

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

April 14, 1980.

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to other members of the legislature a group who are seated in the west gallery from Wascana School. They are accompanied today by Mr. Barlow and Mr. Dumalski. This is a large group of students from my constituency and many of them, Mr. Speaker, also live in Premier Blakeney's constituency, which is on the other side of Pasqua Street. I'm sure the Premier would want me to convey to those students his welcome as well.

I've had an opportunity over the years to visit this school on a number of occasions and I've always found the students at Wascana School to be particularly bright and particularly inquisitive. The questions are always good. I look forward to meeting with them a little later to answer any questions they might have, to have a few pictures taken and have some drinks. I know all members will join with me in welcoming them to the legislature this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Qu'Appelle, Mr. Lane, (unfortunately he is not able to be in the House today; I understand many of the students are from his constituency, which I presume would be west of Pasqua in the new subdivision), I join with the members of the House in welcoming you to the Assembly this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Gross, the MLA for Morse, I would like to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 30 students who are sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They come from Cabri High School at Cabri, Saskatchewan. They are accompanied this afternoon by Harv Engel and Walter Nisbet, Mr. Speaker. I understand these students are sponsored here this afternoon by local co-operatives in their area, an indication of the public-spirited involvement of co-operatives in their communities in this province.

Mr. Gross is sorry that other business took him from the legislature at this time but my understanding is that he looks forward to meeting you around 3 p.m. for a discussion at that time. I'm sure all members join me in wishing this group a pleasant visit to the legislature and a pleasant visit in Regina.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

TV SIGNAL

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of

Sask Tel. This morning, Mr. Minister, Sask Tel scrambled the TV signal by channel 8 of Saskatoon. Telecable on the broadcasting of the throne speech from Ottawa. My question to you is, do you not consider this a blatant suppression of our fundamental right of freedom of the press and another way of denying the people of Saskatchewan their rights?

HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — No I don't, Mr. Speaker, because the opportunity was given to the cable company through Sask Tel's receiving the signal from Anik to an earth station. All the cable operator has to do is plug in and he can have the same kind of House of Commons' debates, live, throne speech or what have you, as he could have with his own station.

MR. GARNER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, Saskatoon Telecable has a licence from the federal CRTTC (Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission) department to operate this public communication. Who gave the authority to prevent the people of Saskatchewan from viewing the throne speech from the House of Commons in Ottawa?

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether Telecable does have a licence. I haven't seen the licence, and of course, will likely not have the opportunity to see the licence. With regard to who gave the authority to turn off the signal — well, one just has to look very carefully at the situation and you will find that the signal is there. There is no scrambling of the signal as far as Sask Tel is concerned. The signal is there via the satellite and it is at a ground station at 7th and Campbell where it can be plugged into that system and the House of Commons debates and the throne speech could quite handily have been seen and viewed by the people in Saskatoon.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary, Mr. Minister, for your information, they do have a licence. But my question to you is, what legislation in this province gave your department the right to scramble the TV signal from Telecable channel 8 in Saskatoon because it was scrambled and the picture was off the air? Who did it and what legislation, what power is there in the province of Saskatchewan that your government has to do that?

MR. CODY: — Yes I realize the signal, which was coming from the satellite to what we term as illegal ground station, was taken off at midnight last night and it was done by Sask Tel. If you talk about a licence, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be certain what we're talking about. The CRTTC may well be giving licences for programming and that's their business. They give licences for programming; the Department of Communications gives permits and licences to operate equipment. In this particular case, Sask Tel has an agreement, an ironclad agreement with the telecommunications people, with the cable operators in Saskatchewan and that agreement is that they (the telecommunications operators or the cable operators) will deliver programming. That does not give them any authority to deliver a signal from a satellite or anywhere else to an earth station. That is completely within the jurisdiction of Sask Tel. We have brought the signal from the satellite to the earth station and that is the head-end operation — that is the next thing to the head-end. And the head-end — then all you have to do is plug it in and the debates of the House of Commons could quite handily be seen. However it would have to go through Sask Tel's equipment.

MR. GARNER: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. New question, then Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, this is without a doubt a suppression of the people's rights . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, new question!

MR. GARNER: — My question is, Mr. Minister, why (and I ask this again) was the signal scrambled? Because they do have a licence with Department of Communication for their ground station, that is another licence they have through the Department of Communication. They have a licence for that. Is what you and what your department did this morning legal, Mr. Minister?

MR. CODY: — Yes, what we have done is certainly legal. We have taken the signal which as, as far as we are concerned, an illegal signal. We have decided that signal would not be viewed. However, for the same program identically, all that has to be done is to plug in to the Sask Tel equipment and it can be done. As far as we are concerned, it is illegal because we have an ironclad agreement between Sask Tel and Telecable which identifies exactly what can or cannot be done. In this particular case they were doing something which they had no right to do because of the agreement and as a result of that, the signal was blocked and the signal from Sask Tel was put in its place. And it is there for anyone to view providing that the individual who owns the Telecable operation up there plugs it in.

MR. TAYLOR: — Very simply, Mr. Minister, would you tell us who gave the authority to cut this signal off?

MR. CODY: — The authority is given by way of an agreement because we have an agreement and it's an ironclad agreement. It's a legal document which indicates what they can and cannot do. As a result of that, the decision was made. I can tell you that the decision was made by the officials at Sask Tel and there's little question that their actions are correct.

SGI AGENCY RE FRANK BUCK

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — My question is to the Attorney General in the absence of the Provincial Secretary. On Friday last, following the adjournment of the House, the Provincial Secretary indicated outside the House that Mr. Frank Buck has a three-month employment contract with CIC. A preliminary form to apply for an insurance licence was filed by Mr. Frank Buck on March 5, 1980. The answer to question 4 (and the question asks the time to be devoted to insurance) was filled in at 100 per cent of the time. I would ask the Attorney General how can he devote 100 per cent of his time while he is still employed, whether employed or on employment contract with CIC?

HON. R.M. ROMANOW (Attorney-General): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the question should be directed to me or to Frank Buck because the question is: how is Mr. Buck to devote 100 per cent of his time? Now that's a statement which he makes and a statement which he will have to explain. The only opinion that I could offer is that with respect to the operation of an agency, the hours of the agency are perhaps not as structured (9 to 5 as would normally be the case) and would involve additional hours over and above the 9 to 5. I think what is intended by that is (and I am only reading here my intentions), the applicant indicates he will give his best effort to the agency.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — New question, Mr. Speaker, further to that answer, Mr. Attorney General. As you are probably aware, for anyone to obtain an insurance licence you are also required (in this case, not just a preliminary questionnaire) to file a statutory declaration on form S and form G. Now the statutory form S which was filed by Mr.

April 14, 1980

Frank Buck (in reply to the answer which you just gave) has to answer this question: does the applicant earn an income other than from any other business, profession, trade or occupation? That was filed March 31 and again was answered in the negative — that he did not. That was a similar type of statutory declaration as was filed in form G.

My question is, are you prepared to investigate that, and if that's a false declaration are you prepared to revoke the licence of Mr. Frank Buck?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I suppose the minister in charge of SGI would be better qualified to answer the question in this sense. I don't know who made the application, whether the application was made by a limited company and its officers, or whether it was made on an individual basis. I just simply cannot give an answer of yes or no to the hon. member based on information which apparently he has and he has not given to us (or to me in any event). I would have to take a look at the documentation before making a statement in that regard.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — New question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I think it is up to the Speaker to identify whether he wants a new question or not. I'll take the member for Kindersley.

APPLICATION FOR LICENCE

HON. MR. ANDREW: — A question to the Attorney General or to the minister of Saskatchewan Government Insurance. Are you not aware that when anyone applies for a licence, be it an individual or a corporation, that they must apply both to obtain an agency, plus obtain an insurance licence which is the form S and form G?

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — In view of your answer was that you did not know whether it was filed as a company or an individual. Would you now answer the question I put to you first?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, again, I do not have the documentation of the forms which were made out by either the limited company (if it was in a limited company name as I have indicated) or in a personal capacity. I simply cannot say to the hon. member that based on certain assertions which he makes, contracts will be cancelled or investigations with respect to declarations will be checked and so forth. I will not commit myself to that on the absence of information before me.

FILING OF FORMS G AND S

MR. ANDREW: — A question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister in charge of SGI. I address the question to you, Mr. Minister, with regard to the filing of form G and form S. Are you familiar with those forms? Are you familiar with the requirements on those forms requiring a person to state (in order to obtain a licence in the cities) whether the applicant earns income from any other business, trade or occupations. The answer was no. I tell that to the House on a search of the general registry which we do not have here. But I'm sure you can find it down there, and I'm sure you can take my word for it. Having said that I go back to my question. Does that not, in your mind, require an investigation as to whether or not there were false affidavits or false declarations signed?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Mr. Speaker, obviously I haven't seen the application. Why would I? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Would the member for Moosomin be quiet for a minute please? The fact of the matter is that Mr. Buck applied for an insurance agency. I haven't seen the application. I won't even see it until we have a board meeting, in terms of it being approved or not approved. It's a fact of life that Mr. Buck applied for the application and the officials at SGI granted it. I knew he was going to apply for it. The absent member for Qu'Appelle said the other day it was for political reasons. Then I ask the members opposite why Mr. Martin Pederson, who was a former leader of that party, is an SGI agent?

I'm answering the question as best I can because I haven't seen the forms. Why would I see the forms? I am not involved in the management of SGI; I'm involved in the policy related to its board.

MR. ANDREW: — A question to the Minister of SGI. In January 1978, a directive to licensing of general insurance agents, as I understand it, distributed to all general insurance agents as the rules of issuing licences for insurance agents (I refer you to part 3 of that regulation, and I'll have the girl send it to you if you wish), but reading from that it says, (and I'll brief this down); (1) there shall be no part-time agents licensed in the city; (2) an employee of a provincial government is not entitled to obtain an insurance licence. Are you familiar with that?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, certainly I'm familiar with that, and the information I had was that Mr. Buck had resigned his position and was not an employee of the government, or any agency of the government when he applied for the application.

MR. ANDREW: — Question (1) as I understand, he is still working for CIC, but (2) it appears that if he is not and he is through some sideways contract and he is still obviously a part-time insurance agent in the city of Regina — Does that not appear to you to contravene the regulations?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, the question was whether or not he had resigned his employment, and that's the information we were given. I have no information with regard to whether he had a contract or anything else. If you check the records with regard to SGI, they do not check into every agent to see whether or not he has any other business on the side. They simply do not do so.

CORPORATE SECRETARY — SASKOIL

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for SaskOil. From the press we already have the answer to this question from the minister responsible for CIC as it relates to CIC, but the latest annual report for SaskOil shows secretary to the board — Frank H. Buck, corporate secretary. I wonder if the minister would indicate to this House whether or not Frank H. Buck is still the corporate secretary to SaskOil, or if he has a contract for service with SaskOil? If he has resigned, what was the effective date?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the Crown investment corporation provides secretarial services to the SaskOil board of directors, and when the Leader of the Opposition is looking at the annual report he is talking about, we are talking about December 31, 1979.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister responsible for

municipal financing corporation — the Minister of Finance, if I could get his attention, in the latest annual report, 1979 municipal financing corporation report, 1979, municipal financing corporation, Mr. Frank Buck is the secretary . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh, I know what the date is. I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Frank Buck still secretary of that corporation? If he has resigned, what was the effective date of his resignation? And has he had a contract for service since his resignation if he did in fact resign?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, the report, as the member has indicated, is for the year 1979 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the members opposite shouldn't get so excited till I've had an opportunity to provide the answer. The members well know, as the minister in charge of SaskOil has indicated, the CIC provides secretarial services to the boards of various Crown corporations and up until December 1979, as the report indicates, Mr. Buck was the secretary to the municipal financing corporation. What arrangements CIC has made since the resignation of Mr. Buck from CIC I am not familiar with, but I'm sure the minister in charge will be able to provide that answer.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. BUCK BY CIC

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — A question to the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services. Is Mr. Buck today on contract with the Crown investments corporation?

MR. ROBBINS: — I don't speak for the Crown investments corporation. We got a resignation letter with respect to Mr. Buck in SGI and that is what we required. His appointment occurred after that.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, as vice-chairman of CIC, I can answer part of the member's question. Mr. Buck resigned as of March 31, 1980; he has a contractual arrangement for three months beginning April 1, 1980 and ending the end of June.

MR. TAYLOR: — To the Minister of Mineral Resources. Do you look at one of these contracts as employment, as terms of employment? Is that employment in your mind?

MR. MESSER: — No, Mr. Speaker, I do not look at it as terms of employment. It is a contractual arrangement. Mr. Buck conveyed to CIC his desire to resign. There were some concerns within CIC that given the time frame, we'd be unable to find adequate secretarial services for the very significant Crown corporations that he serves as secretary on. It was therefore the decision of the Crown investments corporation to approach Mr. Buck and offer him a contractual arrangement for three months. In that period of time it was the hope of CIC that it would be able to find, through the seeking of a new secretary, a person to replace him. I am advised there were ads in the paper as of Friday or Saturday of last week soliciting a person to fill the capacity that Mr. Buck is partially filling now by contractual arrangements with Crown investments corporation.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. Could you tell the House, Mr. Minister, precisely what is the difference between the function he performed as an employee and the function he is now going to perform on a contract or as a corporate citizen?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Buck's duties were more extensive as a

full employee of the Crown investments corporation. The major concern of the Crown investments corporation was the continuation of services at the secretarial level to some of the major corporations that Mr. Buck provided as secretary. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to answer the question as well as possible. There is a significant difference between the employments. He has severed himself from all of the other benefits that he might get indicating that there is very much a difference in respect of Mr. Buck's former position vis-à-vis the position he now holds by contract with the CIC.

TERMS OF CIC CONTRACT WITH MR. BUCK

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources, could you tell us the terms of the contract and what Mr. Buck is being paid for his services under the contract?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the legislature that I am the deputy chairperson. I do not know whether the minister who is chairman of CIC would know precisely; he is obviously not in the legislature this afternoon. I am not, as the minister responsible for SGI has said, responsible for the day-to-day management of the corporation. We believe we have competent, adequate executive personnel who will negotiate those arrangements. I will take the question under advisement and depending on the advice that I obtain from the executive personnel of CIC, give consideration to answering it.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — A question to the minister responsible for SGI. In light of the fact that Mr. Buck does have a contract for service with CIC which obviously requires some time to do the job and in light of the fact that your regulations require that there shall be no part-time agents in the cities in Saskatchewan, would you not agree that contravenes the regulations and his licence should be lifted or at least an investigation conducted to determine whether he qualifies under the part-time clause or not?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I'll make one comment and one comment only. The agency contract does not provide restraint clauses on other activities of an agent.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Is it not true that an agency as well as the individuals involved in that agency have to sign that declaration, saying that I am not involved or I am involved or whatever in outside employment?

MR. ROBBINS: — It clearly indicates that the agency contract does not require or provide restraint clauses in other activities of an agent.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Would the minister at this time or at his earliest convenience get in touch with his office and take a look at forms S and G?

MR. ROBBINS: — I think the management of the organization is left to the executive of the organization and I'm involved in the policy arrangement only at the board level.

INFORMATION RE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

MR. TAYLOR: — A question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, again today in this House you see debate and discussion over contractual arrangements. For the past three private members' days we have continually tried to find out from you the names of people who have contracts with the various departments of this government. Is your reason for refusal because those contracts in those departments are the same

as these, examples of political patronage and pay-off to NDP supporters?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the members of the House that for the last three private members' days, to the best of my recollection, almost all the questions asked by the opposition amended or unamended have been approved unanimously by this House in their final form. I make that point. The members opposite say it's because it's amended and they chose not to like the amended form and of course it was open to them to be opposed the proposed motion in its last form.

Secondly, (although that's not the most relevant aspect to the answer) I would say clearly, no, contracts are not provided for the reason suggested by the hon. member. Indeed, by SGI, as the hon. member in charge has indicated, there are agency contracts cutting across all political parties. The former leader of the Progressive Conservatives has one. The former member of the Liberal opposition had one at the time when he was a member and still has one so far as we know. It's a question of whether or not in the business of doing business with government, contracts should be made public. These have to be done on a case-by-case basis. I think that people who do enter into business relationships with government are entitled to the same degree of privacy and security in terms of the information as people do in private relationships.

MR. TAYLOR: — Would you tell me why you are afraid on that side of the House to let the opposition and the people of Saskatchewan know whom your government has contracts with?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, again I don't know how I can answer the question because it implies some sort of fear. I have indicated to the hon. member that if he would check the practice of provincial governments everything — Progressive Conservative Tory Alberta the same policy is followed; Progressive Conservative Tory Ontario the same policy is followed; the same in Manitoba and was when we were in office and out of office. It's followed for a very good reason, Mr. Speaker. The reason is that it has to be handled on a case-by-case basis. There will be some contracts where the nature of it is not in a semi-business capacity or one which is not in a confidential advisory capacity which may very well be tendered and made public. This has to be dealt with actually on a case-by-case basis, and the record of this government in the revelation of that information is as good, if not better, than exists in other legislatures.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, to the minister in charge of SGI. Mr. Minister, with the position Mr. Buck held as secretary to CIC and through there to a couple of the different corporations, even with the legalities the member for Kindersley raised (whether valid or not) do you not feel for the people of Saskatchewan this was a very, very foolish move, a move that could be conceived as strictly political? Do you not see this as a move by the decision you made?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker. Certainly not. The absent member for Qu'Appelle the other day said, how did this person get an agency when he had no experience in insurance? He worked five years at the SGI back in '59 to '64. He had a lot of experience in terms of insurance, irrespective of his political affiliations. You people are arguing this because he was an NDP candidate in 1972 in Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain that he shouldn't be given an agency now. For all I know, he may be like the absentee member intelligent and probably hasn't, but that's not the point.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN NORTH

HON. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform this Assembly of a meeting I attended in La Ronge this morning, a meeting which is continuing at this moment. Elected representatives of all municipal councils and school boards in the North are meeting today with officials of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in what can be described as the next step in the continuing process leading to more comprehensive and autonomous forms of local government in the North. Delegates at the meeting included representatives from the northern municipal council, the three incorporated municipalities, the local community authorities, the local advisory councils, and the four northern school districts.

Six alternative proposals were presented by the governments on the future structures of local governments. These ranged from maintaining the status quo to the establishment of regional municipal structures. The various options have taken into account the expressed views of northerners on the need for a more suitable form of local government. Since the inception of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, the strengthening of local government has been a major objective and a continuing program. The creation of northern school boards and local community authorities as well as the growth of the urban municipalities and local advisory councils have been significant steps in that development. The consultation process embarked upon today builds upon that development and ensures that whatever form local government takes in the future it will be designed with northerners for northerners.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Assembly will also be pleased to learn that included in these discussions are proposals for a revenue sharing program and a northern development corporation. Depending on the outcome of these discussions up to \$40 million could be made available for a five year revenue sharing program, which will channel increased and secured levels of funding to local governments. A northern development corporation could provide a mechanism whereby northerners would have the means to participate more fully in the development of renewable and non-renewable resources.

Mr. Speaker, the changes to the structure of local government resulting from this consultation process, together with the revenue sharing program and the establishment of a northern development corporation, will address the recommendations made by Justice Bayda in the report of the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry. The government's response to Bayda's recommendations ensures that northerners will participate fully in the economic development of the North, and that their voices will be heard in planning the future of the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, just in responding to the ministerial statement, I would, firstly, thank the minister for bringing the information to the attention of the members of the House. Certainly it is following to the letter proposals that were presented by myself on behalf of the Conservative opposition on March 3. We're very glad to see that there's going to be a strengthening of local government, especially in relation to the school boards, strengthening of the local autonomy there, It's certainly following the new vision presented by the opposition.

April 14, 1980

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, we like to see the development in the North, as the minister says, with northerners, for northerners. We think that's very appropriate. If we can look at more employment opportunities in northern Saskatchewan for northerners as a result of a strengthening of local government in the northern part of this province, it is certainly welcomed by this side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: — Initially, I want to apologize to the House for my rather undiplomatic departure from the Chamber last Friday. I suppose it was the pressure of work or something like that. I hope the members will be prepared to overlook it. I have two statements which I wish to make.

On Friday, April 11, 1980 the member for Regina South raised a question of privilege concerning certain remarks made on Thursday in the committee of finance. I want to remind all members that all breaches of privilege arising in a committee must be raised in the committee and then can be reported to the House. I refer all members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, paragraph 76:

Breaches of privilege in committee may be dealt with only by the House itself on report from the committee.

I also want to point out that questions of order arising in a committee must be dealt with in the committee. I refer members to Beauchesne's, Fifth Edition, paragraph 569(3):

The Speaker has ruled on many occasions that it is not competent for him to exercise procedural control over the committees. Committees are and must remain masters of their own procedure.

Also, paragraph 608:

Procedural difficulties which arise in committee ought to be settled in the committee and not in the House.

I, therefore, wish to inform the member for Regina South that it is not competent for me to deal with the matter of privilege raised. I suggest that matter be raised in the proper form.

On Friday, April 11, 1980, the member for Souris-Cannington raised a point of privilege concerning a minister's reply in the oral question period of April 10. As I stated on Friday, when this point was made, a question of privilege is a very serious matter and ought only to be raised when a privilege or right of parliament which is absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers has been infringed.

I refer members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, paragraph 19(1) which states:

A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not

fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

It has been consistently ruled in this Assembly that disputes between members as to questions of fact and the accurateness of replies to oral questions cannot be determined by the Chair and do not constitute a question of privilege. I refer members to rulings of the Chair, Journals of Saskatchewan, April 20, 1978; November 30, 1976; March 25, 1976; and November 18, 1975. I, therefore, rule that the matter raised does not constitute a breach of privilege.

MOTION

REQUEST FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Allen (Regina Rosemont) that by leave of the Assembly:

That leave of absence be granted to the hon. member for Cumberland on and from Money, April 28, 1980 to Friday, May 16, 1980 to attend, on behalf of this Assembly, a conference organized in London by the United Kingdom branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Motion agreed to nemine contradicente.

POINT OF ORDER ON QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the point of order?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise a point of order. I don't want to state it as any major area but perhaps for clarification from Mr. Speaker with respect to today's question period. And that is pertaining to the line of questions from the member for Kindersley, which in my judgement in effect asked for legal opinions from myself and alternately from the member for Saskatoon Nutana with respect to certain forms and regulations and whether they could or could not possibly disagree with certain statutes and regulations. My understanding of question period is that questions, which do ask that, are out of order as not properly to be asked of the Crown. Now, I could be in error and I don't make a big deal out of it, but I'd just like to know whether or not we're required to pony up legal opinions?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the Attorney General probably has a good point of order and I'll refer to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, Chapter 9, citation 357 (m) and the preamble is:

A question oral or written must not ask solution of a legal proposition such as the interpretation of a statute, a minister's own powers, etc.

So I believe the point of order is well taken.

MOTIONS

WITHDRAWAL OF BILL NO. 5

April 14, 1980

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)) : — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Environment, Mr. Bowerman, that the order for second reading of Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Senior Citizens School Tax Rebate Act be discharged and the bill withdrawn, I'll be bringing in a new bill.

Motion agreed and bill withdrawn.

WITHDRAWAL OF BILL NO. 51

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)) : — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the hon. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Hammersmith, that the order for second reading of Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Time Act be discharged and the bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed and bill withdrawn.

MR. KAEDING : — By leave, I request the new bill be permitted to proceed in second reading at the present time now. I will move first reading of the bill to amend The Time Act.

MR. SPEAKER : — It has been moved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural) that this Assembly now give first reading to an Act to amend The Time Act. That requires leave. Is leave granted?

Leave is granted.

Motion agreed and bill read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER : — When shall this bill be read a second time?

MR. KAEDING : — By leave, this day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER : — Leave is required; is leave granted?

You have heard the motion by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural) for second reading of a bill to amend The Time Act.

Leave is granted.

MR. KAEDING : — Are you ready to proceed?

AN HON. MEMBER : — You are finished. You had a second reading.

MR. SPEAKER : — I am getting too fast for everybody, including myself. I was actually seeking leave and leave has been granted. The minister now intends to move the bill. That way we won't cut off any debate.

SECOND READINGS

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)) moved second reading of Bill No. 51 — **An Act to amend The Time Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Time Act is completely consequential to the passage of

The Education Act in 1978. It provides for time-option areas identical to school unit and school district boundaries which were pursuant to The Larger School Units Act which was repealed in May, 1978.

The school units and school districts for in The Larger School Units Act were replaced by school divisions under that act. The amendments which I bring forward today do not involve any changes in the boundaries of the school units or school districts; they only translate the school units and school districts described into the appropriate school divisions. Thus, the school division boards will have the right to pass resolutions and cause time-option votes to be held.

These amendments are made necessary in order for the electoral office to legally conduct time-option votes throughout the northwestern and western portions of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the bill.

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Assembly that back in June there was a cabinet shuffle in which urban and rural affairs were split (so-called) and I would like to refer to December 12, 1979, page 354 in the Hansard, where the so-called Minister of Rural Affairs said there would be legislation brought in to establish a Department of Rural Affairs. Up to this point in time I have seen no bill to establish a rural affairs department.

Under these circumstances I feel that any bill pertaining to the Department of Rural Affairs should not be brought before the Assembly until legislation has been passed to establish a Department of Rural Affairs.

MR. KATZMAN: — On a point of order, I think the member for Bengough-Milestone has a good point, the same as we have in estimates. Nothing can be approved that is done by this department until that department is approved. I think you ruled that once before from your Chair. I think the member has a point in his comments and therefore we cannot go further with this bill because of that technicality.

MR. SPEAKER: — I assumed the member for Bengough-Milestone was rising to speak on second reading of the bill and not raising a point of order. If he is rising to speak on the bill, there's no reason for me to make any ruling. Now the member for Rosthern rose and I'm not sure he was rising on a point of order. It appears he was. It appears he wants a decision that relates in some way to this particular bill. The Time Act, and the relationship to the Department of Rural Affairs.

I'm not able to agree with the member for Rosthern that there is a point of order with regard to the procedure here. I see before me An Act to amend The Time Act and I see in this bill, The Time Act, references to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan and Minister of Municipal Affairs. But on a cursory examination I do not see any reference whatsoever to the Minister of Rural Affairs. Now, it's common practice that any cabinet member of the Executive Council can move any bill. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural) can move a bill on the Department of Health if he wishes to, if it's the choice of the Executive Council. He can pilot it through the House in all its operations. So there's nothing out of order with regard to the Minister of Municipal Affairs moving this with regard to The Time Act. And there's no reference to the Department of Rural Affairs.

April 14, 1980

MR. KATZMAN: — Here is a second point of order then. I believe that the members of the House should be presented with a new bill, even though we allowed him to go with leave. We should at least get copies of it so we can check it; they haven't been distributed yet.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that the members knew what they were getting into when they were offering leave. The members should therefore equip themselves with the necessary strategic moves which will put this bill in such a position that it will give you time to study it. I'm not here for the purpose of suggesting how you should do that. I think it's obvious to all members. If the member for Rosthern wants to hold the bill, he knows how to hold it.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — In light of the fact that this bill has just not been presented to the members on this side of the House and we would like some time to study it and review it, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)) moved second reading of Bill No. 56 — **An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the same arguments will not apply to this act, but I want to assure the members opposite that a bill is coming very shortly dealing with the setting up of the urban affairs portfolio and the rural affairs portfolio and if they wish to hold up the activities of the House for that purpose, they may do so. I suggest it is another bit of grandstanding which they are engaged in, unfortunately. So I will proceed, Mr. Speaker, to move second reading of Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act.

These amendments, Mr. Speaker, fall into two general classifications . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. Point of order.

MR. PICKERING: — Well the point of order, Mr. Speaker, is, I'd like to refer back to what I said just a few minutes ago. There isn't such a thing as a Department of Urban Affairs and how can we proceed in this Assembly until there is one established? That is my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Would the member just give me a moment please?

I have examined the bill briefly and I find it is a bill to amend The Rural Municipality Act and doesn't have anything to do with anything that is out of order because I gather there is an act which will be amended. That is perfectly in order and as to who is moving it, as I stated before, that is in order as well, so I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural).

MR. KAEDING: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I started to say, these amendments, Mr. Speaker, fall into two general classifications. The first one is to bring the authorities of rural municipalities in line with current administrative requirements. The remainder of the amendments are consequential to amendments of other legislation which have gone before and are mostly of a housekeeping nature.

My comments will be directed therefore mainly to the amendments which bring the

authorities of the rural municipal councils into line with today's administrative requirements. The existing act limits the rural municipal councils to 18 meetings per year. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, because of the larger amount of work being done by local government this is no longer adequate considering the variety, the complexity and the volume of business which must be conducted by many municipalities. This limit on the number of meetings is particularly impractical for some of the larger municipalities. Section 4 of the bill therefore provides flexibility respecting the number of council meetings to be held, but includes a requirement for the reporting to the ratepayers on this matter.

Section 5 of the bill provides more flexibility into calling special meetings of the council. Once again, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is required to address current administrative demands on municipal councils. The provisions of section 74(b) of The Rural Municipality Act have been in existence for many years. This section requires a bank deposit to be made whenever collections of \$2,000 have been accumulated, and not less than once per week. Obviously this provision requires updating because, at present, a single payment of taxes could equal a \$2,000 limit or more before deposits, with the result that daily deposits are required during certain periods of the year.

The amendment will increase the amount of collections before deposit to \$5,000 and will eliminate the weekly deposit requirement. However, all funds are required to be deposited at the end of each month. Increased industrial development and service industries along municipal roads have created traffic problems. Parking on roads is a particular problem in the vicinity of drive-in theatres, auction marts and so on.

Section 7, subclause (1) of the bill provides the authority required by municipal councils to control this parking. Many municipalities are now building super grid roads with oiled surfaces. This program, Mr. Speaker, results from the generous assistance provided to rural municipalities by this government through its revenue-sharing program.

These super grid roads are similar in quality to secondary provincial highways. It is therefore obvious, Mr. Speaker, that municipalities must have authority to control the type of wheel traffic which is permitted on these roads (and I'm referring here to lug tractors and so on). Section 72 of the bill provides that authority.

I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that rural municipalities have now formed approximately 50 maintenance areas. These maintenance areas provide a means of co-operation in construction and maintenance of super grids. Fifty such areas have now been formed, involving about 206 rural municipalities, to ensure effective planning of super grids and adequate maintenance of the oiled surfaces.

This government takes pride in its program, Mr. Speaker. Since 1977 we have contributed \$7.5 million to assist in the construction of nearly 500 miles of super grid roads and oil surfacing of nearly 400 miles.

Section 8 of the bill simplifies the procedure required by municipalities in making changes in the maintenance area of board membership.

The remainder of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, are of a housekeeping nature and are self-explanatory. I would therefore move second reading of this bill.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Saltcoats, I realize a lot of the

April 14, 1980

portions of this bill have been brought to your attention by many RMs throughout the province of Saskatchewan, and I suspect that is the reason you have brought this before the Assembly. I think it is just of a housekeeping nature and I do not oppose the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth) moved second reading of Bill No. 59 — **An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act (No. 2)**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will dwell for a couple of moments on this bill since questions have been raised on it in the oral question period from some members opposite, particularly the member for Meadow Lake.

Let me begin by saying that while the amendment is a very short one, it heralds something of a revolution in the Provincial Library. The amendment permits the Provincial Library and the regional libraries to become members of a non-profit corporation, and I suppose I could explain that and sit down, but one might then ask what particular non-profit corporation did you have in mind?

Mr. Speaker, it so happens that it is the structure which has been chosen to implement an automated computer system which will replace the manual card cataloguing system. The Provincial Library, the Regina public Library and the Saskatoon Library and their boards have approved the formation of a non-profit corporation in order to pool resources and purchase automated library services. These service include on-line cataloguing in the three libraries and retrospective conversion of previous cataloguing records into machine readable form.

Once the holdings of these three libraries have been converted to the machine readable form, the data base thus formed will be utilized to run on-line circulation systems. This procedure has been successfully implemented in many of our country's university and public libraries. Automated systems, as I'm sure you'll appreciate, mean better access to library resources for the public and better utilization of the human resources in the library system. So many fewer hours are used searching through cards trying to find particular books, and this allows a librarian in Saskatoon or Regina to know at an instant whether a book is in any of the three — the Provincial Library, the Regina Library, and the Saskatoon Library.

The member for Meadow Lake asked a question in oral question period which touched upon concerns that had been expressed by staff at the Provincial Library over the introduction of the so-called network. Perhaps it will suffice to say that I think the concern of the staff relates to their security of tenure. I think many of the staff are concerned that this will result in fewer jobs in some areas, and they are right, it will mean fewer jobs in some areas. We've attempted to allay the fears of the staff by assuring them that staff reductions would take place only by attrition. We would not lay off any staff. As vacancies came open we would use those to effect staff reductions. I think as well, to be fair to the staff, their concern stems from a fear by some members that the automated network system will undermine the one-library concept which we have pioneered in this province, and which has given us such an outstanding library system. I don't need to repeat it at great length here, but I'm fond of boasting about what a great library system we have. We have, I believe, the best library system in the world, bar none. And that's based on the one-library concept.

In fairness to the staff as well, some of the regional boards have expressed concern that the automated network will undermine the one-library system. I'll take this opportunity to assure you that the network in no way undermines the concept of one provincial library system. The regional libraries will continue to receive sets of catalogue cards at no charge from centralized cataloguing. The difference is that the cataloguing information usually provided directly by the Provincial Library will be fed into the new computer terminals there, and the card sets will be produced by a larger computer at the University of Toronto library automation system. The card service provided to the regions via UTLAS is a better and a more complete service than the Provincial Library is now able to provide. Arrangements between the centralized cataloguing and the regional libraries will remain the same until a majority agree to change.

I think it's fair to say, though, that change is going to have to come about within the next three, four, or five years. Library systems throughout the world are phasing out manual cataloguing systems, and once large numbers of them have done so (and that will occur within three to five years) the manual cataloguing systems are going to be extremely and prohibitively expensive. So it is probable that the regions have little option but to become part of the automated system at some time in the future. Regional libraries will thus have to take a close look at the future of their card catalogues and the options available to them. Of course, the Provincial Library will be giving them assistance in this regard.

I should have said one other thing about the automated network, Mr. Speaker; I should have touched upon the structure. There will be four classes of membership. There will be principal members. The annual fee for a principal member is \$20,000. At the moment there are just three principal members — the Saskatoon Library system, the Regina Library system and the Provincial Library. Regional library boards have expressed concern that when they have to go onto an automated system and thus have to become principal members they will not be able to afford the \$20,000. My response to that is, you are not going to go on immediately. As and when you do, we simply will have to review that fee and review the grants which are available to you.

As well, Mr. Speaker, there is a participating member with an annual fee of \$2,000. Ninety per cent of this is used to purchase goods and services which the participating member will use.

The third membership, the consortium member — this is simply where a number of libraries get together and they purchase one participating membership.

There is a fourth class which is someone who simply wants to be associated with the library. That is called a various member.

Mr. Speaker, with that explanation of the network system and the background behind this rather terse amendment, I will move second reading of a bill styled The Public Libraries Amendment Act, 1980 (No. 2).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this bill, I understand what the minister is saying regarding the implementation or bringing in this non-profit corporation as a method whereby they can implement the automation system in the library. I don't want anything which I might say here to be construed as opposition to

the idea or the concept of automation in the library system. I, to some extent, agree with what the minister says (to use his words of an earlier day) — a Saskatchewan speciality and a good library system. I will agree with that; I go along with that. We have an excellent library system in the province.

I have a couple of concerns there. Although I feel the network across the province is a good one, it would be a very basic mistake to move so quickly into an automation program like this, implementing it and forging ahead with something that is faced by opposition from knowledgeable people within the library system itself, staff members and people who have legitimate concerns. I am a little concerned about the methods with which the minister and his department seem to want to forge ahead with this thing, over some of the legitimate concerns expressed by those people.

I notice the bill would provide for regional libraries as well as municipal libraries and the Provincial Library. I think the minister made reference in his comments, to classes of membership in this proposed non-profit corporation. I think that is one of the concerns (and you alluded to it a little bit) of the regionals. It is very important that we don't move by the regionals to such an extent that the regionals are left in the dust. That would be my basic concern. We talk on both sides of the House, always, about the preservation of rural Saskatchewan. You can get into all the political posturing necessary, but there is no question that's a very, very basic thing in this province and this library and the cultural aspect the library provides is an important thing.

My other concern is in the report entitled, 'The Automation of Saskatchewan Public Library Systems — First Implementation Plan' by Mr. H.A.S. Ball. The minister seems to be taking that report as the basis for the automation program and I believe that set the case, and he's nodding. I would ask you, Mr. Minister, to just hold up a little and talk a little bit more with your staff than you have been. I am sure you know I know the minister has received some petitions from staff members and so on and I think I would urge you more than just ask you, to listen very carefully to what those people are saying. I don't believe it's necessarily only a condition of tenure for these people, that they are worrying only about their own employment tenure. I believe they have some concerns, budget concerns and so on. I don't know how the minister can justify — I'll just throw this in — the dismissal of Mr. Turnbull. I'll just allude to that slightly now and I will later. The former provincial assistant librarian — it seems his dismissal came right on the heels of his pointing out certain pitfalls in the proposals to implement the automation program. I think at this time, Mr. Speaker, I am awaiting some more information regarding the implications this will have for people directly concerned so I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth) moved second reading of Bill No. 69 — An Act to amend the Western Development Museum Act.

He said: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Although the bill is under Mr. Romanow's name, he was kind enough to move it for me one day when I was absent from the legislature. This is a minor bill which could have gone to the non-controversial bills committee. I thought about it and eventually decided not to. I thought there might be some questions by some members. The bill does two things. It expands the size of the Western Development Museum board. Currently that's eleven. There are currently three members at large. One has traditionally been the deputy minister of youth and culture. The other two are people with various skills. The other eight are chosen, two

from each of the communities in which the WDM has a museum.

It is the intention of the government to amend the bill to permit expansion because the role of the Western Development Museum is expanding somewhat. It was initially formed as a consortium of museums, a sort of confederation of four museums. Now the Western Development Museum is going beyond that somewhat limited mandate and assuming a role which I might characterize as one akin to that played by the Royal Ontario Museum; assuming some extension functions, as they are called when those services are provided by university, and assuming some responsibilities to provide services to smaller museums. Smaller museums often ask for help in setting up their museum and organizing it and cataloguing all the artifacts they have. This is the kind of thing the Western Development Museum is increasingly providing.

Thus it may well be that we want to appoint additional people to the board. I am just providing you with a for instance. I have no present intention to appoint anyone in particular to the board. One might imagine for instance that we might want to appoint a representative of the small museums to the board so their point of view might be brought to bear on deliberations of the board. It's the kind of example one might cite as the kind of additional people we might want to put on the board. That's the substance of the bill. In addition, we are providing that a member is eligible for reappointment but for no more than four consecutive years, thus seeking to limit a member's term on the board. What we have found is if we don't limit the length of a board member's term, they tend to stay on for a very long period of time, often after their freshness and vitality and enthusiasm have left them. Out of courtesy and of misaligned and ill-conceived kindness, we don't ask members to leave when they have really served their purpose. Thus, we have decided to automatically take people off after four years. After having sat out for one year, they could be reappointed if their services were that valuable. But it's a big province with a lot of talented people and nobody is really irreplaceable. These are the two things which the board does.

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — I just have a couple of very brief comments. Mr. Minister, certainly you must have some idea or your people involved must have some idea of what number of people would constitute an effective board. I know it says you moved the provision for an 11-member board and you removed the ceiling altogether. Now that can open its way for all kinds of things if one were suspicious at all. But I won't get into that now. I wonder if you could answer that for me.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, to respond to the legitimate concern expressed by the member for Meadow Lake, we considered putting an upper limit on, increasing it to 14 or 15 and then felt concerned that we might, at some future time, find ourselves in the same sort of jack pot again. So we did not put a ceiling on it this time. I can say to the hon. member that it is our intention to appoint no more than two or three people. We intend to appoint probably one member who represents the small museums. I don't have anyone in mind and have not in a sense discussed this very extensively but it's one sort of person we might add. I don't think the board would be larger than 14 or 15 people. I happen to be responsible for a board, which I won't refer to specifically, but it's much larger than 12. It has 20 people on it. It approaches the unworkable having that many on it. So I have that experience. I can assure the hon. member for Meadow Lake we will not be expanding the board ad infinitum. We'll be putting on two or three people and that's all.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth) moved second reading of Bill No. 70 — **An Act to amend The Recreational and Cultural Facilities Capital Grants Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I might have referred the bill to the uncontroversial bill committee, but I knew so many members of the House would want to have a chance to get up and say what a great program this is that I didn't want to deny them that opportunity. But seriously, Mr. Speaker, we are extending the program. The program would have come to an end on March 31, 1981. Our discussions with many municipalities and our records at the department indicated that many municipalities would not be able to use the full amount of their funds by that deadline. We have thus extended the deadline for applying for the funds to December 31, 1981 so that hopefully all municipalities will be able to make use of the full amount of the funds which are available. With that short explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the minister that I think these grants have been very good for some of our communities. I think something which concerns all of the people in Saskatchewan (and certainly we as legislators) is one of the things that has been a pet peeve of the member for Bengough-Milestone; we are getting assistance from all directions to build these wonderful recreational facilities in these communities, and all of a sudden they are finding (and especially during the winter time) that they are having one heck of a time paying the fuel and light bills in the skating rinks, curling rinks, and in the community halls. With the assistance you are giving in these grants to help communities, we also are creating something which is happening in all communities.

I don't know whether we are over-recreationing ourselves, or what's happening, but we can't seem to keep up. The small communities are having a difficult time. I'm wondering if your department could help put pressure on SPC through the cabinet and if we couldn't peg utilities for these facilities which you are assisting the communities in building at 1975 rates. If you were to do this, you would be doing one of the biggest things for communities throughout this province that you could do. This is just one point that is a very great concern. I know all these communities are grateful for the grants they get for these facilities, but this is a real concern for these communities.

MR. N.E. BYERS (Kelvington-Wadena): — I hadn't intended to participate in this debate because I thought the remarks of the minister would be welcomed and would go unchallenged. The capital facilities grant administered by youth and culture has certainly been a benefit to a great many communities and has served to foster intermunicipal co-operation. I think the extent to which rural and urban municipalities are co-operating in funding the capital facilities is unprecedented in the history of our province.

The decision to extend the time period for the youth and culture capital facilities grant will certainly be welcomed by communities which are planning major facilities involving major expenditures. I know of at least a couple of communities in my constituency which are in the process of planning new rinks. They will now be able to better utilize the funds through the youth and culture capital grants program, with the new capital grants program which will be coming on stream this year through the Department of Urban Affairs. I know this will certainly be welcome.

With respect to the comments of the hon. member for Estevan, we know that communities are facing increases in operation costs of recreation facilities,

particularly artificial ice plants which have some pretty hefty power bills of \$2,000 to \$3,000 a month during the winter months. We have taken some pretty major steps to alleviate this financial strain on recreation groups within the communities. The unconditional grant program through urban affairs was designed to do this. Communities of 1,000 or 1,500 people are picking up an unconditional grant of \$100,000 or \$103,000 a year. Certainly, the intent of that program was that the local authorities would pass on some of that unconditional grant money for the operation of recreational facilities within the community.

I sometimes wonder as I listen to comments from the opposition whether they are convinced the unconditional grant approach to funding local governments meets with their philosophy. We have taken the position as a result of representations made to the government by SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) and by SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) that the greatest portion of grants should be paid to local governments on an unconditional grant basis and not on a conditional basis as proposed by the hon. member for Estevan.

The urban governments and the rural governments came to this government four or five years ago when we started developing the revenue sharing package and urged that the government get out of or abandon this archaic system of funding programs on a conditional basis and develop a system whereby the communities would receive their grants in a lump sum. The decision as to how the funds would be distributed could then best be decided at the local level.

Let's take the case of a community of 1,500 people getting an unconditional grant of \$103,000. Who is in a better position to determine how much of that should be earmarked for the operation of recreational facilities: the people in Regina or the people in the urban community? We say it's the people out in the urban community who have much better judgement than anyone within the provincial government, wherever they may be housed, to make such decisions. But the hon. member for Estevan continues to imply that it's far better if the province package up every dollar and put a label on it before it is sent out to the local governments. We have far more faith in the ability of the local governments to redistribute the generous grants that come primarily from resource revenues than we have in the ability to redistribute it in advance here in Regina.

I want to commend the hon. minister for bringing in this amendment to extend this youth and cultural facilities program. There are a great many facilities that will continue to be built in Saskatchewan. They would still be plans on the drawing board in a good many cases if they were waiting for grants from a Conservative government. They will become a reality so that our young people and all who live in rural Saskatchewan can benefit.

I hope the members will unanimously support this bill. Remember the famous words of the Mayor of Oslo, Norway, attending an international gathering on recreational facilities some years ago, who said that the politician who isn't prepared to put up sufficient funds for recreation purposes wouldn't plan to be a politician very long. I will be supporting the bill and I'll be watching eagerly to see if the opposition will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, just so the member for Kelvington-Wadena doesn't labour too long in unrest as to whether we're going to

support the bill or not. We will be, and would have as a matter of course. We think the program should be expanded and extended, and should have gone through with no debate at all. It should have been a non-controversial bill. But a couple of the comments of the member who just sat down have to be answered.

We accept the program as a good program. We accept that all moneys going to municipalities, to local governments, should be unconditional. We've said it forever. If you'd turn on your selective hearing aid so it catches all of it, instead of what you want to hear, we're concerned about your grants — your happy little recreation facility grants that go out. For instance in Carievale, right now we are considering contemplating building a new recreation facility. Do you know how much we qualify for as a capital grant under your happy little program? — within dollars of what we would pay on education and health tax on the building. So you're taking it out of one pocket and putting it back in the other.

What the member for Estevan was alluding to was why not take a look at the total picture — power rates, gas rates, health and education tax on recreation facilities? You know it's easy to sit down there and sign cheques and say, look what we've done, please vote for us. But you're taking it out of the other pocket as fast, or faster, than you're giving it back to them. I think the member for Estevan made a valid point. I think the member for Kelvington-Wadena tried to politicize it. I'll be supporting the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to confess, quite frankly, I did not expect this degree of discussion about this bill. Nevertheless, I suppose it may have been useful. I want to thank the members for the contribution. I want to thank the member for Kelvington-Wadena for his contribution as well. Indeed, he said something of what I was going to say in closing. I suppose he may have stolen my speech, but he said it as well as I would have or better, so I suppose the Assembly is none the poorer. Let me just say very briefly a couple of things about operating costs.

The member for Estevan raises an issue which has been raised with me by quite a number of municipalities. First of all, and I say this is not very useful to municipalities in a sense, it has one good side effect. The fact operating costs of these buildings are high forces the community to get out and utilize the building, forces them to serve on volunteer committees and so on. I think it does a fair amount. I think having an expensive building to maintain does something for the community spirit, but I don't offer that to anyone, including the municipalities, as an answer. I've more sense than that.

What I do say to the municipalities, who have raised the request raised by the member for Estevan, is I think it's not an opportune way to deal simply with the situation by subsidizing their energy costs. We should not be subsidizing energy costs. Rather we should be conserving on the use of energy and there are some very imaginative things being done by some of these same municipalities. I won't keep the House here all day long telling you some of the interesting ways municipalities are saving energy costs in the building of buildings, but I think the wrong way to attack the problem is to provide low energy costs. A better way to attack the problem is to provide the municipalities with sufficient resources so they can handle the costs they cannot avoid. I repeat something of what the member for Kelvington-Wadena said. We have provided the municipalities not with any specific grant but with some very generous funding under the revenue sharing program — funding more generous than is found in most Tory

provinces. I won't say all Tory provinces, but funding is a lot more generous than is found in most Tory provinces. It is through the generous funding they get through revenue sharing that we seek to deal with the high energy costs which they admittedly face.

With that brief addition to this rather long discussion of a short bill, I would move second reading of a bill to amend The Recreational and Cultural Facilities Capital Grants Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 61 — **An Act to amend The Public Works Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill before you today, Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Public Works Act, is essentially of a housekeeping nature. First of all it replaces the current definition of a public work with a new definition and proposes three other minor changes which are consequential to amending the definition clause.

By way of background, I can say to members of the House that the need for a more precise definition arose last year in connection with the development of the Weyburn Square complex. Weyburn City Council, sensitive to the possibility that a developer might try to establish a shopping mall on the city's outskirts, approached this government expressing concern for the future downtown area if such a development took place. All our experience indicated that a peripheral mall was probably not in the city's best interests and we agreed, therefore, to take action to help preserve the Weyburn downtown core.

Malls on the outskirts of the city, I think, tend in many instances to draw business and people away from the downtown core. Many downtown businesses then become marginal operations; some are unable to maintain adequate stock; their ability to compete is weakened. In many instances stores have closed; buildings have deteriorated; fewer and fewer people shop or visit the core area. Eventually the heart of the city, which is far more than just a shopping area, has a tendency to die. We were determined to ensure the viability of the downtown Weyburn core.

We believe strong city cores are vital to the quality of life in our Saskatchewan communities because they provide them with much of their spirit, character and heritage.

As with many of us, the vision of mall developers is determined by the expectations of the people they serve. Shareholders see a good balance sheet as being more important than downtown regeneration in some far-away city. In meeting obligations to maximize profits and minimize expenses, developers are often inclined to locate malls on the cheaper and more easily assembled land on the outskirts of the city.

We, as elected representatives, have a greater duty. I think we must do more than provide shareholders with a healthy profit margin. The people of this province expect us to provide leadership in areas like downtown development. WE did provide that leadership, Mr. Speaker. Under authority provided by The Public Works Act, we took on tasks such as land assembly downtown, which developers claim drove them to the peripheral areas. I am sure that the hon. member for Weyburn will agree that this government's effort to promote the rejuvenation of the city's core was a very great

April 14, 1980

success — I'm sure that view will be shared by other members who have visited the new downtown shopping centre which was opened only very recently and the tower which will be opened in the not too distant future. The shopping mall and office tower development have led to a number of spin-off benefits which have further strengthened and beautified the Weyburn downtown area.

While we were carrying on the land assembly for this much needed project, the legal advisor for two of the property owners questioned whether or not the project was a public work within the meaning of The Public Works Act. Our legal advice indicated that the project was indeed a public work, but the decision was taken at that time to try as much as possible to ensure that the status of future projects such as Weyburn Square will be clear from the start.

Members will note then in the suggested amendment that the new definition provides the mechanism for the designation of a project to be a public work. It is intended that this mechanism will be used to remove any doubt about the legal foundation for any future project similar to the downtown Weyburn Square development.

Section 3 is being amended to include acquisition and disposal authority in one section, and to specifically provide for the application of The Expropriation Procedure Act to all public works within the meaning of this legislation.

Sections 13 and 14 are being repealed because they are now covered by the amended section of the act. The amendment to section 15 is directly consequential on the redefinition of the term 'public work'.

There is a current authority to make regulations not inconsistent with this act. The addition of a new clause in section 15 will indicate that the manner of designating public works is covered in the regulation.

As I indicated from the outset, Mr. Speaker, the bill largely represents fine tuning and I believe should be acceptable to all members. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Minister, you make the comment about Weyburn and basically what you are saying is, state control of all development wherever the state feels like it wants to get involved. That is what your statement says, as you read it earlier.

It is interesting to note that the words 'public works' all going through your bill seem to indicate the Lieutenant-Governor, in other words the cabinet, can say this area is going to be public because we have one little office in the basement for some purpose, the rest is all non-public buildings, therefore this will become a public building. It is interesting to note as you read through the original bill and compare some of the suggestions you seem to be doing two or three major things and maybe it's because of the Weyburn situation referred to that you are doing them; but I think this bill goes further, the ramifications are much larger than what you indicate when you speak.

I refer to section 6 of this bill which says, in 15(1)(n) there's a new clause that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council can designate any building he so feels. It makes you wonder what you will do by causing this. The government will go into developing sites as they have in Regina, Weyburn and other areas.

In section 4 it makes reference to, I assume when you say otherwise, that you have the right to expropriate. That's what you are referring to there. It's a little different wording than the present act, which also allows you to expropriate. The first part of your bill I have no real arguments against. When we get down to further portions of your bill I have some strong arguments. I am wondering in what way we can modify those problems so the Government of Saskatchewan doesn't become the only developer of shopping centres or any other complex within the province of Saskatchewan. In your speech you indicated in second reading that the concern for preserving the downtown area was one of the reasons for bringing this bill forward. Mr. Minister, I think everybody is concerned with the downtown core but everybody does not require the Government of Saskatchewan to be the only body involved in revitalizing the downtown core. Saskatoon is a good example of that. In Saskatoon, a private developer built the Midtown Plaza complex.

Weyburn, I gather, was a different situation. Mr. Minister, I understand there are problems in Weyburn but we won't get into those.

Before I ask leave to adjourn debate I'd like to check into some ways of amending this to solve a problem I am concerned with and still allow you to do what you're concerned with. Mr. Minister, on that note, I would ask leave to adjourn debate to see if we can do that.

Debate adjourned.

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 62 — **An Act to amend The Cancer Foundation Act.**

He said: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this bill, which should have been moved to the non-controversial bills committee as I had recommended, is a very minor amendment to The Cancer Foundation Act. It is simply one of a technical nature. The Cancer Foundation Act, as everyone knows, was enacted during the 1979 session and was proclaimed to come into force August 1, 1979. Through an oversight in drafting this piece of legislation, the foundation was not stated to be a corporate body. This omission means that the members of the foundation are not protected from personal liability in connection with claims for damages arising out of activities of the foundation. The proposed amendment will give the cancer foundation corporate body status. Further, the amendment will be made retroactive to August 1, 1979, the date when the act came into force.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I move second reading of an Act to amend The Cancer Foundation Act.

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Members on this side of the House compliment the Department of Health and the minister for this act. We have asked before that the cancer board in Saskatchewan become an autonomous body. This strengthens our desires. We thank you for it.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 64 — **An Act respecting Firearm Safety.**

He said: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak on second reading of The

April 14, 1980

Firearm Safety Act. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this act will usher in a new era for Saskatchewan in the teaching of safe and responsible handling of firearms both in the field and home. The implementation of the act will help instil a sense of responsibility and a sense of courtesy in hunters. It will also encourage an awareness of the principles of conservation and a humane approach to the hunting of wild game.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to this House that the request to the government to bring in this act came from the sportsmen's organizations themselves. Those citizens who enjoy hunting as an outdoor recreational activity have requested the introduction of a mandatory firearm training program to help ensure that everyone who goes into the field will hunt in safe and responsible practices. The department has received similar requests from other organizations to introduce a mandatory firearm safety program.

Other sportsmen's organizations such as the South Saskatchewan Wildlife Association, who make their headquarters in the city of Moose Jaw, have constantly requested the government to come forward with a mandatory firearm safety program. The Regina Fish and Game League is another organization, Mr. Speaker, which has submitted similar requests to the department for such a program.

Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan have had a good voluntary firearm safety training program in operation for approximately 20 years. This program has been operating with the full support and participation of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation who provided the instructors and set up courses to provide firearm safety training all over the province. Since that program was set up in 1960, approximately 70,000 of our citizens have passed through the course and received firearm certificates. There has been annual average enrolment in the program of some 4,000 students.

However, because the firearm safety training course has been a voluntary program the department and the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation have found that many young and inexperienced hunters have not been reached. We sincerely believe we have to be responsible in these situations and must ensure that all young and inexperienced hunters do not go into the field without proper training in the safe and responsible handling of firearms. The Firearm Safety Act will make this very possible.

Since the introduction of firearm safety training in Saskatchewan back in 1960, there has been a gradual decrease in the number of hunting accidents. In 1960 when the voluntary program was first introduced, there were 106 firearm accidents with 14 fatalities. This compares with 55 accidents and 7 fatalities in 1979. This is a considerable decrease in the number of hunting accidents but it's important, I feel, that we go one step further and bring in a program that may reduce the number of 7 fatalities even by half.

In reviewing the firearm accidents that have happened over the years, the department has found some very interesting figures. Of approximately 70,000 people who have taken the firearm safety training course, only 1 per cent has even been involved in a firearm safety accident. The task of reducing firearm accidents is therefore clear and must be the ultimate in terms of bringing to an end, or close to an end, the need for useless fatalities such as firearm accidents.

With respect to firearm accidents, the department has found that more than half have been caused by the young and inexperienced hunters in the province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this new act will direct its intention to the young and to the inexperienced

hunters. Regulations, we hope, will be enacted very shortly which will stipulate that all persons under 18 years of age or first-time hunters must have successfully completed a firearm safety course before being eligible to purchase a Saskatchewan hunting licence. The firearm safety training courses will be offered in all areas of our province. It will be under the administration of our department in conjunction with the present sportsmen's organizations now delivering the program, namely the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, community groups, schools, cadet groups and many other organizations that have made the voluntary program a success story. It is our intention not to make the regulations under The Firearm Safety Act effective until the 1981 hunting season. This will give all potential hunters of 18 years and under and all first-time hunters ample opportunity to avail themselves of the firearm safety course and thus be able to eligibly purchase the 1981 hunting licence.

The introduction of The Firearm Safety Act in the province of Saskatchewan will make Saskatchewan the eighth province in Canada to have some form of firearm safety training and hunter education as a prerequisite to being issued a hunting licence. Only Alberta among the major provinces in Canada will be without some form of mandatory firearm safety training. It's important to note, I think, Mr. Speaker, that 28 states in the United States have similar mandatory firearm safety training programs in effect. We will develop agreements with all provinces and states which have these mandatory training programs, under which we will recognize their firearm safety training certificates so as to make their citizens eligible to purchase a Saskatchewan hunting licence. Mr. Speaker, I believe this act will be a major step forward in our province in encouraging the safe and responsible handling of firearms both in the field and in the home. I believe it will be a major step forward in helping us to reduce the number of firearm accidents in the province of Saskatchewan.

In closing, I would only want to pay tribute to the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation for the tremendous role it has played over the years in providing instructors and organizing the present firearm safety training classes. I want to thank other sportsmen's organizations too, which in fact also sponsored the training classes and made the voluntary program such a success story, Mr. Speaker, it's clear to see that I will be, with great pleasure, supporting this act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments to make about this. First of all, I think this is one bill I can agree with the new Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources on. I think he is finally (not just him) but I think the government opposite is finally listening to the people of Saskatchewan; but, Mr. Speaker, it was the former minister who four years ago promised the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation that it was going to get this. Hopefully the rest of the government's promises won't take three or four years to complete.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to congratulate all of the wildlife organizations in the province and especially the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation. They put into place the programs for the hunter safety training courses which I think are proved beyond any shadow of a doubt and I won't go into statistics because the minister has done a job of that. But the one thing is, Mr. Speaker, when the minister states about the new era, well hopefully, in this new era if this bill saves only one life, just one life, it will be well worth the time and effort and we've put into bringing it into force.

Also to the minister, I'm the last one who would want to take any credit for bringing this

April 14, 1980

bill forward. I would like to say though, Mr. Speaker, that I think there's been a little bit of pressure exerted from this side of the House . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I think I did raise it once, or twice, or three or ten times before. But anyway, we have the bill before us now. I think it is a good bill. I would like to see the regulations that pertain to it and as soon as the minister has those I'd appreciate a copy of them.

Mr. Speaker, just one little short comment on how important this bill is. It has to do with a young man who came to me last summer, a young man 18 years of age who had never had a gun or a hunting licence before. And the shocking truth of it is, Mr. Speaker, he came to me and said Jim, I've just bought a gun. I've got a hunting licence and I bought a case of shells. But you know what Jim? I can't load the gun, would you show me how? Mr. Speaker, that's why this bill has had to come in and the only thing wrong with it is that it should have been in three or four years before. This side of the House will be totally supporting it; this is a very good bill for not only the sportsmen of Saskatchewan but especially our young and first-time hunters of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services) moved second reading of Bill No. 67 — **An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act.**

He said: the main thrust of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to modernize education and health tax exemptions for the agricultural sector of the economy. The present Education and Health Tax Act lists for exemption 44 specific items used by farmers in agricultural activities. Also, we currently have 79 specific items listed as exempt from tax in the regulations to the act.

Mr. Speaker, the specific items listed for exemption in this act and the regulations include things like threshing machines, binder twine, butter churns, horse harnesses and the infamous turkey saddles. The items have accumulated in the act over the past three decades in an ad hoc fashion but they have not kept pace with the rapid rate of innovation in the most important industry in this province, agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 67 proposes to make exemptions for farmers more flexible by providing an exemption in The Education and Health Tax Act for farm production equipment and machinery purchased for use directly in primary farming activity. In the regulations we will list 11 major groups of farming equipment, with each group having several examples of what is included in that category. For example, Mr. Speaker, one category is crop handling equipment, with bale handling equipment as one class of exemption in that section. This means that specific pieces of equipment like bale sloops, bale elevators and bale throwers do not have to be individually mentioned. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, it means that if the industry develops a new method of handling bales, the new equipment will automatically be exempted from tax.

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide for a reasoned debate on this topic, I have provided each peer with a copy (I understand they have been provided with a copy) of the proposed regulations to The Education and Health Tax Act which deal with farming exemptions. Also included is a list of the 42 items added to the large number of types of machinery and equipment already exempt from education and health tax.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed regulations also provide for a definition of farm which will be used in several other areas, such as fuel taxation and vehicle registration. I might inform the members of the House that we had committees from the Department of Revenue and the Department of Agriculture working on this for some time before we came to some reasoned conclusions with respect to the identification of a farm. All members of this House are aware of the difficulties caused by the lack of a uniform definition of a farm for consumption tax purposes. The new definition of farm will include feedlots, sod farms, tree nurseries, large greenhouses and bee-keeping activities, along with the more typical grain and livestock operations. Farming will still not include manufacturing or processing or refining or marketing or off-farm cleaning, sorting and grading of crops or livestock.

Mr. Speaker, the current wording of the education and health tax exemption for agriculture requires items to be purchased by a farmer for use solely in the operation of his farm. This leads to rather strange situations based on the ownership of equipment. For example, Mr. Speaker, large bulk fertilizer spreaders are being widely used in the province. If a farmer buys one for use on his farm the machine is exempt from tax. If the spreader is purchased by an elevator or a fertilizer company and loaned to the same farmer for use on the same land, the machine is taxable because it was not purchased by a farmer. We propose to change this situation by making the education and health tax exemptions applicable to machinery and equipment purchased for use in primary farming activity.

Mr. Speaker, we believe the proposed amendments to The Education and Health Tax act and regulations will be of substantial benefit to the agricultural sector of our economy. The changes will bring more consistency and equity to the treatment of all farmers and will provide some tax relief.

There are two or three other minor changes proposed in Bill No. 67. The definition of funds from the education and health tax is eliminated since the revenue only provides about \$276.5 million, whereas the actual cost of health care and education, based on the estimates in the current budget, is around \$974 million. It's obvious that E&H tax is a very small proportion of the total of those two costs. Therefore, we propose to remove the name education and health tax. The money flows into the consolidated fund in any event and it will be simply referred to as the sales tax, which is the same title put on it in all other provinces in Canada.

Also, Bill 67 removes the section of the act dealing with the newlywed refund program eliminated by this House last year. A further change is made in section 8 of the act to renumber the general exemptions since we have moved the farm exemptions into the regulations. We also will move the power to define words from the exemptions section to the regulations section to standardize the drafting of the statute. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is basically a housekeeping move.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say we welcome this revision and its change in The Education and Health Tax Act. We will certainly be supporting it. We would like to be in support of it wholeheartedly but I'm afraid we can't do that because there are many areas which are not covered by this change we have been asking for. Many of the changes in here now are changes that we've asked for, in particular exemptions.

I notice the minister spoke entirely, in his explanation of the bill, on farm exemptions. I won't touch on the farm exemptions. I'll leave that to one of my colleagues since I've

April 14, 1980

been told in this Assembly I don't know too much about farming. I won't argue that point.

We have asked the minister many times on this side of the House for inclusion of children's clothing and school supplies, schoolbooks, etc., in the exemptions. It's noted, of course, that it's not listed in the items of exemptions. We intend to put forth an amendment to this bill to include these very important exemptions. I hope I don't have to start that all over again.

The minister mentioned the change of the name of the education and health tax. That's certainly a good idea. We support that wholeheartedly. It has always been known, in my many years in this province, as a sales tax anyway. As he explained, the revenue derived from this particular tax is certainly only a very small portion, approximately one quarter, of the amount spent in this department. That is about all I have to say at this time, Mr. Speaker. We'll be supporting the bill. We'll be putting forth amendments. My colleagues will make some further comments on it.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, I think you have heard me many times indicate some of the areas I think should be considered. It's with deep regret that I see you, as of yet, have not included these. I think it's commendable to certainly be making some changes in the E&H structure for the farm community. I agree with you that some of the things which are included are a bit archaic and I am still not quite clear on turkey saddles myself. However, I do think there are many other areas of the society, especially in these times which we are in right now, with the interest rates increasing, with the inflationary factors which people in Saskatchewan are having to cope with, I think it would have been very commendable had you broadened the scope a bit, as is the situation in many of the other provinces in western Canada.

Specifically, as my colleague has pointed out, I am concerned about the young families; the people in this province who are educating young children. I know that having been in the school situation and being a father of four children myself, there is a considerable outlay of money at the beginning of the school term in the way of books and also in clothing. In some of the other provinces they go up as high as 15 years of age in exempting children's clothing. I really think, Mr. Minister, that would help a lot of people in this province.

I spoke many times in this house about the exemption of certain types of reading material which I don't think, Mr. Minister, you adhere to, nor do I; these are exempt where the school supplies are still taxed.

I had hoped sincerely, Mr. Minister, being the type of gentleman you are, that you would have considered some of these things in amending the bill.

Getting to the situation of farm exemptions; what you have brought in, I welcome. I am pleased to see that you have outlined your definition of farming to include such things as feedlots. I think this has been a concern; you have come out and stated this is a farming occupation. I give you credit for that and I think also it clarifies things for the agricultural sector in our society.

However, just glancing through some of these, and with further study we will have more comments from my colleagues, there are certain things I would like to raise with you. On the explanatory notes which you provided, on page 3, I see that milking machines

are exempt, or milking systems, which I totally agree with —except replacement, multi-use piping and replacement electrical controls. I don't know why you make the exception of the controls because I don't know what on earth good the milking machine is if you haven't got the controls for it. If it is all part and parcel of one unit, then why are certain things singled out for taxation? You may have a valid reason for this, and I would like to hear this, Mr. Minister, when you again speak on this bill.

You have included the field fertilizers and chemical sprayers, and also the aircraft specifically designed and licensed for farm spraying; I think this was an area which did need clearing up.

Again, it seems to me that sometimes you don't carry right through. One of my colleagues asked about the staples. I still haven't seen whether the staples are going to be free from taxation or not, along with the barbed wire. If you have fixed a fence, Mr. Minister, you certainly know they both go together.

On page 5, item (c), you say specialized facilities such as barns, pens, stalls and cattle squeeze-ins, and you go on and on. I think we would agree with these. But then you go on to say it does not include lumber, metal, plastic, glass, motor controls or other components purchased separately by a farmer for the purpose of constructing or repairing specialized facilities. It would seem to me that if in the original purchase they were exempt, then when you come around to repairing them why is one charged E&H tax?

Going on a little further, Item (g) on the same page, Mr. Minister, you say ventilation fans for livestock buildings. Well we certainly realize that in the hog industry — one of the things I would like to see this government do is to provide diversification for people in livestock. I think we must realize that perhaps for every person who wants to take part in a livestock enterprise . . . Straight grain farming, although the Minister of Agriculture says it is the way we should be going, is maybe not within the grasp of everyone. I think diversification such as chicken enterprises, eggs . . . We're going to be eating eggs in this province for a long time. I think there's a good market there. There's a good chance for a young couple to enjoy farm life and have a living with various types of diversification.

When you get into those concentrated types of operations, as you know (when you get into chickens and you get into hogs or any of these things) one of the most important aspects is ventilation. If you ventilation quits on you in a chicken enterprise, you can be out of business that night . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It sure does. That's right. It gets very warm as my colleague says. You're including the ventilation equipment for livestock buildings but in the same line, Mr. Minister, you say, but not including the electrical controls. Now, I don't know if the electrical people have a good lobby or what's the situation here, but to me if you're going to have a ventilating system for a chicken barn or a hog barn or a dairy barn, I think you're going to have to have the electrical controls. It just doesn't seem to wash right with me that you're exempting part of the assistance, Mr. Minister, and not other ones.

Skipping on to page 7 . . . I know one concern raised with me by many people in Saskatchewan, was the steel bins. I see now you have brought these into your list. Certainly steel bins and partially assembled or specially pre-cut wooden grain bins but do not include building materials purchased to build grain bins or other structures.

It seems to me that although you have made some movements in the right direction to help the agricultural society, in summation, I think, Mr. Minister, I am disappointed you did not look at the whole Saskatchewan society. Again, I say, the young, the people with the young families, the people who are starting up, people who have these mortgages with the high interest rates that are going to have to be renegotiated — it seems to me in your bill, you haven't paid consideration to them. That you have in some areas moved into the agricultural field and have brought in some changes I think will be welcomed, but as I say, I spot certain inconsistencies in these. You may have good and sufficient reason why these things are exempt and I would like to hear some of your reasons, Mr. Minister.

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to touch on a few areas in this bill. One, in particular, I've had concern with and have raised with the minister before, is the education tax on the electrical energy used for the operation of irrigation equipment on farms. Now, this type of electrical energy is easily identified because it has to be three-phase power. You don't use that for many of the other things on a farm so you can identify it fairly clearly. One particular individual who's been in contact with me has an electrical bill that exceeds \$10,000 a year. When you add the education and health tax to that kind of a bill, it gets fairly costly. Now, that may sound like the man is making a lot of money but I think if you look at the other side of the coin and see the cost involved in establishing that size of an irrigation system demanding that much power, you see this man is also faced with a very high interest rate today and is finding it difficult to continue to operate.

So I had hoped when this bill was coming forward that you would indeed be looking at this particular area. It's a very real farm cost, as real a farm cost as if he were buying diesel fuel or purple gasoline. Those two would not be taxable but this form of energy is, I think it's discrimination against these people. I believe also that electrical energy is something we want to encourage farm people to use to begin to cut back on the non-renewable resources. If we're going to penalize them for the use of that type of energy then we're not going to encourage it. So I would ask you, before the bill is passed, to look at it and perhaps accept an amendment or propose an amendment yourselves that would bring this particular area into it.

The same people in the irrigation industry face the cost of education and health tax when they buy the stationary engines they use to drive that equipment. If they're buying electrical engines then those are charged to the education and health tax. If they go to a diesel engine or a gasoline engine they have been charged. I'm not clear as I read this bill whether you're intending to cover them or not. In talking to your department it seemed that they might. But I can't pick out the section here that clearly defines that they will be exempt under this new piece of legislation. So, I would like an explanation of that area.

Some time ago I raised with you the issue of education and health tax on bedding, television sets, and general furnishings for hotels and motels. These people tell me they pay education tax to the government (the people using these rooms pay it, really) each time the room is rented for service. So they feel it's a duplication of tax when you charge education and health tax when they buy these supplies to go into their hotels. I would like an explanation from you as to why these items are taxed to the owner of the hotel and also taxed to the person who rents the space. I believe that's not the case when you go to people renting out equipment such as lawn mowers and power equipment from rental shops — or cars, for that matter. It's only paid at one time. But in the case of the hotel and motel it's paid twice. They feel they're not being treated fairly. I believe it's an

area you must look at and I look forward to your comments on this and an amendment, if possible before the bill comes to committee of the whole, or when it comes.

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Minister, we have had several people contacting us regarding the E&H tax on airplanes used specifically for agricultural purposes throughout the province. We have organized a meeting with some of these people later this week. Until we obtain further information on that portion of the bill I would like to beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Robbins (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services) that Bill No. 43 — **An Act to amend The Consumer Products Warranties Act** be now read a second time.

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, we have been contacted by various groups throughout the province who have had some concern about this bill. We feel the bill strengthens the position of the consumer and also strengthens the position of the retailer as to lines of responsibility and in general we feel the bill is fairly good. I would like to see this bill with the extra guarantees added on by retail firms to a consumer. I would like to see this bill advertised, either through pamphlets or through newspapers, as to the rights of consumers in the event a retailer adds specific warranties other than what is guaranteed by the manufacturer.

In general we will be supporting this bill though we will be having some questions in committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Robbins (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services) that Bill No. 55 — **An Act respecting Saskatchewan Government Insurance** be now read a second time.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would have to agree with the minister that an act which has been around as long as this act requires changes and should have changes. We will be supporting this bill with perhaps some amendments. Generally speaking we support it. There are areas of concern. I have had some time to study it.

I want to refer to the minister's comments as he explained the bill when it was read for the second time. Referring to Hansard on page 1441, the minister said:

The trend in the insurance business is toward the diversification of services offered to the public. It is commonly felt the present act may inhibit the capacity of the corporation to become involved in other lines of insurance services or it may hinder Saskatchewan Government Insurance in its ability to be charged with the responsibility of administering government programs such as the provincial disaster financial assistance program.

I repeat, he says there are some inconsistencies in the present legislation. Well, what are they? The mere fact that the government has decided SGI should be in the provincial disaster financial assistance program or motor vehicle administration does not indicate inconsistency but rather a desire on the part of the government to expand the operation of SGI into areas not directly related to the insurance operation. What other services are contemplated? What other types of insurance are contemplated? What other government programs and responsibilities may be undertaken by SGI?

His remaining comments refer to specific sections of Bill No. 55, sections 1 to 8 in the new bill. There are really no comments on those, except that in the previous act, section 4 required the minister to be a member of the board of directors. Section 3 of Bill No. 55 has no such requirement. Why is the minister relieved of this direct responsibility? Is there a risk that the minister can pass the buck if the board of directors takes an action that might be embarrassing to the government?

While general manager is defined in section 2, there is no provision for his hiring as there was in section 9 of the previous act. Why? Is the corporation going to be run by the advisory committees established under section 5, paragraph 5? I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that section 9(c) requires in-depth questioning. It is so broad as to encompass almost anything the government might want done. The concern would be that it might undertake an activity on behalf of the government at less than cost and the insuring public would be subsidizing the operation out of insurance premiums. It is my view that this section should be limited to specific programs such as a provincial disaster financial assistance program, the motor vehicles' administration and any other the Legislative Assembly authorizes.

Additional programs could be undertaken in the future if considered desirable but only by amendment to the act debated in the legislature. There's no reason why the government should be given these broad powers. No reason why those programs that they may want authorized in the future could not be debated in this legislature where they should be debated. They should not be left to the order in council or the board of directors or whoever.

Section 12 eliminates the SGI from some of the conditions of The Saskatchewan Insurance Act. When we get into committee of the whole, Mr. Speaker, I want to determine what private insurance companies must comply with, that SGI does not have to consider.

Section 14 is probably the most disturbing change. On page 1442 of Hansard the minister says, and I will quote:

This brings me to another important section of the new legislation, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan Government Insurance doesn't have the same power as other Crown corporations to borrow funds to support its activities. If it becomes necessary to borrow funds they have to be taken from the consolidated fund. This puts an unnecessary burden on the consolidated fund and places the corporation in an uncompetitive position.

Well, on that point, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure other insurance companies consider that an advantage rather than having to go to their owners for more capital from time to time. I see no objection to subsection 9 of section 14 which gives the power for temporary loans from banks or others. This could be a legitimate need of the corporation.

Expanding the borrowing powers beyond this would seem unnecessary unless there is an intention to undertake other than insurance activities as contemplated in section 9(c). Insurance companies, Mr. Speaker, are normally lenders and not borrowers. Assuming that premiums are adequate to pay claims and operating costs there should be no need to enter the long-term borrowing activities contemplated in this section.

Section 15 only adds to my concern because repayment of interest and principal are a first charge of revenue on the corporation. This authorizes the use of insurance premiums to pay off loans for other non-insurance activities that might normally require payments from tax revenues.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that before this bill was to be debated in second reading the government would have given us or tabled the annual report for 1979. Unfortunately, we still do not have that report and it is difficult for me to comment on some of the monetary reasons or the financial status or the position of the corporation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we hope to have that information before this reaches committee of the whole, so further questioning and scrutiny of this bill can be done by the opposition. I would hope the minister will give me that assurance. As I said earlier in the beginning of my remarks, basically in principle we support the bill. We do not support it in its entirety since we would like to see some amendments. So, Mr. Speaker, we will not be voting for the bill at this point in time, rather going into committee of the whole to further debate it and ask questions on each clause.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILL NO. 18 — AN ACT TO REGULATE PRIVATE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

Sections 1 to 7 agreed.

Section 8

MR. TAYLOR: — Perhaps the minister could just give a little overview of the purpose of this, and a bit of explanation at this time which might facilitate the passing of it. If you would do that, just a general description of what the intents are.

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to do that. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman I could just introduce to members of the House two officials who are with me here this afternoon: Mr. Bob Borsches from the Department of Continuing Education and Mr. Getty McIntyre from the Department of Continuing Education.

Mr. Chairman, this particular bill, while it is presented to this House as a new bill, really in fact and substance is not a new bill. The reason it is presented to the House as a new bill is because the terminology of the previous legislation, referred to as The Trades Schools Regulation Act, was outdated and some of the references were outdated. Times have changed in the whole area of vocational training. There has been a change in terminology and so on. Practically each and every section referred to the outdated terminology. It was decided for convenience to bring in a complete new bill. However, in just about all of the sections, if the members were able to compare sections with the previous legislation, they would find that there are only very, very minor changes

generally.

I might, for instance, refer to the current section referring to section 8. If you compare the new bill to the old bill, you will find in general what we have done is substituted the term 'private vocational school' for the term 'trade or trades' in that particular section. Other than that the clause remains the same as in the previous legislation.

MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I think a couple of the concerns I would have regarding this would include number one, the registration of them. There should be no intent to try and restrict certain private trade schools that may be operating or may in the future wish to operate within the province. I suppose on the other side of the coin, though, there should be adequate provision for some type of evaluation. I think this is important as there may be need down the trail for instruction that perhaps doesn't come under government sponsorship. It would be best handled by a private trade school. At the same time we must see that the people who often enrol in these are safeguarded against any type of shoddy instruction. In fact it could be in some cases fraudulent, saying they're going to provide certain types of instruction when, in actual case, they do not.

So, those would be kind of the things I would be looking at as concerns in this bill.

HON. McARTHUR: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is largely true that this bill is a kind, if you like, of consumer protection legislation for the potential student of a private trade school. There is no intent at all to restrict the number of areas in which there may be private trade schools. Indeed, both the terms of this bill expand the range of areas for which there may now exist private trade schools if people wish to enter into that business and meet the standards. In one of the sections of the bill, it will be noted that we have now expanded the scope of private trade schools in this province to cover all of those areas for which there is an occupational classification now established to international standards by the federal government through its Department of Employment and Immigration. We have provided the possibility for the operation of such schools throughout that whole range of classifications of occupations and related training.

We do provide under this bill, and have provided under previous legislation, that all private trade schools providing vocational training, which we now call private vocational training schools, must be licensed. And that is for the very reason the hon. member mentioned: to ensure that there are minimum standards met so that when a student applies to take a training course within a private vocational school that student will know certain standards have been met by this school and those standards have been certified by the Department of Continuing Education and by ex-professionals within that field who go around and do the inspections.

I might make reference to sections 10, 11, and 12 for the hon. member's observation. Sections 10, 11 and 12 provide for the basic kind of matter the hon. member was referring to. The fact is that when an applicant for registration or renewal registration applies, he must comply with certain kinds of standards and provide the proper instruction at reasonable rates and so on. Section 11 provides for the inspection and section 12 provides that where the department is satisfied, through my authority, the school can be licensed or the licence taken away if we are satisfied the school is not providing the basic kind of instruction it should.

MR. TAYLOR: — Those licences would come up for renewal annually?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, they'd come up annually.

MR. TAYLOR: — This probably, Mr. Chairman, is just a little aside from the bill but is something I'd like to mention to the minister pertaining to this bill. It is, as I pointed out to you, the need to evaluate and see which of these are authentic and sound educational institutions. I remember when I was teaching there was a document that came out from continuing education indicating which ones were approved. I thought that was very good because being out there in the field they have high-priced salesmen in many situations, and they do get some of these students. I know of cases where students have paid tuition. I think it's valuable, not only for those operating within the province, Mr. Minister, but also those who may have headquarters in other provinces who are trying to attract our students. I just put that as a suggestion to get this information out to the people in the field as a safeguard against being, shall I say, 'sucked in' in some situations.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. member's point. I know we do now have a pamphlet but I will look into the extent to which we have adequate distribution of the pamphlet because I think your point is a good one. I believe you also made the suggestion that we might consider some sort of listing of registered or approved schools outside the province, probably those approved by other provincial licensing authorities. That's something also which I'll take into account and have a look at. I appreciate the point.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Minister, how do you tie in with the apprenticeship programs at, say, Kelsey and other places? Is there any requirement for the people who are in private institutions to make sure their programs will tie in? For example, in Winnipeg there's a Red River College; if you want to be a mechanic, you can go there and pay your way if you're from Saskatchewan, instead of going to Moose Jaw if you can't get in there. So this I assume, will develop in this province. We'll begin where somebody wants to be a mechanic; is there any arrangement or requirement for tying in with the Department of Labour so the person who is paying his way can also get the same benefits as going the other way?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, in our province, all of the apprenticeship training programs are provided by provincial institutions. There are currently no private vocational training schools or trade schools that are providing apprenticeship training. The trades, as the hon. member probably knows, that are established for purposes of apprenticeship training are the indentured trades which the Minister of Labour, through his authority, establishes as such trades. I do not anticipate that we will be moving toward providing apprenticeship training through private vocational training schools. If that development did occur, of course this legislation would provide us with the authority to establish the kinds of standards which such schools would have to meet. But I do have to say to the hon. member that at the present time we do not anticipate the likelihood of providing apprenticeship training within the indentured trades through private vocational schools.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just one more point on that. My concern isn't that you would be providing it. If a private school sets up and they say they are going to provide the required classes and so forth to get your journeyman mechanic's ticket, for example; you pay the total cost yourself, no subsidy from any government, O.K. —is there anything in this bill that makes them work within our provincial system, which says you

must have these classes and so forth to qualify the student so he can get his journeyman's ticket?

MR. McARTHUR: — I think I did not have the hon. member's question correctly in my mind earlier. As I understand it now, the answer is, if such a development were taking place, before that training could be recognized as apprenticeship time within the apprenticeship program, the Minister of Labour would have to approve that training program. In addition, the school would have to be registered under this legislation. The instructional program as well as the facilities and that sort of thing would additionally have to be approved by us under this legislation. It certainly would be covered if that kind of development took place.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, that was my concern because in Manitoba they have Red River College, in Alberta they have the Mount Royal College where if you can't get into a government program you can pay your own way. It allows people another alternative to get the education in a trade. I think that's important for the school to be covered in that way.

MR. McARTHUR: — Should that take place, yes. We could handle that eventually.

MR. TAYLOR: — I think we can discuss all of the topics at this time and then we will move through it quickly. In the evaluation of the school, in 'the inspection' as it is called in item 11 it is quite exhaustive, and you mention the business books of the school. Did that mean you are wanting to look at its whole financial operation? Also, who conducts this inspection? I know in the school system you have superintendents or directors. What or who do you have in the Department of Continuing Education? I'm not interested in the personnel; I'm interested in the type of training and the type of position you would have doing the evaluation and looking at premises, operation, and programming.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, with respect to the interest in the business books and records and any circulars, and so on. We're not, of course, concerned with controlling the management of that school in any sense. What we are interested in is ensuring there is basically a viable school there, first of all. So, when a student applies and pays his or her tuition, the student can have an expectation that under normal circumstances at least that school will continue to function, carry through with the program and be able to issue on a continuing basis the certificates it issues.

Secondly, we are I suppose just checking to ensure that essentially the revenues, and so on, are being directed toward the purposes of education functions the school advertises and indicates it wishes to do.

With respect to the circulars, pamphlets, and other material, again it's a kind of provision for our truth in advertising, if you like. We just want to check to make sure that what the school says it is offering for a training program, the kind of certificates and so on it says it can offer, are consistent with what the school is permitted to offer.

I might indicate to the member that I think we now have 16 such schools in this province. That's up from 14 a year or so ago, so the numbers seem to be increasing. It's not a major inspection job. We are able to handle this through one professional in the occupational training field who concentrates, to a high degree, on this kind of undertaking. He goes around, does the inspections and seems to be adequately able to cover off the responsibilities in that regard.

Section 8 agreed.

Sections 9 to 14 agreed.

Section 15 as amended agreed.

Sections 16 and 17 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

BILL NO. 14 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE NOTARIES PUBLIC ACT

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 49 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE COMMISSIONERS FOR OATHS ACT

Sections 1 to 6 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.