

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

April 17, 1980.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I want to have the Assembly join with me to welcome a very important group of people from Saskatoon who are with us in the Speaker's gallery. Some of them may be in the west gallery as well. They are a group of 67 Grade 8 students from Caroline Robbins School in Saskatoon Westmount constituency. They are here to see the Assembly in operation. They are accompanied by teachers and chaperones, Ron Farbrother, J. Ward, Mrs. Kalthoff, and Mrs. Vann. I know all members will join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly. I hope to be able to leave the House later on and possibly answer some questions they may have about what went on here today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me considerable pleasure this afternoon to welcome and to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, a group of Grade 12 students, some 24 in number I believe, from Richey High School of Richey, Montana. They are sitting in the west gallery and are accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Kuka, and Mr. and Mrs. Freisinger. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, I'm expressing the sentiments of all of us when I say welcome to our American friends. We wish them a very pleasurable visit here at our capital of Saskatchewan, in our Legislative Building, and we wish them also a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B.J. PONIATOWSKI (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly, 36 Grade 7 and 8 students from St. Matthews School who are seated in the west gallery. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Noonan, and also their teacher, Mr. Boyko. I am sure that their visit to this Assembly will be rewarding, and I wish them an enjoyable afternoon in our capital city. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the opposition I would like to join with the member for Weyburn in welcoming the students from Richey, Montana. Most of my relations are in Montana and I spent a good part of my youth around Plentywood and Outlook. On our behalf I'd like to welcome you here today too.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. LUSNEY (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the legislature, a group of 26 Grade 11 and 12 students from Norquay High School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Shymkiw, and Mr. Karakochuk, along with ops, and I'm certain they found their tour of the various co-operative facilities very educational. I know they will also find their visit to the Legislative Assembly equally

interesting and informative. I know all members of the legislature will join me in welcoming the students here today. I'll meet with them later on for pictures and refreshments.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Continuing Education. The other day, Mr. Minister, I informed you of some of the problems that were existing in the psychology department at the University of Regina. I know since then you've met with a group of students and Mr. Minister you've stated you would ask the university board of governors or the Saskatchewan Universities Commission to use their good offices to ensure the students receive a full hearing. My question is, Mr. Minister, can you tell me what action has been taken?

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, it is quite correct that the day before yesterday I met with a group of graduate students from the psychology department of the University of Regina. I must point out to the hon. member, as I pointed out earlier, that with respect to such matters as these students raised, which had to do with academic matters within the university, it is not within my power or authority nor should it be to take any particular action. I did listen to the students because they were very anxious to make their presentation to me. As I have indicated and as the hon. member has mentioned, it is my intention to refer the matter to the universities commission and to the board of governors indicating that the students have made this presentation to me and indicating my wish these students be given a full and complete hearing, if they have not already had such a hearing which I cannot judge at this time.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, a lot of the problem has to do with the Mahrer and Nelson report as you well know. As Minister of Continuing Education, do you intend to ask for a copy of the report to see if the complaints that have been voiced to you are legitimate complaints?

MR. McARTHUR: — No, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to ask for a copy of that report. I must indicate to the hon. members the extreme importance of the principles involved here. It would be totally inappropriate for a minister of any government to inquire after any documents, information or to interfere in any way with academic matters within any university. That kind of protection is guaranteed under legislation and any minister that took such action as is being suggested here would be acting, in my view, not only inappropriately, but in a way that is repugnant to the whole system we have in our country with respect to universities.

MR. TAYLOR: — Final supplementary, Mr. Minister. I think we all are aware of academic freedom but I ask you once again, as the Crown's minister, and I repeat, the Crown's Minister of Continuing Education — do you not feel it's incumbent upon you to urge the university commission or the board of governors to investigate this current problem within the University of Regina?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat evident that the hon. member, if he were a minister of continuing education of the government, would step into a university

and demand that a university provide certain kinds of information or whatever. I suggest to the hon. member that would be in contradiction of the principle which states a minister of the Crown shall not in any way interfere with the academic activity within the university. I suggest to him that this report, as I understand it, was an investigation or a review of academic matters within the department of psychology, I say to the hon. member it would be totally inappropriate for me in any way to attempt to interfere in that particular problem. I am confident the university fully understands its responsibilities in this respect and it will take appropriate measures, provided that everyone involved gets a full hearing within the university, which I am sure they will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AMENDMENTS TO WATERSHED ACT

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Environment. Mr. Minister, in December the throne speech indicated that amendments to The Watershed Associations Act would be introduced this session. And you also indicated at that time a study was in fact under way regarding ditching and diking in rural Saskatchewan. Many farmers are inquiring — will such a bill be introduced in this session?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, there has been for about two and one-half years a public advisory committee given the responsibility for reviewing the water drainage and surface water drainage in the province. That report has been placed with the Department of Environment. We have considered it. We have publicly stated it was not our objective to go with that recommended draft legislation at this point in time. However, we have also publicly indicated that it was our intention to proceed with some amendments to The Water Rights Act, which would generally do the kinds of things which were suggested in the draft legislation for a drainage control act. In saying that, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the members opposite that any amendments coming to The Water Rights Act, commensurate with that and in the ongoing process, we will continue the public advisory council process in order to be able to put together something which is acceptable in this area.

I need not say to the member, I am sure, that this is a very controversial area. I has lots of difficulties in it. One should not proceed with any haste to try to bring about a solution because of a number of very difficult kinds of questions which will arise as a result of it.

MR. PICKERING: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not agree that due to the inefficiency of your department once again you will be pitting farmer against farmer in the courts of Saskatchewan this summer as a result of the recent rainfall and snowfall.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well of course I wouldn't agree with that, Mr. Speaker. There is no question about the fact that if a farmer decides he is going to drain water onto his neighbor, then obviously he is taking an action which pits him against his neighbor. It isn't any legislation which pits him against his neighbor; it is an action which he has undertaken that has obviously placed him in jeopardy with good relations with his neighbor. The only thing any contemplated legislation might do is provide a remedy whereby through some civil action or some action between neighbors, it may enable the offended party to receive compensation or damages or whatever the resultant effects may be.

MR. PICKERING: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate to the Assembly just exactly how long you think this study will take before you will bring in legislation before the House?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I tried to indicate, Mr. Speaker, to the members opposite and to the hon. member for Milestone it is our consideration that legislation will yet be on the order paper during this session for amendments to The Water Rights Act. Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to do so, however, those amendments are now receiving the consideration of our caucus and at a suitable and appropriate date they will be tabled in the House if we do so.

SPECIAL-CARE HOMES

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. Special-care homes in the province are facing severe financial difficulty and many have had to assess increases ranging up to 21 per cent to the residents of those homes. Your government has provided a mere 7.1 per cent on the portion subsidized by the government, which is indeed a small portion. Do you not agree that the government is doing less than its fair share when you allow in level 3 an increase of \$33 per month on a total cost of from \$1,150 per month to \$1,250 per month?

HON. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I think I have addressed this question to the House on a previous occasion. I want to indicate that we have in fact brought about an increase in the basic rates, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 7 per cent as the member has indicated.

I just want to say further that we have discussed with SASH (Saskatchewan Association of Special-care Homes), as has been indicated previously, looking at a revamp system in terms of looking at the whole structure of classification and subsidy. As I indicated to the budget there is additional money which will be put into the system, I hope, during the course of this year. At the present time, commensurate with the priorities of government, this is the direction in which we are going. But I want to say that certainly the other consideration is that if any individual in a special-care home is unable to pay the amount, that isn't totally covered under social assistance payments. Some 48 per cent is covered for special-care coverage.

MR. SWAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do you not agree, Mr. Minister, that the figures we are using are to some extent misleading at least? When you look at the cost of special-care homes and especially for level 3, running between \$1,150 a month and \$1,250 a month, you are paying only \$497. But the increase that you have allowed is a mere 3 per cent of the total cost, and that's not very much to be looking at for senior citizens.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to say we don't allow or say the percentage allowed because the individual homes are privately operated and in that regard they set their own rates. I'm not sure where you get the average figure of \$1,150. I think it has been quoted as somewhat lower than that, but I want again to indicate that when it comes to the responsibility of social services that we pay in fact the whole amount where the need is required.

MR. SWAN: — Do you not agree that it's a little unreasonable to expect senior citizens in level 3 care to be paying an average of \$643 per month out of their own pockets?

That's a very high figure for a person on a fixed income. I believe it's one of the highest in Canada, and I would like to have the minister tell us when indeed are you going to move and provide some relief for these people?

MR. KOSKIE: — As I indicated, and I repeat for the member, social services sees that no one is in a position that they are unable to receive care in a special-care home. That should be made abundantly clear. As a consequence, where need is demonstrated, the total amount is paid. As I indicated to you before, we have increased the subsidies during the course of the year as of April 1 and we are looking at the re-structuring. As I indicated, and if you look at the budget, there are additional funds within the budget for the current year. If you look carefully you will see that there is some 22 per cent increase in the total overall budgeting funds so, as a consequence, you should come to some conclusion on your own.

WESTERN CONTRIBUTION TO MAINTAIN CONFEDERATION

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of the federal government's throne speech and your comments that from a western point of view the speech was not encouraging and since much of the discontent in our nation is based on declining standards of living, (I believe we dropped from number two in the world to number six in the last few years) do you feel that western Canadians are willing to accept a lesser standard of living to maintain confederation and to maintain central Canadian policies, especially with relationship to oil pricing?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think the answer shortly put is that western Canadians are willing to accept a lower standard of living than they might have in the short run in order to maintain a united Canada. This has been illustrated for a good number of years with respect to Alberta and British Columbia who have willingly paid equalization payments without demur in order to maintain a united Canada, and I think the same is true with respect to the willingness to take a less than world price for oil. I believe the feelings of western Canadians are brought about, firstly because they are strongly of the belief that Canada is well worth saving as an entity, and, secondly, because they believe in the long run their economic interests are well-served by being part of a larger national entity than western Canada would be if it stood alone, and accordingly are very much attached to the proposition that western Canada should be part of a united Canada.

MR. HAM: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, would you not agree that once our renewable resources are gone, and since we do not have a significant manufacturing base in western Canada — in other words to maintain a 'have' position, how do you intend to deal with the other western premiers with respect to reversing a problem that has existed for over a hundred years, in light of the throne speech and the obvious concern by the West?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it is possible to interpret the question one way, of asking how I am going to deal with the situation when the non-renewable resources are exhausted, and while I hope to have a long political career, I don't think it will extend to that period of time. However, I think I understood the hon. member to suggest or ask what actions we should take now to deal with the situation which will come about when the non-renewable resources are exhausted, in order to provide an economic base for western Canada?

I say to the hon. member that we are happy to join with the premiers in the three western provinces to attempt to expand the economic base of Saskatchewan and attempt to expand the manufacturing base of western Canada. I believe this is coming about rather more slowly, I'm sure, than all of us would hope but I think very significant expansions have been seen in Alberta and British Columbia, and a lesser but nonetheless considerable level of expansion in Saskatchewan. We propose to continue our efforts in order to diversify the economic of western Canada.

OFFSET OF INCREASES — SPECIAL-CARE HOMES

MR. SWAN: — A question to the Minister of Social Services. In your answers to me today you tell me you have money in your department which you will be allotting this year. Could you not indeed provide some of that money to offset the high increases that these homes are going to experience, so they don't have to charge their self-paying residents the high rate now being demanded?

MR. KOSKIE: — At the present time, as I indicated, we are sitting down with the association of special-care homes. I was at their convention yesterday and the day before, and we are sitting down to work out some of the details and to implement the increase as rapidly as possible. In the interim I find it rather difficult within the framework of the budget and the sort of projections of the future.

ROLE OF INLAND TERMINALS AND QUOTA SYSTEM

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Several days ago I was referring to your annual report in which you indicated there had been studies done on the role of inland terminals and on the quota system as set out by the Canadian Wheat Board. You indicated you were going to see if they were ready and provide them to this House before agriculture estimates came up. Have you checked into it, and when will you be tabling them?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I have not received them from the department as yet. As soon as I receive them and have an opportunity to look at them, I will provide them to the House. Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker. I think I assured the hon. member that we would have them available for discussion during the estimates and I will keep that commitment. Estimates of agriculture have not yet been called and therefore I still have some time frame.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Agriculture. Again, several days ago I raised the matter of Wilkins and land bank, and somewhat prior to that I raised the matter of Middlemiss and land bank; these are two instances where these people exercised their five-year option at some considerable capital gain and put the money in their hip pocket. Your land bank officials indicate that there have been about 90 people exercise the five-year option. You indicated that you have some concern about these kinds of things happening and you were going to look into it. Can you tell this House now whether or not occurrences have happened similar to Wilkins and Middlemiss?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I can't respond to the direct question the hon. member has asked in terms of are there other situations. I indicated we are, as a government, concerned about the problem the hon. member identifies. As I indicated the commission and the advisory council to the land bank are looking at it. We have yet

to achieve policy. It is a very difficult area to address. We have not yet achieved a policy. As soon as one is in place we will be announcing such a policy.

Part of a previous question and discussion related to foreign ownership — I indicated to the hon. member that we are considering such legislation. That still stands.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have you looked specifically at the 90 or so cases where the five-year option was exercised to see if there have been any other abuses of the program as was done by Wilkins and Middlemiss?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. member, no, I have not looked specifically. I think as early as the hon. member describes the Middlemiss case, we were aware that there was a problem and we felt, based on that, it was necessary to see if we could address the problem with some kind of solution and that is in fact what we are doing.

DECLARATIONS FILED BY FRANK BUCK

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — A question put to the Attorney General. You now have had time to review the Frank Buck case. Will the Attorney General give assurance or indicate to the Assembly, if you are prepared to file charges against Mr. Buck for filing false declarations on two different occasions?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I frankly don't understand the member's question. I've had time to review it, but I have not been reviewing anything of that nature. So far as I know, no request has been made of me in that regard. This is a matter which I don't decide; it's decided upon by the department and the department officials as required.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the Attorney General hasn't been officially asked, will you look into the matter and will you (if you find false declarations have been signed) file charges against Mr. Buck?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I take the position with the prosecutions in the department (and I say this to the member opposite) that these matters are decided by the prosecutors in my department; they are decided based on the evidence, which is accumulated by policy investigation or otherwise, to them. I do not make decisions with respect to prosecutions. I never have. I don't believe that should be a political judgement. I think those are matters of judgement to be taken by prosecutorial staff.

TAXES IN LIEU OF GRANTS

MR. R.A. LARTER (Esteron): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). Mr. Minister, on different occasions I have raised the question of taxes in lieu of grants, for instance at the Boundary Dam station and more recently a problem arising at Coleville where SPC is very heavily involved. Mr. Minister, the tax load, the recreation load for these areas (particularly Esteron now) is getting so great that unless we get some help from SPC the grants aren't good enough for this area, although you do offer a good economic base and you do bring a big recreation and the load is just getting too heavy. I would like to know where you have these huge plants and where there is school load — extra tax burden to the people — are you considering a different tax formula?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I believe we have given considerable assistance to those communities already and the hon. member has recognized that. He does, however, bring valid concerns and observations to the Assembly in that rapid growth does bring about additional demands on communities. He relates to Estevan; I can tell him there are similar problems in Coronach, Saskatchewan with the establishment of a large thermal generating station there. We are aware of those problems even though we continue to assist in the way we have in the past. We have expanded that assistance, changed our policy somewhat. In specific answer to his question, are we reviewing the contribution and the assistance that SPC should be giving, the answer is yes, and that review is ongoing.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I would like to just pass on the urgency of this because Estevan this year has a 12 mill increase and a good part of it is on recreation. I think the minister has a copy of the letter from Coleville about the problems they have and the burden it is putting on their municipality on their roads. They do welcome these employees there; they are good citizens and I would urge the minister and I would plead with him to look at this as quickly as he can because it is placing too heavy a load on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I get the distinct impression the member is making a plea or a debate.

MR. MESSER: — I recognize the member's plea, Mr. Speaker, and we are taking the matter very, very seriously. I want him to realize we cannot move in isolation. We have to carry on discussions with the departments of rural and urban affairs and revenue sharing does have some implication in respect to this. The hon. minister, my colleague, makes mention of the capital grants that are made available so that in order to be fair with all communities, we have to work out a solution that is going to be acceptable, not only to SPC and give assistance to the community, but also the departments of government who are now assisting those communities. I think the member will agree it is a tremendous benefit in the long haul for these large entities to be located there, indeed some of them can derive much more revenue than they can properly spend over the period of time they are there. We want to see there is some equal distribution to rural and urban municipalities alike when we make some adjustment or change.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

HERITAGE PROTECTION

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The current growth of Saskatchewan's economy has brought with it a growing confidence and a sense of place in Saskatchewan but growth and development inevitably bring attendant problems. There is in Saskatchewan, a most legitimate concern about the natural and human environment. The concern has been expressed about the growing external pressure on Saskatchewan's way of life to growth and consolidation of a continental lifestyle.

The government has responded to this growing public concern. Environmental legislation and programs are being introduced to complement our economic development; the province has established a cultural policy secretariat to help chart future government actions in the cultural field and Celebrate Saskatchewan this year reminds visitors and residents alike of the unique character of Saskatchewan's

heritage. For some time now the government and a concerned public have been aware of limitations of existing heritage legislation passed in 1975. While adequate at that time, changing conditions, public concern, burgeoning economy have brought us to consider introducing additional measures. I might add, Mr. Speaker, in passing, that members might be interested in the realization (as I was interested) that pressure on heritage property is a direct result of economic activity. It's been said that the best conservation program in the world is a prolonged recession, and the most devastating force is an economic boom. To some extent our problems relate to our buoyant economy.

As a first major step towards this new measure, we published a discussion paper, distributing over 5,000 copies. We then established the consultation committee, chaired by Mr. Lyle Bergstrom, consisting of representatives of SUMA, SARM, the construction industry, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Heritage Advisory Board, and the Department of Culture and Youth. This committee received active responses from organizations and individuals at eight public meetings held throughout the province in February of this year. Written briefs were received from many interested organizations and individuals. Mr. Speaker, I am now tabling for the consideration of this House the report and recommendations of the consultation committee on heritage property legislation. I want at this time to thank those members who served on the committee and served so ably, Mr. Speaker. I have worked with a number of committees in my time. I have had, I think, very few which worked as well as this one with as much dedication. As you will note when the report is distributed, the committee recommends among other things that new legislation be enacted, that municipalities be given the power to protect heritage resources, that heritage protection be a matter of zoning and not expropriation, that an appeals procedure be provided for in the legislation, and that special measures be introduced to preserve archeological resources.

Mr. Speaker, we believe we received sound guidance from this committee, and indirectly from the people of Saskatchewan. The results of a questionnaire distributed with the brochure indicated that 98 per cent of the respondents favored new legislation. Mr. Speaker, we intend to pursue this matter and will shortly present proposed new heritage legislation for consideration of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, just very briefly a response to the minister. I would say that we on this side of the House welcome the initial move to public participation in this heritage area, and I'll be looking forward, as will other members on this side and I'm sure members of the public all across the province, to reviewing the report that is tabled here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ASBESTOS MATERIALS IN SCHOOLS

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, there is national concern being expressed about asbestos in schools, particularly as a result of publicity over school closings in Ontario recently. I would like to report, Mr. Speaker, on the situation here in Saskatchewan. In August of 1979 I became aware of growing concern over the past use of asbestos-containing materials in school buildings, largely as a result of work being done by the environmental protection agency in the United States. In

September 1979, after a careful monitoring of the situation, I asked officials of the Department of Education to begin a comprehensive survey of every school in the province for potential hazards related to asbestos. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that schools are areas of special concern for asbestos-related problems because of the large number of students who could potentially be exposed to asbestos-containing materials almost daily over most of the year.

While there are many types of asbestos-containing materials used in schools, potential health hazards are limited to the presence of what is known as friable asbestos materials, which were used in certain cases prior to 1974. This is asbestos-containing material which can be crumbled, pulverized and reduced to powder in the hand and it is usually found on overhead surfaces such as ceilings, beams, and pipes where it has been applied as fireproofing, thermal insulating, soundproofing, or occasionally as decorative material. Asbestos fibres are released into the air as a result of the breakdown of friable materials due to a deterioration of the surface or direct contact or damage. The inhalation of these minute fibres in sufficient quantities over extended periods of time may result in the development of a number of illnesses.

Because of this potential health hazard, Mr. Speaker, I initiated immediate action by the Department of Education in co-operation with the occupational health and safety branch of the Department of Labour to ensure the safety of Saskatchewan school children, teachers and maintenance staff.

The facilities planning section of the Department of Education co-ordinated a comprehensive preliminary survey to check for the presence of friable asbestos material in every school. Because of the urgency and importance of the problem, and because administrative and communication links already existed through the Department of Education's regional offices, local superintendents and directors of education carried out the survey with the assistance and co-operation of the occupational health and safety branch laboratories.

Specifically, superintendents and directors of education inspected schools and collected samples of all materials suspected of containing friable asbestos. These samples were submitted to the occupational health and safety branch laboratories for analysis.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that we did not use widely the air sampling techniques now commonly used in other provinces. The best scientific evidence available to us indicated that air sampling only revealed an asbestos hazard present in the environment at that specific moment, while sampling of all suspected materials allowed us to determine where a potential health hazard existed. Therefore, air sampling was considered as only one of a number of tests used to determine the extent of the problem.

By doing selected ledge sampling in facilities where friable asbestos had been identified, it was possible to determine if any contamination had taken place over an extended period of time.

Regardless of the results of either an air or ledge sampling, if friable asbestos materials were present in an exposed area, boards were advised that corrective action was essential as a preventive measure.

Our survey is now virtually complete. To date the results of the analysis of test samples from 973 schools have been received. Samples from 669 schools have revealed no friable asbestos fibres. Samples from 260 schools were found to have friable asbestos materials only on heating pipes and in furnace room areas where material is usually well contained and protected and posed no potential health hazard to students or staff if reasonable caution was exercised. Forty-four schools had friable asbestos materials on ceilings or walls requiring corrective action. In most instances, the hazardous material was in a stable condition and did not present an immediate health hazard. In only one instance was it necessary to vacate classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, if a sample was found to contain asbestos fibres, the facilities planning section of the department conducted a specific follow-up visit to the school to determine if a potential hazard existed. Depending on the type of problem found in the follow-up visit, appropriate corrective action was recommended to the school board involved.

If any immediate hazard appeared to exist, boards were advised to restrict access to the affected area until the appropriate corrective action could be taken. This corrective action would be the removal of the asbestos material, the coating of the material with a sealant or the enclosure of the material. When potentially hazardous problems existed, boards were asked to proceed immediately with renovations to remove or contain the asbestos.

Mr. Speaker, my department gave its highest priority to approving these renovation proposals and assured boards of education that they will receive financial support for this necessary emergency work. To date, asbestos-related renovations totalling \$479,517 have been approved. This amounts to \$124,108 in provincial grants, with the remainder being met through long-term debt retirement and board down payments. As in other construction projects, boards will be responsible for approximately 10 per cent of the total costs.

After renovations have been completed, further follow-up visits are to be made to ensure that the problem has been completely eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the most immediate and direct action possible to assist boards of education to locate and correct any potential asbestos hazard in Saskatchewan schools. To my knowledge, my government is the only government which has conducted such a thorough and widespread survey of their schools.

The steps that have been taken by my government will reassure parents, teachers and maintenance staff that any potential health hazards from friable asbestos have been located and dealt with immediately and effectively.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Education and his department on the investigation into the asbestos in the schools that he has undertaken. I rest assured that you have used the most exhaustive type of testing that is available at present. I hope this is the case. I was very pleased to see that you are considering follow-up on these schools in which asbestos was used to make sure that the situation is stable. I didn't understand by your report if you just confined yourself to the public schools of Saskatchewan and the private schools or if you did look at the universities and the technical schools where there are a

number of people during the day for long periods of time and may be exposed to the same dangers. When talking about school health problems, I would like to indicate to you that perhaps a similar study in school lighting is advisable because I remember when I was teaching that we were told to improve the foot candles and within about two years, we had to change the lighting. In about two years, some of the evidence showed that too much artificial lighting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think the member knows that he's not relating specifically to the subjects before us.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, we'll talk about this in estimates but I'd like to get back to the testing of asbestos in the schools. Once again, congratulations, and I charge the other ministers, the Minister of Health and Minister of Social Services, to take a look at the other buildings in Saskatchewan to see that they're safe also.

POINT OF ORDER ON QUESTION PERIOD

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Before orders of the day, if I may ask for a ruling on the reason that you would omit a second supplementary on my behalf today. If I may with respect ask you, if you ruled it out of order because it was a non-urgent question, could I have your definition of urgent?

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I was looking at the rules with regard to the question the member raised and I believe that questions should be such that they do not encourage debate. Now, I realize it's difficult to ask the type of question the member is asking without getting debatable opinion in answer and, in fact, putting debatable opinion forward in order to solicit an answer. So, on that basis, I judged it to be a bit of a speech and the rules are quite clear that a question cannot be a speech however short it may be. I realize this is a problem for the member but it's something he will have to deal with and unfortunately now, there's always an opportunity later on when you may raise the question again.

SECOND READINGS

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 74 — **An Act to amend The Election Act.**

He said: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These amendments are not major amendments and I will not take much of the time of the House to explain them to members.

With respect to Bill No. 74, the main thrust of these amendments is to permit nomination day and polling day to be held on any day of the week. Now I should hasten to add here that it never was the intention of the legislation or the drafters of the legislation to permit the possibility of an election on a Saturday or Sunday. If the legislation, in fact, does permit that technically, we'll be bringing in a House amendment, during the course of consideration of the bill clause by clause, to rule out those days of the week. Outside of those days, that is the general thrust and intent of the bill.

Under the present law, as you may know, Mr. Speaker, section 4 says that the day to nominations of candidates must be a Monday and polling day must be a Wednesday. This is set out in statute. The amendments contained in sections 3 and 4 of the bill will

delete the references to the specific days names in the statutes. Monday and Wednesday. So this will mean that the day for nomination day and polling day can be any day of the week with the exception of the days that I've mentioned.

The time limits between the issuing of the writ — I want to stress this to the members of the House — the time limits between the issuing of the writ, nomination day, polling day, the day for counting votes and the day for the return of the writ; those remain all the same. There is no change with respect to the days required for nomination and the advance warning for an election date. Those are unchanged; they are fixed by statute; you cannot do that by order in council. Advance polls may be had on any days of the week; that is a change.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that all members of the House do have definite opinions on the best day to hold an election. I am sure we would find, if we ever canvassed the members of this House, that they would have one day or other of the week, which they think is the best day for holding an election. What this means, in a kind of an arguing point, is that any day would be a good day. If that is so, then these amendments would permit that. I do think, however, that we are seeing more of a trend to Monday elections — perhaps by virtue of the relative regularity of the last two federal elections — and there is some argument that Mondays perhaps could be a favored day. This would allow Saturday and Sunday (the weekend) as a cooling-off period; perhaps a better cooling-off period than having Wednesday as election day and then having Monday and Tuesday as the cooling-off period.

I think another complicating factor is with by-elections. Under the present law a by-election must equally be held on a Wednesday. And if by-elections are to be held during the fall period, frequently this causes a conflict with the municipal elections which take place, particularly during certain periods (the fall periods) of the year. That, I think members would agree, is undesirable. We don't want to confuse elections with local people any more than we want federal people confusing it with us, or vice versa.

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, sums up the intent of the bills. We will be bringing in a small House amendment to make the clarification that I have indicated and with those few words, it gives me pleasure to move second reading of Bill No. 74, the substance of which is to permit the holding of an election on any day of the week.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spent some time studying the bill and I would concur with the remarks of the Attorney General that the main changes are from the days Monday and Wednesday. I did have some concern about the Saturday and Sunday, but he has pointed out that he is bringing in a House amendment which, I'm sure, we on this side would support. I believe that there probably are valid reasons for the elections on Monday such as the cooling-off period and I would think the suggestions put forth are quite reasonable. The thing that I was looking at (and you didn't answer in your remarks and maybe you will) is the bill as it stood, in the case of advanced polls, did indicate that the advance polls under the existing act would be held on a Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Monday. And it did indicate the times. Now I notice under the new act you want to extend the times from 3 p.m. until 10 p.m. rather than 7 p.m. until 10 p.m., which I would be in agreement with. The only thing that I don't see in here — is there a guarantee of 5 days for advance polls as there previously was under the other act? And I think this is important . . . You will look after that? Indication is that will be looked after under a House amendment, and if that is so, I think we'd be able to let the bill proceed.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Agriculture) that Bill No. 58 — **An Act to amend The Agricultural Implements Act (No. 2)** be now read a second time.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Minister, I've been involved with changes in the implement dealers acts through the years and bills that apply to farm machinery dealers and to farm machinery distributors. I always have to see something come in front of the legislature as it affects farm machinery dealers, because having been a dealer for some 20 years, I think every time you bring in a new rule on a legitimate dealer who is giving service, you make him pull his horns in a little bit. And I think he has a tendency to live a little more by the rules than he ordinarily does when he runs his business. This isn't a bad bill.

There are some concerns I have here. One of the concerns I have — and I think I pointed it out when we talked about this a year ago — is the pressure being put on dealers to supply parts is a good one. Previously, when a farmer found himself in trouble either through the fault of the machine or through the fault of the customer himself where he had smashed the machine through something he had done wrong — a dealer who has steady customers and was giving good service, would replace that machine for that fellow, or he'd let the customer use a tractor or a combine or a swather. I think the tighter you tie the rules for a dealer, the more you take away the customer-dealer relationship.

I see one of the concerns I had a year ago where you were charging the farm machinery distributor by gross sales — you've now changed that. Is it a flat fee now, Mr. Minister? Is that what is happening? I know you can't get up, but I'm wondering . . .

MR. MacMURCHY: — When he closes debate.

MR. LARTER: — Yes, I'm wondering if this is a flat fee because I don't think there is any doubt about it — depending what product is introduced — there's always going to be one farm machinery company that is more guilty than another company. And for the reason, I don't think you should be punishing other distributors for a poor product that one company makes. This is a concern, and I see you have done away now with billing them on gross sales. I'm curious at how you're assessing them for moneys to maintain this fund.

I think your legitimate full-line dealer finds that the customer who has most of the trouble is the farmer who shops furthest away from home. In other words, he's a fellow who buys on price only. This seems to be the customer who gets into most of the trouble and always has been. I would hate to think you were punishing a company or a dealer for a freedom that the farmer is taking by shopping from here to Medicine Hat and buying a piece of equipment and then wondering why he can't get service at a given time of the year. As you know, service on a piece of equipment is f.o.b. the dealer's shop on warranty work and other work.

And these are a few of the concerns I have. I was away the night you spoke on this bill,

Mr. Minister, I apologize for that because I was reading it and I did want to hear what you had to say.

I notice there are many of these cases, something like 10, that were settled without going to arbitration or to the board. I would be very curious and I think it would be very responsible on your part to look and see if one or two companies in particular are causing the problems that force a new piece of legislation. Sometimes we get into legislation which maybe isn't required. Maybe if you can punish the culprits, you don't need to have a bill that paints all of them with the same brush. This concerns me. I will be making some amendments in some of the areas I'm concerned with later on when we go through committee of the whole.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — I appreciate the comments from the hon. member for Estevan. I think having been a dealer, he has had some experience both in dealership and in operating under the rules of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments provided in this legislation have come from the agricultural implements board on which the dealers and the manufacturers are represented. It has come from that board and is, therefore, supported by that board. It's not a piece of legislation that has come from the Department of Agriculture. It has come directly to me from the board. So in terms of its operations as a board, they feel these amendments are in fact necessary.

In my discussions with the board and in my brief discussions with implement dealers, when I met with them at their annual convention here in the winter, they indicated they are pretty supportive of the legislation, but probably more importantly they are pretty supportive of the operations of the board. So the relationship between the board and the dealers, I think, is a good one.

I think that is not quite the case with the manufacturers. Clearly they had concern with respect to the fund being based on gross sales and there was a court action relative to that. I report to the hon. member that last year the fund was based not on gross sales but on a formula developed by the board. There was objection to that formula and the board has made amendments to the formula for this upcoming year. How that formula is arrived at I don't have in my mind but certainly we could provide the information when we have Mr. Lehman, who is executive director of the board, here during committee of the whole. If there are any other specific questions relating to the operations of the board, we'd be glad to discuss them during that committee.

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. 52 — **An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act** be now read a second time.

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Lane spoke the other day, the member for Qu'Appelle spoke the other day on this bill. I note from Hansard that he had asked the minister for some information respecting the bill. I will not be discussing or debating or talking on it today. We will be supporting the bill if the minister can provide us with the information that was asked for by the member for Qu'Appelle.

MR. ROBBINS: — I don't recall the information which was asked for.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I thank you for allowing us to get this question across to the minister responsible. Mr. Lane, on April 1, page 1437 of the Hansard . . . and I'll just quote from Hansard, Mr. Minister, for your benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would supply to the Assembly the cost to the public of the differential which he referred to. In other words, you get basically a minimum allowance payable under section 33 of The Teachers' Superannuation Act and the minister didn't address, in his remarks, whether or not there would be a cost to the public purse for that floor. On the face of it I have no objection. I am wondering if the minister would mind supplying, to the opposition, the projected estimated costs of the amendment and then secondly, the number of individuals affected.

As the member for Regina South was saying — if the minister would comply with the request to answer those questions, we would be more than happy to support the bill and let it go. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll certainly try to get the information but I'm not even sure that it will be available. It will depend on the number of teachers now in the public service who might be pensioned some time in the future. Some of them may be pensioned 15 or 20 years from now and that's going to be a pretty difficult situation in terms of determining what the differential may be between the guarantees under The Public Service Superannuation Act and the guarantee under The Teachers' Superannuation Act. I will certainly inform the members opposite that I will try to get it but I can't guarantee that you will have any immediate answer on that particular problem. I thought the particular questions then member for Qu'Appelle had were not really related to this act at all. They were basically related to the other act, the supplementary provisions act.

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. 60 — **An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act** be now read a second time.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, again the member for Qu'Appelle spoke on this bill the other day and I do not intend to belabor the discussion on it. I will say to the minister, however, that in the committee of the whole we will be bringing forward an amendment to the bill. For the benefit of the minister I'll read the amendment now. I understand I can't do it today, but I will read it to him so he will know what we will be talking about at that time. The amendment will add a new subsection 3(2) as follows: 'No increase such as is provided for in this section shall be paid to a former employee who is in receipt of the superannuation allowance under a superannuation act, or under any former superannuation act in respect of any period in any year in which such former employee receives any remuneration, fees, or other payments for services rendered by him to the Government of Saskatchewan, or to any of its agencies'.

I might just speak for a second on the reason for that. We agree this is a good bill. There are many people who will benefit. I believe the member for Qu'Appelle the other day indicated the amount was not even sufficient. This applies to the majority of the people, of the workers. There is, of course, a concern from us that it would also benefit those who could take advantage; who would like to spend six months of the year in Hawaii, the

other six months drawing both the contract fees from the government as well as the superannuation. That is basically our concern, the gist of it. The rest of it will be discussed. We'll debate it at further length in committee of the whole.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to express appreciation to the member for Regina South for indicating they want to put forward an amendment when the bill is considered in committee of the whole. I think I should make one or two comments with respect to his reference to the fact a lot of the people were at relatively low pensions, and were not getting enough assistance. I'd like to see some kind of a formula, if he could devise one, which would do better than what we have been doing. A person in 1974, pension of \$3,000 a year, now gets \$6,080, more than double. The cost of living has not doubled in that period of time.

I also want to point out to him the expenditures with respect to the public service superannuation board this year totals \$16,418,010 in the estimates. Over \$4.25 million of that is in terms of the additional amounts we've added since 1971; most have been added since 1974. I readily admit there are problems related to the person on a pension of \$12,000 a year who gets the same amount of increase, if he had the same period of service, as the fellow on \$3,000. He is getting a relatively small percentage increase in relation to the cost of living. We are going to have a problem somewhere along the road in relation to those people. We do get representations from superannuated groups related to that fact. I cannot find any other way than if we said the increase was more than \$14 per annum per year of service. If we said it was \$16 or \$20 or \$30, obviously it would be more money. But the fact of the matter is, for 25 per cent of the total pay-out of over \$16 million this year, provision has been made for in advance except that we are adding these additional amounts to help those people who are suffering obviously from the inflationary trend.

In my view, it has been the best approach we could possibly use under the circumstances. I don't suggest for one minute that it is a proper long-term solution. A long-term solution in relation to pensions is something where you have to take the action now to see results 25 to 30 years from now.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

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. 67 — **An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act** be now read a second time.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I had mentioned to the government House Leader that we would postpone that one for a little while and that we would be ready after 3:30 p.m. Could we move on to another one? I had his assurance we would be doing this, bringing it in later today.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could call it before we go into committee of the whole, if that's appropriate. If you're not ready the, we could just stand it off.

MR. TAYLOR: — Yes, very good.

MR. SPEAKER: — The suggestion is that we return later this day to item 9, Bill No. 67.

April 17, 1980

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour) that Bill No. 61 — **An Act to amend The Public Works Act** be now read a second time.

MR. R. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this bill the other day for a few moments and made indications that parts of it bothered me because of the wording, even though the amendments are in some ways much better than the present legislation. The amendments still give more sweeping powers than we on this side of the House think the government should have. Realizing, of course, that the government was involved in a legal case and several words in the legislation for the use and purposes of the government were challenged in court. That is the reason we are seeing this piece of amending legislation.

I have already spoken with the minister and there will be amendments coming forward in committee of the whole. Rather than delay this bill in this form and keep it in second reading, most of the amendments can be made in committee of the whole and cannot be made here. There is ongoing discussion between the people involved with this legislation and me, but rather than hang it up I will lay out some of my concerns. We will let it go to committee of the whole and hopefully, we can correct my concerns in that position.

On the bill, obviously in section 2 of amended Bill No. 61, the third clause is a clause to which we need an amendment because otherwise, it has wide, sweeping powers. Of course there is no limit to where you can go under the new proposed clause 15(1)(o). and by that subject with the section 15 amendment which allows the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to designate any building, even if you have one tiny little office in it (let's assume the CN Tower in Saskatoon) you could declare it as a public work. That was not your intention, I'm informed, and therefore the amendment will hopefully come forward and clean it up. In committee of the whole we will discuss an amendment to sort of tighten it up a little.

There is one other concern and hopefully with cleaning up section 6, we will also solve that problem. As you are aware, public works buildings pay grants in lieu of taxation. Once again let's assume the CN Tower has one little office of the Government of Saskatchewan and says well, we want to be called public works so we don't have to pay taxes therefore, we pay a grant in lieu, whatever we want to pay.

This is quasi if the courts would say, yes, you could go that way. We don't want to leave the opportunity for them to do that. We don't want people using a backdoor way to escape taxes which are legitimate. Therefore, hopefully it will be checked by the legal people before we get into committee of the whole to make sure that is not a problem. That is another thing that will, hopefully, get corrected before we go into the committee of the whole, the reason is we are waiting for interpretations from the legal department of the Department of Labour, so we don't cause ourselves some problems down the road.

As I indicate, I realize the bill is a necessity because of a lawyer's action against the government and therefore, you have to bring in this bill. I suggest that, hopefully, a good relationship has developed between the critic of this department and the department, and we can cure the problem I see. In discussion with the minister, he seems to say we need an interpretation before we go further. Therefore, I suggest that

the bill with amendments will assist in making a piece of legislation less horrendous. In time we will see how the amendments go, and we will vote at that time on whatever we see before us. Thank you.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. N.E. BYERS (Kelvington-Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the Chamber for allowing me to interrupt the proceedings to introduce a group of students who have just arrived in the gallery. The group of students who has just arrived in the gallery is a class of Grade 8 students, 43 in number, from Ituna school. They have been touring a number of sites and attractions in Regina today. Mr. Kowalchuk called me just before the House commenced and asked me if I would, on his behalf, extend greetings to the students. He is unavoidably absent.

Ituna School is a pretty regular visitor to this Assembly. Their school has a pretty good record in having a group of students visit. The students today are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Hudema and Mrs. Buchko and the bus driver, Mrs. Wuschenny.

I ask that all members join with me in welcoming the students from Ituna to the proceedings this afternoon. I hope their brief stay here will be informative and educational and they will return at a later time.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILL NO. 6 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT, 1979

Section 1

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Chairman, I welcome you to the Chair for the first time and hope you have a good day there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, as you obviously see the minister has no officials to back him up here today. I think the amendments he is making today are excellent. They allow people who work for one employer and are temporarily helping another employer to be covered. It was a deficiency in the old act. I commend the minister for bringing in these changes, as I will on Bill No. 7, the next one we handle. They are welcome and due, I am glad to see that now when an employee goes to assist another business leaving his main employer), he is still covered by compensation, as the rest of the act improvements indicate. I compliment the minister for this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Sections 1 to 10 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 7 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT

Section 1

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had such a good Chairman and things going so well just a few minutes ago . . . But once again on this bill, I realize one change that you are making will improve the bill and leave a little less confusion and therefore we welcome the amendment.

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 8 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE ARTS BOARD ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

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

MR. R. KATZMAN: — Just out of curiosity — I'm not sure if it's a legitimate place to do it or not — but we've always tried to find out details of the total grant and the involvement of the people of Saskatchewan and area, in the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts and maybe we can ask those questions during an amendment to their act. I'm not sure.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth): — I think that's a legitimate question. I wonder if it wouldn't be more appropriate under the estimates. I'll be prepared to provide the information under the estimates. Quite frankly, I didn't anticipate a detailed discussion of the financing of the institution. I don't have the officials here with me. I would say to the member that I'll be prepared to fully disclose the financing of these institutions during the time of our estimates. It comes up there, and I think that's probably a better spot for it.

MR. R. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I'll accept that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, that's good because I think both the question and the answer were out of order.

Section 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 10 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 69 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM ACT

Sections 1 to 5 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 70 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE RECREATIONAL AND CULTURAL FACILITIES
CAPITAL GRANTS ACT**

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 4 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 15 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS ACT

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Section 3

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — I'm glad the Chairman is recognizing me as a minister. Maybe very shortly I will become one but I won't have to join your group to do it.

Mr. Chairman, once again we see a bill coming down which allows the cabinet to decide where they're going to give money without coming before the Legislative Assembly. It seems interesting to note this is just another example, as I referred. I've discovered since I referred to it last time in my budget speech, to the premier, who I always thought was responsible for intergovernmental affairs which I did not know had the protocol office . . .

You know, if it's abused as bad as the protocol office in my own constituency, I think it's a terrible piece of legislation. I refer to that one because that's a case of a grant, once again, where a constituency is told the only way they can get this particular grant is if a cabinet minister or a high-ranking government official goes out. That's what they were informed. Yet, I find out in doing my own checking that the member for Saskatoon Centre, who is not a high-ranking official and is definitely not a cabinet minister, and unfortunately for him is probably never going to be one, goes out and people get the grant when he appears. But yet, you don't allow MLAs from the opposition to go out in their own constituency when there are grants to be doled out.

That's what we're talking about, grants of all different types, Mr. Chairman. That's what this is. They can make any grant they so wish up to \$10,000. Well, they could give one organization a grant for \$9,999.99 and not have to tell us in the House, just do it right through order in council, and hopefully we might catch it.

I don't even know if they're even gazetted for us to find out. At least, I haven't seen them gazetted. It's interesting the other day, the minister responsible for — Ned, what's your department now? — culture and youth, when I asked him about grants, suggested that if I write him a letter, he'll notify me. Well, do we have to write to this minister? Will this minister give us his assurance that if we write him and ask him to notify us when he gives out a grant he will be as willing as the Minister of Culture and Youth has been? If so, I may be a little more agreeable to this motion. But the way it stands now I would

April 17, 1980

have to vote against it because you don't want to tell anybody except the cabinet ministers who is getting money.

So I would suggest that maybe the minister will stand up when I take my place and say, yes, he'll send us a letter on each of these as they are approved from his department and therefore we will all know and then I won't be as hesitant to prove it. So I will allow the minister to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's interesting to know that the member for Saskatoon Centre indicates the government's on that side. Well let me suggest that's true. That's one statement he is totally correct on. But I would suggest that it's the people's money you're spending and we all are here representing the people of the province, no matter what political party we stand for. We would like to know why you're not willing to allow all members of this Assembly who are supposed to be the watchers of the Queen's purse to know where it's being spent.

And the Minister for Northern Saskatchewan likes to make side comments from his chair. I like the last comment he made because once again he gets up and makes personal insults or what are believed to be personal insults by him to the member on the opposite side. I'm not insulted at all that I was a hard-working young lad at 16 and willing to make a dollar. I'm not insulted at all by the reference you make to me always across the floor. Are you ashamed because maybe you didn't? That's what you seem to indicate.

But, Mr. Minister, back to the bill. Will the minister responsible for the Department of Consumer Affairs, the hon. member for Saskatoon Nutana, be willing to send us a copy on each of them? Maybe the Leader of the Opposition sitting close beside you can convince you while I'm talking that you should. Maybe he'll stand up and tell us in your place that you will allow us that information because no other member from your side except the Minister of Culture and Youth has suggested he would. Now, maybe we should be asking each of the other cabinet ministers, starting with you. Unfortunately, we didn't realize that you people might be co-operative when all the other ones were passed over the last three or four years. So, I really don't want to take my place but I'd like the answer from the minister, if he'd like to give it from his seat. So, Mr. Minister, let's hope that you'll give it to us and we'll see what you're saying.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, I think that's much ado about nothing, really. It's true that a standard rule of not to exceed \$10,000 . . . I will assure the member opposite that as long as I'm the Minister of Consumer Affairs and that might not be very long, there will be one grant and one grant only. It will be to the Consumers' Association of Canada (Saskatchewan section) which currently has \$3,500 a year and it isn't enough. And that's why this is in this bill. That's the only reason it's in that bill.

Section 3 agreed.

Section 4 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 43 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CONSUMER PRODUCTS WARRANTIES ACT

Sections 1 to 16 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 55 — AN ACT RESPECTING SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

Section 4

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I wonder if the minister would explain to the Assembly why in section 4 the minister himself is no longer on the board of directors as he was in the previous act? 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? I'd like the answer as to why the minister is no longer on the board of directors.

MR. ROBBINS: — I don't know how you get that interpretation out of it, quite frankly. What this is attempting to do is officially set up a board. There has never been a recognized board before. There was no provision for the actual appointment of a board of directors as such. They were termed officers of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. All this is really doing is legally setting up a board.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — O.K. You're saying it will set up the board. Will the minister be on that board?

MR. ROBBINS: — Yes.

Sections 4 to 6 agreed.

Section 7

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That capacity to sue or be sued was not in the previous act. Was it in the previous act? I was looking for it and I couldn't find it.

MR. ROBBINS: — I understand it was in the previous act and it is simply incorporated in this one.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Will the minister tell me where it was in the previous act?

MR. ROBBINS: — I don't have a copy of the previous act here at the moment. Could I have a look at it?

Mr. Chairman, it's under section 13 — legal proceedings. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office shall have the capacity to sue and be sued in all actions and proceedings arising out of any contracts.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I want to thank the minister for finding it for me.

Sections 7 and 8 agreed.

Section 9

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I would like the minister's comments on what I mentioned the other day regarding section 9. I would like to repeat what I said then.

It is so broad as to encompass almost anything that 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 that 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.

The broad scope of this section, as I understand it, gives SGI the right to do almost anything without debating or bringing it to the legislature. I find that difficult to accept.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, if I might allay the member's concerns, the fact of the matter is SGI has always had the right to go into, for instance, the life insurance business but has never done so. It has had that legal right. The reason for this change in this particular portion of the act is related specifically to the disaster fund approach because we are now doing all the adjusting for that with adjusters from SGI. Secondly, it is to administer the motor vehicles' administration which seemed logical in relation to the fact that insurance and registration of fees, etc., could be carried out one in conjunction with the other.

I can understand the member saying, well you could operate and administer any other plan or plans of insurance that may be authorized by any other act. They could legally set up annuities. They have never done so but it is in the act specifically put in here in relation to the two things that they weren't authorized to do previously. That is, look after the disaster fund or look after the motor vehicle administration.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I find a lot more in that than you are saying, Mr. Minister:

9. — (1) The corporation may:

(a) engage in and carry on the business of insurance and reinsurance . . .

(b) operate or administer any other plan or plans . . .

(c) perform any functions in relation to any program of the government or agency of the government that may be authorized under any statute, regulation or order or that may be assumed by the corporation by agreement with the government or other agency, and the corporation may stipulate for and receive compensation in respect of the functions performed by it . . . (that's quite broad in itself).

(d) undertake research into and provide services in relation to loss prevention and control, rehabilitation and generally any means of reducing the risk of loss, damage . . .

(e) give any undertakings and enter into any agreements that may be authorized or required under the law of any province, state or country in relation to any instrument or class of instruments of insurance . . .

(f) enter into agreements with any other person, organization or institution, providing the same or similar services, whether within or outside Saskatchewan . . .

(g) acquire by purchase or otherwise, hold as owner, tenant or otherwise, and take options on, for its own use and benefit, any real property:

(i) necessary or required for the conduct of its business;

(ii) conveyed, mortgaged or hypothecated to it by way of security;

(iii) acquired and held by it as an investment (you know you can enter into the real estate business with that clause);

(iv) conveyed to it in satisfaction in whole or in part in respect of debts and judgements;

Just to that point, would you comment, Mr. Minister?

MR. ROBBINS: — The fact of the matter is, they have always had these rights in terms of (if I may use the example of the building being built in Prince Albert which is an investment by SGI) . . . they simply own the building or hold a mortgage arrangement on that building. It's an investment. I don't think there is a single thing in here (other than the fact that the disaster fund and motor vehicles' administration are now specifically covered) that SGI couldn't have done previously, at any time in the past, under their act.

Sections 9 to 11 agreed.

Section 12

MR. ROUSSEAU — I would like the minister's comments on section 12. Section 12 apparently eliminates the SGI from some of the conditions of The Saskatchewan Insurance Act; can we determine what conditions private insurance companies must comply with that SGI does not have to consider?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, I am not completely sure of this, and I will certainly try to get more information. I think it deals specifically with the automobile accident insurance fund, because that is a different type of fund than the average insurer is involved in; the automobile accident insurance fund being a fund which by law requires every person to register under that particular act and gain insurance when he buys his licence. Now if that's not the whole story (and I haven't got the whole story), that's the only thing I can see in there — I will certainly be willing to try to find more information for you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to pass on a clause in a bill if the minister isn't sure what is in it. I would like to suggest this be held until such time as the minister has a definite answer on that question.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can defer this item for the time being while we do some checking. Perhaps we can come back to it later this day.

The committee agreed to stand the bill until later this day.

BILL NO. 16 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SASKATCHEWAN 4-H FOUNDATION ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**BILL NO. 22 — AN ACT TO REPEAL THE MINING, SMELTING AND REFINING
DISTRICT ACT**

Section 1

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to pose a few questions to the minister. I notice you were tightening up on the environmental rules in this area. I wonder when a bill like this goes through if you are also thinking — for instance, you have four stacks at Boundary Dam and IPSCO Steel in that — of tightening up something in existence, a bad situation. Are there going to be large sums of money forced on these people in this area? — for instance, you have four stacks at Boundary Dam and IPSCO Steel in that — of tightening up something in existence, a bad situation. Are there going to be large sums of money forced on these people in this area? — for instance, something that has to be changed such as stacks at Boundary Dam, or putting catalysts on. Is this going to cause problems like that? Otherwise I have no argument. I was just wondering if we are looking after our own environment as well as industries we're involved in.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Chairman, there is a modest difference here in that these people are protected from having to carry out any improvements required because of detrimental effects on the environment caused by their operations. They have, by law, the right to say no. they are not obliged to do that. In the instance of Boundary Dam or IPSCO or any other major industrial activity, or entity in the province of Saskatchewan, they abide by the law of the day and the code of good practice, or the rules and regulations on an ongoing basis. They have been given no privileges by legislation to exempt them.

This bill goes back a number of years when the general public (and no criticism of the government of the day or the general public) just had no awareness or real consideration or concern for some of the environmental implications of such mining and smelting activities. So the exemption was readily granted to the company. We are now living in a different era. There is significant concern about the implications of the mining, smelting activities of that region. It would be inappropriate of us to continue to allow that sector to have an advantage when IPSCO can't, or Boundary Dam can't. So we say this will be repealed and they will have to allow that sector to have an advantage when IPSCO (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation) can't or Boundary Dam can't. So, we say that this will be repealed and they will have to now start as all other industries do. I believe there are no other exceptions, in Saskatchewan or Manitoba (I might stand to be corrected) or even in Alberta, where there is a bill protecting a particular industry from environmental consideration. So in repealing this, we say you will start to live like any other good corporate industrial citizen in recognizing environmental considerations and moving to meet them.

I guess to the member's question about cost, there will be some costs, I guess, for them along the way. But everybody else has been able to meet them and I'm confident that this entity will also be able to do that.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, I'm not arguing against controlling the environment. Are they polluting the environment quite badly? Is it something they can change over gradually, or is this something they have to do immediately?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know of any specific concerns that have to be immediately rectified. I believe it would be inappropriate to say that there will not have

to be changes implemented but they will be implemented over a period of time, realizing that this entity has been operating for years without having to consider — so that they haven't been breaking the law. They haven't, in effect, been poor corporate citizens. They say we've been different than everybody else but we're different because of legislation giving us the privilege to operate in a different fashion. So, if we change that, then we will have to catch up and/or adjust to what society says is a requirement of such industries. We will need time to do that and we will have to be given reasonable parameters to operate in by the governments which will act as an authority in respect to the changes that have to be made — no different than they do in any other industry. So, it's not a case, when this is repealed, of their meeting within 48 hours all of the terms and conditions that would apply if they were to just start to build now. We know that there has to be an element of reason practised in allowing them to adjust to a different circumstance. I think that's about the best I can convey to the member at this point in time.

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

BILL NO. 20 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SASKATCHEWAN LOANS ACT

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Could we stand that bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Stand. Agreed? Next piece of business is item 30, Bill No. 56.

MR. ROMANOW: — Point of order. Don't make any bid deal out of this but I'd like to know for my own edification — committee of the whole, government business, government calls the bill — how is it stood in the committee of the whole by an opposition member?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I put the motion in the sense of leave to stand the bill. I said is that agreed? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I said is that agreed and nobody said . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, I guess I learn something new everyday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'm glad to hear you do.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't care but I just don't understand the procedure.

BILL NO. 56 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE RURAL MUNICIPALITY ACT

Sections 1 to 6 agreed.

Section 7 as amended agreed.

Sections 8 to 21 agreed.

Section 22 as amended agreed.

April 17, 1980

Section 23 as amended agreed.

Section 24 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

BILL NO. 62 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CANCER FOUNDATION ACT

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

BILL NO. 64 — AN ACT RESPECTING FIREARM SAFETY

Section 1 agreed.

Section 2

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, maybe it's not in the right section, but this House amendment has just been handed to me now. I would like a minute to have some time to consider this or any other regulations concerning this bill. I would also like to take a look at them too. I mean a bill is one thing but a handful of regulations is another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. We don't deal with regulations in this committee. We just deal with the bill here.

Section 2 agreed.

Sections 3 to 7 agreed.

Section 8

MR. GARNER: — I would like the minister to just go through these regulations in just a little bit of detail and elaborate on them.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, there are no regulations available at this time. They will be announced or made available in due course.

MR. GARNER: — Let's just go through the ones here. Give me a little more explanation on these existing regulations you have here under section 8 right now.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it's enabling legislation, the regulations under 8. The member has specific questions? It's kind of hard to go over the sections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) without knowing the questions the member has in mind. If he could just give me an idea of the questions he has in mind maybe we could answer them.

MR. GARNER: — Have you got anything on a maximum enrolment fee under clause (b) of section 8?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier the regulations are not put together yet but it is our feeling, our impression, we will be going with a fee somewhere around \$10, certainly not more than \$10.

MR. GARNER: — Fixing the maximum enrolment fee, no. The length and passing mark for any firearm safety course, give me a little bit of detail on that.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the length, type of course and passing mark the member is asking about — it is our anticipation the regulations will not vary from the present voluntary course. It will be exactly the same type of course, the same length, the same duration, the same passing mark, at least that is our feeling right now, before the regulations are passed.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., that is basically what I want to know. It is going to be basically the same thing it is right now except you are going to make it into law. I am in complete agreement with the bill. It is just that I want to know the ins and outs of it. If it is going to be pretty well the same as the program working right now, I can sure live with it and I know everybody else can.

MR. GROSS: — That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, can I say a few words about subsection (d), section 8?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — O.K.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Minister, if I could just ask you a question with reference to that particular clause — that is subsection (d) section 8, where it refers to remuneration. Would that include, as an example, an individual, who was working through community college, instructing people on firearms safety? Could that include him?

MR. GROSS: — Yes, it could.

MR. BIRKBECK: — If a community wants to get a firearms safety program going in their community, would that be the route they should go, or would there be some other avenue, other than community college?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, there are established zone chairmen in every area of the province, and the proper route would be to go through him and he could advise what group could help out, whether it be the wildlife federation, whether it be Cypress Hills Community College, or a Cadet group or whoever has the auspices of providing the program.

MR. BIRKBECK: — In concluding some questions in that particular regard, what type of remuneration are we talking about here? Do you have a maximum and a minimum? Of course we have a minimum wage but what is your maximum? Do you know what type of remuneration will be paid for the instruction of firearms safety?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that at this point in time, it is travelling expenses — whatever expense is incurred by the person putting on the course.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Did you say travelling expenses?

MR. GROSS: — That's correct. For a zone chairman, it would be travelling expenses.

MR. BIRKBECK: — What about remuneration for the actual instructions for safety with firearms? That is really what my question was.

April 17, 1980

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that it is up to the organization. If they want to pay the chairman a remuneration, it is entirely up to them; whether it is the community college, or whether it is the wildlife federation, or whoever it may be, it is up to their discretion.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, one other quick point. What is the length of the course right now, and will it be the same length in this one?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the course will remain exactly the same, and the maximum length of the course right now is 12 hours; the minimum length of the course is 8 hours.

MR. BIRKBECK: — That's a good bill. Let it go.

Section 8 agreed.

Section 9 as amended agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

The committee reported progress.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES
VOTE 39**

Item 1 (continued)

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I don't remember where we left off, if we've already gone through it, please bring me up to date. I think I had asked you what the cost was going to be on a series of TV programs to be aired by cable TV. Have you got that information for me now or were you going to get that information and send it to me?

HON. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Chairman, I think we supplied the information the last day we sat here. There was no cost for the cable TV series that was on the air. It was a service free of charge.

MR. GARNER: — The different trade shows where Saskatchewan TRR (tourism and renewable resources) is attending all over, whether it be in Canada or the States — I would like to know the cost to the department in each case and who attended, what officials, etc.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I have a list here with the information. Do you want me to send it over to save reading it?

MR. GARNER: — What is the total employment of your extension services department?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised it is 18 permanent positions.

MR. GARNER: — These permanent positions — could you give me a breakdown of salaries? And do they all have government cars, etc.?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I don't remember. Were you wanting names of individuals as well?

MR. GARNER: — You might as well give me the whole package.

MR. GROSS: — There is the director, Harvey Dryden, and I don't have his salary here but we could supply you with it later if that's O.K.?

MR. GARNER: — Well, rather than having you read them out to me, to speed things up, could you just give those to me? Send them over, salary, car, etc., so we can speed it along.

MR. GROSS: — Agreed. There is no problem, Mr. Chairman, we can do that.

MR. GARNER: — Good. I notice on this last one you sent me over here (I am always concerned about airplanes, Mr. Minister) this air fare. This is separate and has nothing to do with government airplanes — is that correct? It's under the air — on the transportation here on the trade shows.

MR. GROSS: — No, there isn't, Mr. Chairman. There is no government aircraft involved on that list you have there.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. In the Prince Albert region, what was the total amount of financial assistance from Sask Power for the removal of deadhead logs from Tobin Lake?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we don't have the dollars the member is looking for but we do have the number of deadhead logs that were removed. We removed \$5,300 out of Cowan Lake and 2,190 out of Tobin and we can provide later, if the member wants, the money we received from SPC. That's O.K.?

MR. GARNER: — That's pretty well what I want. I wanted the cost. I wasn't really too concerned about how many logs or that; it was the cost of removing. While you're doing that I would like to know who removed them and the total cost to the department. Was this done by a contractor and were there tenders let out on this project?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that our share of the clean-up in Tobin Lake was \$8,645.24. The other question was about whether or not a contractor is involved in clean-up. No, there was no contractor, it was done by our own department people. As in regard to the SPC figure, we still don't have that but we can provide that later if you want.

MR. GARNER: — That's O.K., you can send it to me later. What other lakes (I know you mentioned one other lake) did you or your department remove these logs from?

MR. GROSS: — The only other lake is Cowan Lake that we mentioned earlier and the cost of the clean-up was \$4,728.27. It was done by our crews again.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. Did you receive any assistance from anyone else on this?

MR. GROSS: — No.

MR. GARNER: — What vehicles and equipment were purchased for the department in the last year and were these vehicles or equipment tendered out?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that all the equipment and vehicles we do

purchase are purchased by the purchasing agency. We've purchased nothing on our own.

MR. GARNER: — Then central vehicle agency purchased them all for you?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the vehicles that the purchasing agency purchased were purchased on our behalf and it's a separate agency of the government which purchases tractors and trucks and that kind of stuff. We don't purchase it directly.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. Well, then the other question leading into this: do you insure your own equipment and if you do whom do you insure it with?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised we have no insurance on our equipment. The only insurance we carry is the licence that would insure a vehicle.

MR. GARNER: — In your annual report you stated that 40 per cent of permanent supervisory staff took advantage of training and development sessions. Where were these held and what was the cost of these programs?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we can provide the member with a list. It's a very long and complicated one. It will have to be drawn up showing each individual and where he went and what he did. We don't have a list handy that we could read so we'll provide you with a list, O.K.?

MR. GARNER: — Fine, sure, as long as I get the list. I want to know how many people in total took part in this program and from what parts of your department as well. You could add that to that list as well, could you?

O.K. We'll move along. Mr. Minister, you stated that the wildlife development fund has a total of 55,000 acres to date. Last year you stated you purchased 3,080 acres. From whom and at what cost?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think we supplied the member with a list of who those people were, the transfers and the purchases. Did you not receive the list?

MR. GARNER: — O.K. We'll move along then, Mr. Minister. How many acres of permanent lure crop did the province have for the year 1979?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised the total permit lure crop acres in 1979-80 was 2,200 and the cost was \$83,698.63.

MR. GARNER: — I would just like to back up here, Mr. Minister. I notice in this one list you sent over to me, southeast quarter of section 7, township 49, range 10, west of the 3rd meridian acquired in trade for northwest quarter of section 18, township 49, range 10, west of the 3rd meridian plus \$300. Could you be a little more elaborate on that trade? What land did you have that you were trading there?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we will have to supply the member with the exact details. We don't have that here. We will supply him with the details as to what parcel it was and what it was we were trading for. We don't have an explanation for it right here.

MR. GARNER: — The thing is, Mr. Minister, you have a lot of officials there and it's not going to be done until later tonight. I am going to have to have specific information on

this because once the government starts trading a quarter here and a quarter there . . . This is land bought by moneys taken in from hunting licences, etc., and I just want to know about this quarter of land. You can trade from one department to the other and I want to know where this land is going and what you are doing with it? I will have to have that information.

Going back to the lure crops, how many acres of temporary lure crops were purchased from private farmers for the year 1979?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, 2,554 acres were purchased for temporary lure.

MR. GARNER: — What was the cost?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised the net cost was \$153,134.87.

MR. GARNER: — What was the total cost of the crop depredation claims that came in for migratory birds for 1979? While you are doing that, what was the total cost of administration for 1979 for the same program?

MR. GROSS: — I don't have a breakdown for administration, that's separated out. The total cost of the migratory bird crop damage program was \$353,239.32. If you want a breakdown we'd have to get that later but we don't have it.

MR. GARNER: — I think there was one other question I'd asked you in there on the administration. I wanted to know the cost of the amount of claims coming in for '79. I wanted that cost too.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the \$353,000 figure is the total cost, administration and claims all totalled.

MR. GARNER: — Surely to goodness we can break this down. I didn't want it amalgamated together. I want to know exactly how much came in, in claims alone and then I want the cost of administration besides that.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if I understand the member's question correctly, you were asking for compensation? You'll have to ask the Minister of Agriculture because he handles the compensation program. Depredation? That's the figure we just gave you; \$353,239, is the total depredation costs with administration included, everything in.

MR. GARNER: — But my question was I wanted it separated out. I want the administration separate from the other. This is what I want.

MR. GROSS: — If it will help, we'll get it separated out for you. They are going to break it down for you here and ship it over. We don't have it handy. Is that O.K.?

MR. GARNER: — O.K. How much money was put into habitat protection and development for the year of '79?

MR. GROSS: — The total operating costs of the wildlife development fund — was that your question?

MR. GARNER: — That and how much money was put into habitat protection?

April 17, 1980

MR. GROSS: — \$57,964.57.

MR. GARNER: — Also into the development fund.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, advise \$226,000.

MR. GARNER: — On page 24 of the annual report under habitat protection program number one, Senlac, you have a project out there. Could you describe to me in a little more detail what that Senlac project is please?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised the Senlac project which the member is asking questions about is located in the Manito Sand Hills, and consists of 13 grazing co-ops which have collectively gone together and formed this project. It's a multiple use habitat agricultural development program.

MR. GARNER: — How much money did you put into that?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there's no direct cost to the government, to the department as a result of this project but there are two wildlife ecologists working part time and the estimated costs of their time involvement is \$10,000.

The committee recessed until 7 p.m.