as we do want to here, you have to try to do it in an atmosphere of some calm and some reason. You can't have people reason when you have constant tension and great emotional issues before them. What I say the government did, in the process, is it changed its position so often that it had almost a yo-yo effect upon the expectations of the people involved.

You see what happened is, that you put one position forward and the teachers are pleased with it and the trustees are displeased with it. And then you put together a second position, which is something of a compromise between the two and you get the expectations of the teachers declining and those of the trustees rising. Then you introduce Bill 43 and, again, there is a sort of division because they don't know where you are going. Now what does that lead to eventually?

It makes a great distrust. Now, the trustees don't trust the government. That is clear. The teachers, in some respect, don't trust the government either and the problem is, is that there are these tensions and distrust and suspicion in the groups, which has been added to, in large part, by the way in which you chose to proceed. Now, that is unfortunate. We can't do anything about that now, because the issue has now arisen. But there were better ways to do it and, surely, one way that you should have done it is not to raise and then lower the expectations of the respective groups three or four times, as you did.

I fault the government a great deal for inflaming the circumstances. The member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) made a good point the other day when he said the Minister of Education is now adding to an inflammatory situation. The trustees got to the point in their frustration where they ran a series of ads, at great expense and you can see the frustration of that group in those ads. The minister chose to respond with his set of ads. Now it is escalating to something in the nature of warfare in the public, between the trustees and the minister and the teachers and the trustees as well. Well I ask you, in the end what does all this mean? It means that the teachers and the trustees and the parents and the schools have to get along in terms of broad good will and understanding of each other. Every time we raise these issues, as we have been doing now for so long in this province and, again more recently, shifting around on behalf of the government, what do you do? You erode the good will that exists between the parents and the school and the teachers and the trustees. That is what happens. Now we have another situation in which it is going to take a substantial length of time again to restore, between the two groups and the schools and the parents, some good will and some understanding and some affection about one another and what they are doing because, once again, we have driven the wedge between them. That is bad and clearly the government should have avoided doing that and it could have done it.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Quill Lakes says, what are you going to do in the situation because there is no perfect solution, and there is no perfect solution. The act itself is imperfect and we all recognize it is imperfect. You cannot draw a consensus between the teachers and the trustees. It is impossible. The Premier said one day, the argument has been around for 17 years and it cannot be resolved in terms of the two groups

sitting down and doing and that is clear; you cannot. The situation here is an imperfect solution.

I was surprised one day to see a report on television that categorized, and it is the kind of categorization that it resists so strenuously, the categorization that suggested the Liberals were with the trustees with respect to this thing. What is wrong with those kinds of — Well, members opposite make them too. What is wrong with those simple categorizations is that they do not stand up when you look at them.

There are some sections of this act that I agree with, and in respect of my position, it coincides with the teachers? There are other sections of the act that I have problems with and my particular position would tend to coincide with the trustees on that one.

Every member probably has the same position. The difference between the government (in a sense) and us, is that government in the end has to make a decision and stand by it.

Mr. Speaker, there is one area here, which I view as being particularly crucial and that is the area with respect to the board of reference and how a teacher, and if a teacher, is to have access to some means to determine whether or not the dismissal of that teacher is justified. My view is that teachers ought to be accorded fundamentally the same rights that everyone else has in respect to this question. Everyone has had the right, under the common law for years, to have determined the question in some binding way, of whether or not his or her dismissal is properly done, that is to say, suppose Imperial Oil fires an executive, that executive has a right to go the courts and have it determined whether or not the firing was proper and justified. If the courts find it is not it will award the executive compensation, damages, for a wrongful dismissal. Everyone has had that right for years.

Teachers, in my view, have to have the same right. That is to say, if a Board of Education finds that it fires a teacher, gives its reasons, the teacher has to have access to some mechanism to have it determined whether or not that firing was justified, if the teacher wants to take the course. Therefore, I support a binding reference to determine whether or not a teacher, in the particular circumstances, has been justifiably dismissed.

Mr. Speaker, will know that I have a very different view from my colleague and seatmate the member for Saskatoon Eastview in that respect. His view tends to coincide with what members perceive is generally the trustee position. My own tends to coincide with what is perceived as the teachers' position. Which brings me back to the point that the simple characterization of people as either being sort of pro-teacher or pro-trustee on this bill is wrong. In respect of the Board of Reference and the fact that it is binding, a teacher ought to have that right. I agree with that provision in the bill and I would support that provision. What I would like to see added to it are some refinements.

One refinement is that the scope of the investigation and the inquiry by the Board of Reference is too wide — no question. It ought to be limited to the particular reasons and the particular circumstances of the particular dismissal.

Now there is a section in this bill, Mr. Speaker, which gives to the Board of Reference power to expand its own inquiry. And that isn't good. Members who have seen some of these things operate will recall a circumstance that was brought to my attention where a teacher was dismissed and the question was under a conciliation or reference earlier whether or not the teacher was justifiably dismissed. Now the inquiry wasn't limited to

that one single question. The inquiry was thrown wide open.

What happens in a community when you do that? Two hundred people go to the community hall — this is what happened on this occasion and listen to this sort of court going on for three days. Everything is dragged in, everything about the teacher, everything about the parents and the students and everything about the way in which the board has conducted its business. And that is before them for four or five days and it is extremely inflammatory in the community. It's almost, in a sense, a sort of old barbaric system of justice. That's what those have been in some respects.

What we have to do here, and I put this to the minister seriously, is to (in defining the powers of the Boards of Reference) is to limit the question before them as to whether or not the teacher has been dismissed with justification. The door ought not to be opened to drag in a whole lot of extraneous essentially irrelevant material, for lots of reasons. For one, you get an inquiry that goes like Topsy, it keeps growing and growing. Secondly is, it is an unending process because, as you say, eventually what you lead to is you bring in all kinds of material about the way in which the teacher has been conducting himself in the community and that applies to, you know, whether or not he's good with the children in respect to their baseball events. It expands and it expands and it expands and inherent in all of this I tell you is a basic injustice. It's a basic injustice. Our system has always recognized that when an issue is being determined the issue has to be clearly defined and the inquiry is limited to the definition of the issue. That's a fundamental in our system. This particular section goes too far in giving the Board of Reference the power to expand its scope of inquiry as it, itself, sees fit. I support the principle. I would want to see it limited to that single question.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would want to see generally a consideration of some right of appeal here. And again it brings me back to a point that I have made many times with members of the House, is that we have over the course of time given more and more jurisdiction to administrative boards of the province, jurisdiction that used to belong to the courts. I won't argue that point one way or another except merely to say this, that in the court system that used to determine all issues of this variety, now being determined in a large part by administrative boards, you always had a right of appeal. The right of appeal I tell you is absolutely fundamentally important. Bad decisions can be made. Now, we are dealing here in an area where the professional reputation and the livelihood of a professional person can be irreparably damaged. The teacher is fired. The question is, is it a justifiable firing. The Board of Reference makes the determination; it's a binding determination. The question is whether or not they were right. Often mistakes are made. Mistakes are made by administrators of tribunals in the same way mistakes are made by courts and mistakes are made by anybody else. That's why you provide people with a right to appeal. There is no way here that a teacher can appeal a decision of a Board of Reference. It may be a split decision; it may be a decision that has said that that teacher is totally incompetent. His or her professional career is wrecked and where do they go for some appeal. The avenue is cut off.

Let's look at the doctors as an example in contrast. If the doctor is disciplined by his professional committee they have a determination within the profession as to whether or not he is guilty of unbecoming conduct and then disciplinary action is taken. Now they are given a right of appeal. There is a committee set up with a Court of Queen's Bench judge as the chairman of the Appeal Committee designated by the minister and the appeal goes forward. There are appeals in other professions as well. There is generally the right of appeal and yet here we limit people to having no right of appeal and I think that's wrong. You will find that there will be mistakes made by Boards of

Reference and they aren't simple mistakes, Mr. Speaker, they are very meaningful mistakes. A mistake under this particular act can ruin a career and no place to go by way of appeal.

AN HON. MEMBER: — On law there is an appeal.

MR. CAMERON: — The member keeps saying on law there is an appeal, on law there is an appeal. I am not suggesting that on an appeal one open up all the facts for consideration. Generally speaking, the facts are to be taken by the Appeal Tribunal as they have been found in the first instance. Generally speaking, unless there has been some perverse decision along the way and that occasionally happens too, it happens in the courts all the time, I won't argue the detail of that with the minister. What he is referring to are some very limited rights of challenge, very limited. You don't have a right of appeal under this section and you ought to have a right of appeal. That's the second point I want to make in respect of that particular section.

The third thing is and we drew this to the attention of the STF people, the trustee people and to your attention now as well, that you have made an error in the drafting of the powers that are given to the board after the conclusion of the hearings. You see what you wanted to do is you wanted to say to the Board of Reference, here are the powers you have. You can either reinstate the teacher, that's your right, if you find that the dismissal is unjustified or alternatively you can confirm the firing. It's one or the other; that's the way the situation has been. Now what you have tried to do is build in some additional power to the board and you have done it because the section says they can take such additional action. Now what the section currently pre-supposes is that the board has already made a decision, either with respect to confirmation or termination. There is no other avenue open to the board. Yes, this is true if you look at it, it's too limited. What you have got to do with the section is to say that the board can make such further or other order. If you limit it to saying it can make an additional order, it means you are adding to the order you have already made. Now it sounds like a legal point but if you look at there is no doubt about it that the powers of the Board of Reference as currently struck in the act are inadequate because you haven't given them the flexibility in that section which in my view has to be amended. You have to give to the Board of Reference the right to pay damages in lieu of reinstatement where the dismissal has been found unjustified. Let me give you an example of that. If you take again a small community and a teacher is dismissed; the teacher appeals the dismissal; the board finds that the dismissal was unjustified. What power does the board have? The board can say, we reinstate the teacher. But you can't in those circumstances practically do that. You can't. The atmosphere at that stage is too charged, the division is too strong. The teacher can't go back into the school. This may not apply in the same way in the cities but it certainly applies in the smaller areas. You can't practically do it. The teacher can't live in those circumstances, the parents can't live in those circumstances, nor can the board. That's clear.

There is a solution. The solution is this. In those circumstances where it is impractical to reinstate a teacher that has been fired unjustifiably, the board has to have the power to give that teacher damages in lieu of the dismissal. In other words, if the teacher has been employed for four or five years in that particular unit and that particular community is fired unjustifiably, the teacher ought to be entitled to an award of damages, perhaps a year or six months of salary in lieu of reinstatement. That's what has to be done. I see that in this bill that is not possible and it isn't possible.

(inaudible interjection)

April 14, 1978

MR. CAMERON: — Well no it isn't. Well it clearly isn't. When you look at it you know it isn't. What I question is, what was your intention in this respect? Do you intend to give the boards of reference these additional flexible powers? If you do, let's give it to them then you would have no objection to it. You say the power is there. Presumably you agree that it ought to be there so you agree with the point I make. Now why are you resisting an amendment that will ensure that it is there? Why are you so resistant to what I am saying? What I am telling you is that the power is not there and that section has to be dealt with to give them that additional power.

I am pleased to find that the Minister says he is prepared to do it. I'm happy with that; I'm happy. If you give us the assurance that you are prepared to do it, let's clean up the bill to be certain that it is done. If you continue to resist . . . I'll give you the amendment; I'm happy to draft it myself. Believe me, I will and send it over to you. You give me your assurance in turn that that is your intention, — that you want to give to the board, the power, (a) to terminate or (b) to reinstate, and in addition you will give them some other powers — powers to substitute damages in lieu of reinstatement. That's what I want. We will send that over to you to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I was going to be about 15 minutes and I thought 15 minutes was going to be adequate. I see it is now 1:00 o'clock and I haven't even really begun, even in the 15 minutes.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:00 o'clock p.m.