

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

April 25, 1979.

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, SUPPLY AND SERVICES
VOTE 18

ITEM 1 Continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We're on the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services - Vote 18, Item 1, page 89.

MR. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Chairman, I would just like to recap before continuing. Before 5 o'clock I asked the minister a few questions on the costs. One of the questions that I asked which I haven't received an answer to was why the user charge was dropped from 60 cents to 30 cents?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Department of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Well, at that time we had not segregated all the fixed costs for the aircraft. Obviously, the 60 cents didn't cover all the costs and CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) had to really in a sense subsidize it out of the profits of CVA. When the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services was set up, we went to the approach of the fixed costs and the variable costs or the user costs. We think this makes eminent sense because it's an asset which we don't want just sitting there; we want it to be used and utilized effectively.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — One of the answers you gave me before 5 o'clock also was the cost of operating a Cheyenne on a per hour basis of \$82.24 and based on the 275 miles per hour of that aircraft was 29.99 cents. Well, my first question would be: is the Navaho also a 275 mile per hour aircraft?

MR. ROBBINS: — The Navaho is about 190 miles an hour aircraft.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Therefore, your 30 cents per mile logic wouldn't necessarily or wouldn't at all apply to the Navaho?

MR. ROBBINS: — The Navaho costs are a bit less; it uses less fuel and we don't use it for executive aircraft very much. It's simply used as a backup. The two Cheyennes do most of the executive flying.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, then that leads to another question. Both Navahos being primarily ambulances, is your charge of the ambulance use to that department a 30 cent per mile charge?

MR. ROBBINS: — That's charged to the Department of Health at a total cost of operating, \$1.27 per mile.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — So then the 30 cents per mile only applies to the Cheyenne for executive use. For the Navaho, which is coming right out of your department, you're using a different logic and a different policy in making the charge of \$1.27. I can't see the consistency of applying one rule for one department or for certain departments and using an entirely different rule under your department to apply to the ambulance service. Why not be consistent with your policy?

MR. ROBBINS: — Well, we know the Department of Health is going to carry the total cost of the air ambulance whereas the executive aircraft's being charged to a number of departments and agencies and we bear, in the revenue department, the fixed costs related to that operation.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, that's exactly my point. You know the exact cost will be borne by the ambulance service. So that's budgeted for and it's accounted for in that respect. How could you possibly have a policy where the Attorney General or the Sask Power, or Sask Tel, or minerals or any other department makes use of a more expensive, more costly aircraft for government business in those departments? Why not charge the true costs, the total costs involved in the operation of those aircraft? Why mislead the public into believing that the user, probably mostly cabinet ministers, of the aircraft are using them where the cost is minimal when, in fact, it's five or probably seven times what you are really showing? Why not come clean with the public of the province and say this is what it's costing the cabinet ministers to use these aircraft?

MR. ROBBINS: — Because we know roughly how much utilization of the air ambulance is going to occur from past experience. We don't know how much utilization there's going to be made by various agencies and departments of the executive aircraft. It's possible that I might have to use that aircraft five times in one month and not use it for the next three or four months. We simply made sure that all the costs are accounted for, the fixed costs accounted for in the appropriation and revenue and the variable cost carried by the charge made to the user agency.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Obviously, I am not going to convince the government to change their policy, however, I have to comment on your answer, Mr. Minister. All business is carried on, budgeted for, through past experience and knowledge of the areas in which it does business. It isn't the first year you've had Cheyenne executive aircraft in use. It isn't the first aircraft of any kind that the government has had. You've had experience . . . you've had usage by the different departments, by the cabinet ministers. You should have some idea of the amount of usage that's going to be made of these aircraft. To use the excuse that you just have used is really not very logical. The federal government in Ottawa through the Lambert Commission or the royal commission — I believe it was the Lambert Commission, that's right — have recommended to their government to provide services to other government departments on a recovery basis. They would charge each department for services rendered for those departments that have the options of challenging the fees charged. Now that is a much more realistic approach to take to the problem. Have you taken a look at this? Have you recommended it to the government? Have you investigated the possibilities of perhaps applying the same policy in the use of aircraft? As well as, I might add, the same policy that you use in automobiles and trucks.

MR. ROBBINS: — Now first of all, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we can learn very much in terms of financial management from the federal government. I think that's a pretty poor model to attempt to follow. What we're saying is that when we show the fixed cost of the aircraft in one department it's much easier for you to get at it in terms of finding out what those costs are. They show up in an appropriation in the Department of Revenue and Supply. You mentioned automobile but this is a different matter because we have a policy saying how long we shall keep automobiles. They are driven a certain mileage or a certain length of time and they are disposed of. That isn't true with the aircraft. They are kept for an indeterminate amount of time. In fact, one of the Navahos has, I think, completely depreciated at the present time but we may be using that aircraft for

another six or seven or eight years.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, then perhaps I don't understand your bookkeeping system. I'm looking at your report on page 9. You're saying that it's much easier for us to determine the true costs of operating these aircraft. Yet, on one hand, you're charging the Navahos a full cost; on the other hand, you're charging a partial cost on the other and the balance of it is in an appropriation account. Why then are you showing a \$1.72 per mile cost of aircraft in your report? I arrive at that by the figure of \$708,000 on 411,000 miles. I guess the balance of that question would be, is any part of this \$708,000 in the appropriation account to which you referred?

MR. ROBBINS: — If you look at page 9, that's the 1977 breakdown, before we made the change on April 1, 1978 when the fixed costs were shown in the appropriation and the revenue account for the aircraft.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — So that's using the old system and now you're on a different system entirely. At that time though, you were still using a 30 cents per mile charge as a user charge.

MR. ROBBINS: — No, we were using the 60 cents per mile part of the time and 30 cents for part of the time.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Which of course is still a different figure than \$1.72. What was happening then to the difference between 60 cents and \$1.72? Where was it showing up?

MR. ROBBINS: — It's \$1.27 not \$1.72.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No. Mr. Minister, I don't have a calculator at hand but my calculation is based on the 411,000 miles at \$708,000 and I beg to differ with you that figure is \$1.72 not \$1.27.

MR. ROBBINS: — Well at that time that breakdown included planes which are now in DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan), the water bombers, for example. We had grave difficulty breaking that out.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, that is not correct. In your report it says three aircraft. So how could it include the DNS aircraft?

MR. ROBBINS: — We had to make some assumptions. It did include the DNS aircraft at that time and we had to break it out as best we could. Now you are saying that because we show three aircraft only . . . however, when you look at the actual operating depreciation and administrative costs, what we attempted to do was break that out. We couldn't do it exactly because the water bomber is actually very difficult to compute, that is, the costs of operating it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Oh, Mr. Minister, I can't believe the answer you just gave me. You have just finished telling me that in 1977 you had the aircraft which were included in the DNS. Why then weren't they shown in your report? How can you possibly give us a report that is inaccurate? You are telling me that you had some 16 or 17 aircraft in your department in that year and now you are showing 3 aircraft in your report. Now can we have the accurate information please?

MR. ROBBINS: — I must point out again to the member, Mr. Chairman, that this is for illustrative purposes only. There were three owned aircraft; there was one on lease and it did include the DNS aircraft. We broke out as best we could, the costs for illustrative purposes, in this report here. We are simply saying this is as close as we could get to accuracy in relation to the costs related to the aircraft. But, part of the reason for that difficulty was related to the water bombers. It is very difficult to arrive at the accurate costs related to them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't accept a report that is not accurate and I don't know how the people in this province can accept a report from the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services that is inaccurate.

Now, I'd like to take it one item at a time. I notice just now that this says 1977 breakdown. Are you saying the 1976-77 fiscal year or are you talking about the 1977-78 fiscal year? From the answer you gave, you indicated that the DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) aircraft which were in your fleet at the time of the report were taken out and other figures were used to arrive at what you've arrived at. Therefore, I would ask you, since they were in your department during the year under review, I would ask you, Mr. Minister, to please give us that information here tonight. I do not like to receive from you an inaccurate report.

MR. ROBBINS: — O.K., I'll try to go through this and give you the breakdown right through the whole operation. As of April 1, 1977, in Regina we had a Navaho which was purchased in 1969 and we had a Cheyenne which was purchased in 1975; in Saskatoon we had two Beach Barons, one purchased in 1965 and one purchased in 1966; in the northern operations we had one Cheyenne purchased in 1976; one Aztec in 1975, three Cessna 185s, and six tracker bombers (water bombers).

In May of 1977, the two Beach Barons at Saskatoon were transferred to what is termed the northern operation.

In June of 1977, there was a Navaho leased for Saskatoon for air ambulance.

In October of 1977, the 13 aircraft located in the northern operation were transferred to DNS.

In November of 1977, the Cheyenne was leased for use in Regina.

In February of 1978, the Navaho previously leased for use in Saskatoon was purchased. A second Cheyenne was purchased for use in Regina and the lease on the other Cheyenne was terminated.

So the aircraft establishment, as of March 31, 1978 in Regina was one Navaho and two Cheyennes and one Navaho in Saskatoon, which is the air ambulance operation.

Now, all of these aircraft were in there for varying periods of time over that period, and what that chart attempts to do is to cost out as best we could. We couldn't do it right down to the last dollar. We tried to segregate everything that went to DNS and what didn't go to DNS remains, of course, in the executive aircraft in Regina and the air ambulance in Saskatoon. That's the best explanation I think I can give you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Minister, I am afraid that I am not prepared to accept your explanation. You have a 1977-78 report that you have submitted to the government

and to the members of the opposition as well on other areas. If you had aircraft in use and leased, etc., during the year which we are discussing (which is 1977-78) then I would like that information in writing. I would like to know exactly the total cost of those aircraft for the time you had them? I want to know the mileage you put on, if you had it for one month, and then I want to know the mileage you put on that aircraft in a month? I want to know the cost of operating that aircraft; all the information which should have been put in this report? It was in your department in 1977-78. You had to account for it to the government in dollars and cents. Why isn't it in your report? I see no reason why you shouldn't be supplying the information which I have just asked for. How many aircraft did you have and for what length of time did you have them in 1977-78? What was the total cost of operation and the total mileage put on those aircraft?

Now, you mentioned leased aircraft. I would also like the information on how many you had and how much you were paying on the lease? What happened to the leases? I also want to know if you still have some on lease?

MR. ROBBINS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, to the member for Regina South — the figures with respect to the operation of all the aircraft were given in Public Accounts, page F82, for 1977-78. They are there in total. If you take that figure of \$1,348,717 and take it off the transfer to DNS of \$640,338, you get the figure of \$708,379 which appears in this report. All of the information with respect to hours of flying, etc., have been given in Public Accounts with respect to all those aircraft.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I am not even going to attempt to try to determine why you would charge \$640,000 for 10 aircraft and \$708,000 for only 3 aircraft, which is what you are really saying you are doing here.

If in your report . . . Mr. Chairman, I am having a little difficulty . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please. There is too much cross talking going here and it is very difficult to carry on our estimates.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — By providing the type of information you have provided in this report, Mr. Minister, and this is really what your department is responsible for and should answer to. I haven't been in public accounts, I haven't investigated the public accounts figures. The information we previously asked for, we have always been told, well, you will get them in estimates. O.K., well, we are in estimates.

If you gave us a figure of 3 aircraft when in fact you had 13 or whatever the figure was, why should we accept the figure of 1,570 passenger cars? Why should we accept 391 station wagons? Why should we accept 654 trucks? They could be just as wrong as the figure of 3 aircraft that you gave us. Why should we accept any or your report in light of the information you have just given us?

MR. ROBBINS: — This was the average number of aircraft (if you want to use that term) that CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) was responsible for within this report. The figures on cars vary, of course. Cars are sold. There are lists of cars sold nearly every week in the paper. I can tell you that at the end of January, 1979, we had 3 subcompacts, 746 compacts, 1,303 passenger cars, 519 station wagons and 1,619 trucks, for a total of 4,190. Now that is what was there on January 31, 1979, but it would not necessarily be what was there on February 6, 1979, because sales are being held from time to time and some of those vehicles are being disposed of.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That is right, but your report says average number of vehicles in use per month. As I say, obviously the three aircraft as an average number of aircraft in use per month is wrong. But that is the information you gave us. So I could also say to you then, the 1,570 and the other figures you have in your report are entirely wrong.

By the way, did you transfer any of your car fleet or truck fleet or station wagon fleet to the North that year?

MR. ROBBINS: — You realize that the Department of Revenue and Supply came into operation on March 1, 1978. It would be inappropriate for them to report on aircraft which had been transferred to DNS. That transfer to DNS occurred in October of 1977 — 13 aircraft.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think you are getting in deeper every time you give me an answer. I don't really care whether Revenue, Supply and Services came into effect in February, or whatever time you said. CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) has been there for a long time and I am talking about the Central Vehicle Agency; I am not talking about Revenue, Supply and Services. Your report is referring to Central Vehicle Agency.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. ROBBINS: — CVA is a part of Revenue, Supply and Services.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well it may be a part of Revenue, Supply and Services — it may be today — but Central Vehicle Agency which is the department that I am referring to at the present time, has been in existence for a long time. You didn't change the policies of CVA when it became part of Revenue, Supply and Services, or did you?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I can satisfy the member, but the fact of the matter is that we transferred out the costs related to the aircraft which were transferred to DNS in October, about four months prior to the setting up of Revenue, Supply and Services. This is the remaining cost. So that is the cost applicable to the executive aircraft and the ambulance which comes under CVA's operation.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, that is contradictory to what you told me earlier. You indicated to me the cost of operating the Navahos at \$1.27. You haven't indicated to me the cost of operating the Cheyenne. Then by what you are telling me now, based on the information which you have given me, the cost of operating your Cheyenne has got to be well over the \$2 per mile. Because now you are telling me that these are the costs incurred on the units which were transferred or kept in the CVA when the others were transferred out. Earlier you said this was arrived at to the best of your ability to come up with a figure after they were moved out. If you are saying to me now that this is the true cost of operating the Cheyennes and the Navaho and you are saying three of them and you have four so I don't know why you use three, then your cost per mile has to be well over — in fact if you take the \$1.27, the difference between that, and add it to the \$1.72, you come up with \$2.17 per mile on the Cheyenne. Is that a close or accurate figure?

MR. ROBBINS: — Well, it depends on the number of miles that are flown, obviously. You know I could use the example of a \$30,000 fire truck that only went 50 miles to one fire. How are you going to compute the mileage cost per mile in terms of that fire truck? If

you worked out depreciation and the operating cost, the fixed cost and the variable cost, it would be pretty high, obviously. We are not saying that this is an audited figure. We are saying it's an illustrative. You asked the question about three aircraft, that's because one was leased at the time. It's the average number of aircraft we had available for executive aircraft.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — For executive aircraft or including the ambulance? Did you not in fact have two executive aircraft and two ambulances all that period of time?

MR. ROBBINS: — No.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — All right. You may tell me, Mr. Minister, that this is not an audited report but I accept this report as being a document that you have provided to the people of the province for them to arrive at your costs, operations, expenditures, etc. The press would receive these reports; they would be published. I say that the information provided in this report is very misleading to the taxpayers of the province. I say that the taxpayers are entitled to have accurate information. I would ask you, Mr. Minister, not tonight but in the very near future, to provide an addendum to this report, outlining the true costs of all the aircrafts, owned and leased, that were in your department of the Central Vehicle Agency between April 1 of 1977 and March 31 of 1978 including the mileage of each aircraft, the cost of operation, including maintenance, depreciation, including fuel and all other related costs involved. I would like this as an addendum to this report supplied to us and to all who receive reports from your department.

MR. ROBBINS: — It's already been supplied in public accounts and you'll get copies of it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I am not sure when the reports of the public accounts come out. Is that after the House sits or prorogues or whatever?

MR. ROBBINS: — Your members already have verbatim transcripts of it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Minister, I am told that what happens in public accounts is secret to us as well as to anyone else until it's all over with. Am I wrong in that?

MR. ROBBINS: — That's not correct.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Then I shall ask for the information tomorrow, for sure.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Chairman, I would ask a question of you, if I may, for a ruling. The minister just indicated that the information that is supplied to public accounts, the copies that are given to those members as it's being done can be given to the rest of the members now. I understand that they're instructed that they can't use that information or give it to us until after public accounts is over and they have tabled the report. So, we have ourselves in a bit of a jam here, if my understanding is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Order. It is not for me to rule as chairman of this committee, we'll put it that way, it's not for me to rule as to the practice or the rules of another committee.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, may I just say that you've got a copy of these public accounts for the year you're asking about, '77-'78. You've got them; every member on your side of the House has them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, that may be so. But all that gives us is the cost, the total cost. There is no breakdown and I've asked for that. I would hope that you will provide the information that I have asked for since you started to do so in your annual report.

MR. ROBBINS: — I gave you the figure with respect to the public accounts. You have that — \$1,348,717, less the transfer to DNS for \$640,338, leaves the figure of \$708,379 which is the figure that appears in the revenue supply report for illustrative purposes. You also asked some questions with regard to the hours flown. One Cheyenne flew 745.5 hours plus 38.25 hours on test flights, training instrument flights and servicing flights. That's roughly 784, or pretty close to it. The second Cheyenne which was leased in that period November '77-January '78, flew 138.5 hours. Then we bought the second Cheyenne in February and March, it flew 112.5 hours, plus 10.5 hours on test flights, training instrument flights and servicing flights. The Navaho flew 207 hours operational and the other Navaho which is basically the air ambulance one, flew 695.5 hours roughly. Also, they had some periods of flying, not a great many, a little over 18 hours and a little over 15 hours on test flights, training flights and servicing flights.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman (and I don't want to prolong the questions on this department any longer than necessary), I will ask you, Mr. Minister, once again because you're not answering my question, not to read it to me tonight, prepare it for me and submit to me the same information you just talked about on all of the aircraft you had in the CVA whether it be for one month or 12 months during the year 1977. Obviously, you had more than four aircraft. You had all of the aircraft for part of that year that are now in the DNS department. So while you had them in the CVA I would like the information provided at a later date, as soon as possible, the way you gave it on all of them and add to that the cost per aircraft if that's possible. I see no reason why it wouldn't be possible. You gave a figure of \$1,348,700 and some. That, I assume, is the total operating cost of the aircraft including everything. Does that include the pilots?

MR. ROBBINS: — Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, it includes the pilots. How many pilots do you have at the present time?

MR. ROBBINS: — We have 10 pilots plus Mr. Hanton who's the manager. I can give you more information on them. Their average flying hours is 10,327 hours; one has over 18,000 and the one with the least flying hours is 3,700. And they range from pilots two, three, and four dependent upon their flying hours, I presume, and their certificates.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Now you indicated a few minutes ago during the year 1977-78 you leased one aircraft and you flew it 138.5 hours. Did you pay for the 138.5 hours or did you pay a contract for more hours than that, or was it just actual usage?

MR. ROBBINS: — \$7,900 a month plus \$35 an hour engine reserve.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — For the length of time you had it or for the full year?

MR. ROBBINS: — It is a monthly charge for three months: November, December, and January.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — O.K. You didn't answer my question. Will you provide that information that I asked for prior to this last question?

MR. ROBBINS: — We will certainly endeavor to provide it but it's going to take a good length of time to get it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I also asked you and you agreed earlier, before 5 o'clock, to provide the photocopies of the logbooks. Just to confirm what I was asking, I'd like to be assured that they would include first of all the logbooks of the aircraft (the flight logs) and secondly the logbooks that you have in your office or in the CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) office. Will it show the number of flights, the destination, origin, the flight, the passengers carried, and all of the information that I'm asking for?

MR. ROBBINS: — We agreed to supply the journey log which is the one required by the Ministry of Transport in the aircraft.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Do you not know whether it includes point of origin, destination, the passengers carried, miles flown, the hours flown, etc.?

MR. ROBBINS: — Point of departure, destination, hours flown, weights carried in the aircraft, number of passengers carried in the aircraft, name of the pilot.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — What about the names of the passengers?

MR. ROBBINS: — No, it does not.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Will you provide that information?

MR. ROBBINS: — We will supply exactly what we agreed to supply in public accounts for '77-'78.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, not knowing what you agreed to supply in public accounts, can you tell me what that is?

MR. ROBBINS: — The number of the flight, the destination, date or dates, the authorizing officer, and the number of passengers.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Minister, I agreed with other members of the south to be as brief on this subject as possible in this department but unless I get that information, I'm afraid we could be a long time. I've asked you if you would provide the names of the passengers carried on those flights. Will you not do that or will you do that?

MR. ROBBINS: — . . . MOT (Ministry of Transport) requirement is the authorizing officer and the number of passengers. They don't necessarily supply the names of the people on board.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, that's not the question I asked you. Will you supply me with that information? I'm asking you, not the DOT (Department of Transport). I'm asking you, will you supply me with the names of the passengers on all flights of the aircraft in your department?

MR. ROBBINS: — We don't know them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You do not keep a record of the passengers that are on your flights? There is no manifest to indicate to you who the passengers on the aircraft are?

MR. ROBBINS: — We know the number of passengers there are on the aircraft.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That's not what I asked you. Do you not know the passengers? Do you not keep a record of that? Do you not have that information available?

MR. ROBBINS: — It is not a requirement under the MOT (Ministry of Transport) regulations and we do not know the names of all the passengers on all the flights.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, since I can't argue the point with you, I don't know why the CVA (Canadian Vehicle Agency) would be any different from all the commercial airlines in Canada or North America where they have a list of all the passengers on their aircraft. However, since I have no way of determining whether you are right or wrong, or whether or not you have the information, I have to drop that subject.

I would like you to provide as well, and again not tonight, but to me and to those who want it, the information regarding the salaries as we asked for them in your other department earlier today, and to include in that all employees over \$25,000 a year, including the pilots. I'd like to know each pilot as well. I don't need that now but I would like to have it provided to me.

Also, do you have a CVA Director of Aircraft Operations separate from the automobile vehicles?

MR. ROBBINS: — Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Could you give me the name of that pilot, and was he at one time with the NDP government in Manitoba?

MR. ROBBINS: — He was a 30-year employee with the province of Manitoba and the New Democratic government wasn't in that long in Manitoba.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — A final question, Mr. Chairman. You will provide . . .

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, before you ask this question I can give you the figures on the salaries.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I am looking at the clock and I realize it is a lengthy procedure.

MR. ROBBINS: — It wouldn't be that lengthy. You said everyone over \$25,000 and there are not a lot of them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I am prepared to accept them at a later time if you like.

Mr. Chairman, one final question. I want to get back to that logbook again. The information you just relayed to me, I take it was referring to the flight logs, right? Do you have a logbook of other sorts, other than the flight log?

MR. ROBBINS: — We can give you the journey log which is required by the MOT (Ministry of Transport). That is the one in the plane. We can give you the flight number, the dates, the destination, the authorizing officer and the number of passengers.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you totally missed the point in my question. The question required a very simple yes or no. Do you have one flight logbook or do you have two for each aircraft? Is it only one or do you have two, a duplicate that you keep in the office or wherever you might keep it, in the hanger or in the office?

MR. ROBBINS: — There is only one log required by MOT and it's in the aircraft.

Item 1 agreed.

Item 2 agreed.

Item 3 agreed.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, if you like you can just read the number and the total as a whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Is it agreed that I read the number and the totals?

Items 4 to 12 agreed.

Revenue, Supply and Service Vote 18 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION BOARD VOTE 34

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would you like to introduce your support staff, Mr. Minister?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Mr. Chairman, members of the Assembly, Mr. George Todd, the chairman of the Public Service Superannuation Board, is seated to my left. Mr. Ken Orr is behind me. He's the executive secretary.

ITEM 1

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Minister, this board is also responsible for the pensions, for example, for the city of Saskatoon and so forth. Am I correct? They make sure they have the right actuary studies and so forth?

MR. ROBBINS: — No, that's not correct.

MR. KATZMAN: — This is strictly for the government civil servants, correct?

MR. ROBBINS: — It is for the public service of Saskatchewan.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I noticed all through the estimates that they are all statutory. Is it geared to a percentage of matching that makes it all statutory? All the figures? Do all of the figures in here indicate what you believe the other side will put in there for their match?

MR. ROBBINS: — No. I think, Mr. Chairman, the member is confusing this with the

public employees superannuation which is the new plan which is a matching plan. This is not a matching plan. Contributions are made by the employees based on 7, 8 or 9 per cent contribution based on the age of entry and there is not separate fund for it. The money flows into consolidated revenue fund and when a person is pensioned, their total amount credited to them is set up and paid.

MR. KATZMAN: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I have one question here. People that were on the old plan were allowed to transfer into the new plan if they so wish which is a money purchase plan. Do you have any idea how many years it would take till all employees contributing would be off this plan? Do you have any idea; will we be down say to 10 per cent of the employees in two years, and then it will just be a gradual drop-off or anything like that?

MR. ROBBINS: — Any figure I give, Mr. Chairman, will have to be an estimate. It's fair to say that it could be up to 35 years before the plan is completely phased out; although I must tell you that there were a fair number of transfers into the new plan and since new employees all go into the new plan (not the old plan) it will over time, phase out.

Items 1 to 6 agreed.

ITEM 7

MR. KATZMAN: — On this figure — are these the people that don't qualify the 10(45) clause that you assume you'll be repaying?

MR. ROBBINS: — It's people that were in the old labor service set-up. They were not in the public service. There were in an employees' savings account which was matched by the government.

Items 7 and 8 agreed.

Public Service Superannuation Board Vote 34 agreed.

Supplementaries - Vote 34 - agreed.

The committee reported progress.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILL NO. 7 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL EXPROPRIATION ACT

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 75 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' SUPERANNUATION ACT

Sections 1 to 8 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 80 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE RURAL MUNICIPALITY ACT

Sections 1 to 12 agreed.

Section 13 as amended agreed.

Sections 14 to 22 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 83 — AN ACT RESPECTING PROPERTY TAX REBATES TO RENTERS OF
RESIDENTIAL PREMISES**

Sections 1 to 15 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 66 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE URBAN MUNICIPALITY ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

Section 4 as amended agreed.

Sections 5 to 7 agreed.

Section 7 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 74 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE COMMUNITY CAPITAL FUND ACT

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 82 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT GRANT ACT

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

Section 5 as amended agreed.

Section 6 agreed.

Section 8 as amended agreed.

Sections 9 and 10 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 43 — AN ACT TO REPEAL THE TUBERCULOSIS SANITORIA
SUPERANNUATION ACT**

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 6 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CO-OPERATIVE PRODUCTION ASSOCIATIONS
ACT**

April 25, 1979

Sections 1 to 7 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 4 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FUEL PETROLEUM PRODUCTS ACT

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Section 3 as amended agreed.

Sections 4 to 11 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 51 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE TOBACCO TAX ACT

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Sections 3 to 9 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 9 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN ACT

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 10 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY OF REGINA ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 11 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE DEPARTMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION
ACT**

Sections 1 to 6 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 57 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SASKATCHEWAN ASSISTANCE ACT

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 14 — An Act to repeal The Industrial Standards Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 26 — AN ACT RESPECTING REGIONAL PARKS

Sections 1 to 9 agreed.

Section 10 as amended agreed.

Sections 11 to 15 agreed.

Section 16 as amended agreed.

Sections 17 to 28 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 27 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FOREST ACT

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Section 2 agreed.

Section 3 as amended agreed.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed.

Section 6 deleted.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 35 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN
SASKATCHEWAN ACT**

Sections 1 to 6 agreed.

Section 7 as amended agreed.

Section 8 deleted.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 1 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS AND SECURITY
GUARDS ACT**

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Section 3 deleted.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 2 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE ATTACHMENT OF DEBTS ACT

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 3 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CHILDREN OF UNMARRIED PARENTS ACT

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Section 3 deleted.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 34 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SUMMARY OFFENCES PROCEDURES ACT

Section 1 agreed.

Section 2 as amended agreed.

Section 3 agreed.

Section 4 as amended agreed.

Section 5 deleted.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 37 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CROWN ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 48 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PROVINCIAL COURT ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 61 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGAL PROFESSION ACT

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 54 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE ASSIGNMENT OF BOOK DEBTS ACT

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

Section 5 as amended agreed.

Section 6 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 55 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

Section 6 as amended agreed.

Section 7 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 56 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE GARAGE KEEPERS ACT

Sections 1 to 6 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 70 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MECHANICS' LIEN ACT

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2 to 4 as amended agreed.

Sections 5 to 8 agreed.

Section 9 as amended agreed.

Section 10 agreed.

Section 11 as amended agreed.

Section 12 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 71 — AN ACT TO REPEAL THE PUBLIC WORKS CREDITORS' PAYMENT ACT

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 22 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SASKATCHEWAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS
ACT**

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 73 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE OSTEOPATHIC PRACTICE ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

Section 4 as amended agreed.

Sections 5 to 11 agreed.

April 25, 1979

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 15 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM ACT

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 32 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE ARTS BOARD ACT

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 62 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE ENGINEERING PROFESSION ACT

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 79 — An Act to amend The Liquor Act

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Section 3 as amended agreed.

Sections 4 to 26 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 85 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE WATER SUPPLY BOARD ACT

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

Section 5 as amended agreed.

Sections 6 to 8 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:55 p.m.