

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

May 2, 1980

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. A.S. MATSALLA (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to the legislature and to you, a distinguished group of educators from the Canora constituency. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are 11 in number. They represent the public school teaching staff at Canora schools. Their visit to the legislature is part of the teacher in-service familiarization program. Hopefully their visit here to the legislature this morning will be an informative experience.

Following their visit here, they will be visiting the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) training centre and the John Bosco Home. We extend a warm welcome to the teachers of Canora.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)): — Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me this morning on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture to introduce to you and to the House a group of 12 young farmers from the People's Republic of China who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. This group has been sponsored here. They are going to spend six months in Saskatchewan visiting individual Saskatchewan farm families. This project is being co-sponsored by the Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Federation of Production Co-operatives with the assistance of the Chinese community here in the province. The federation through its president, Lorne Dietrick, has arranged farm placements for these young farmers in the Swift Current and Perdue areas. The Department of Agriculture will be responsible for co-ordinating the off-farm activities of this group including visits to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, to the universities and to some of our research facilities.

The Department of Industry and Commerce will be arranging visits to the Western Canada Agricultural Farm Progress Show and farm machinery manufacturers. As well, the Department of Education will organize suitable short-term farm training courses for the visiting teams.

These 12 boys are all able to communicate in English and will be, of course, visiting with some of our farm families and staying with them. We are confident that this interchange between ourselves and this group from China will be mutually beneficial to all of us in our two countries. I would want you to welcome this group now to Saskatchewan.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, just to add our words of welcome to those of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural) to the farmers from the People's Republic of China, we met with the Ambassador to Canada from the People's Republic of China about a week ago. We briefed us on the program which was coming up this summer. From the opposition, I would just extend a warm welcome. I am sure

May 2, 1980

you will find your summer enjoyable and informative. It is our wish that will be the case.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. R.J. GROSS (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you today, 29 Grade 8 students from Wymark School. They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Mr. Jake Nelson. I am sure members of this House will want to wish them an educational and entertaining stay.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Effects of Formaldehyde Vapors

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Consumer affairs. Great concern has been raised about the adverse health effects on humans by formaldehyde vapors as released by installing urea formaldehyde foam insulation in homes. We have a case in Saskatoon where a mother and father and three children have had to vacate their house because of the high level of formaldehyde vapors in this home. To date they can't seem to get any action, on your government's part, to help them solve the problem facing them. I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, is your department presently conducting or intending to conduct any studies on the feasibility of banning the use of UF (urea formaldehyde) foam in Saskatchewan?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Yes, we have been familiar with this problem for some time. We've been in contact with the federal people with respect to getting it under the Hazardous Products Act, some six months or more ago. We have not made any progress, as far as I'm aware at the present time with respect to that particular approach. We are informed by the people in Ottawa that there is no guideline with respect to formaldehyde fumes in homes whatsoever.

There is some guideline for it in respect to offices or factories, because of the fact that people are there roughly eight hours a day. They are still looking at this problem. We did have the Research Council of Saskatchewan check out that home and they concluded that the formaldehyde fumes were too high, were bothering the people a good deal and they moved out. I think they are temporarily staying with the lady's mother.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You indicated that six months ago you alerted the federal authorities as to your concerns over this particular product. Can you not impose your own ban? It's interesting that the National Academy of Sciences in the United States has conducted tests for formaldehyde vapors in residential areas, and its conclusion is that there seems to be no safe level to be ascertained.

MR. ROBBINS: — No, we cannot impose a ban. There's argument with respect to whether the chemical product used (manufactured I believe by the Borden Chemical Company) or the installer was at fault with respect to this particular instance that you mention.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. These people have been put out of their home and for all intent and purposes, because of the sensitivity of the

children, will never ever be able to return to that home. Because once the vapors start they can't be stopped. There's no means of stopping them. Your department issues licences, I suppose to protect consumers from questionable installers. Do you have any type of control over the people who are doing the installing?

MR. ROBBINS: — No, actually we did not.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. New question.

SGI Coverage on Home

MRS. DUNCAN: — Minister in charge of SGI. They've made a claim to SGI, and to date no action has been taken on the part of SGI. Are they just to destroy their home? Is there not some place in their SGI policy package that would cover something like this?

MR. ROBBINS: — SGI does not carry the insurance on that home. It's carried by another insurer.

Government Action re Home

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — To the minister in charge of consumer affairs. Mr. Minister, here's a case where a family under a Warm Up Saskatchewan program has followed all the rules. They are using the insulation that they are given permission to use; they have a home they can't live in and the doctors have advised them to get out of there. They can't ever go back. Now what are you going to do about it? You recommended this type of insulation. You sanction it. They are in a very, very tight. . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. The member is debating the issue. I'll take the Leader of the Opposition.

Government Monitoring of Insulation

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Premier. It is beyond doubt that under certain conditions urea formaldehyde foam insulation is toxic and hazardous. It's carcinogenic. It causes birth defects. All of these things are beyond doubt . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm setting the stage, Mr. Speaker,

We know, Mr. Speaker, that several of these insulation applicators have operated in Saskatchewan. Hundred of houses must be insulated with this insulation. The question, Mr. Speaker, is does your government have any mechanism to monitor houses insulated in this way? Would you consider offering some sort alert to people who may be suffering from symptoms of this toxic gas and some alert as to what the effects of prolonged contact with the gas would be? And do you not agree that this is an urgent matter and should be dealt with quickly?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think the role of the Government of Saskatchewan up to now has been in the case, let us say, of Warm Up Saskatchewan applications, to permit the applicant to have a sum of money and to choose the insulation and the type of insulation or other commodity which is going to be installed.

The Government of Saskatchewan also provides some licensing arrangements for the installers but not heretofore any licensing of the types of insulation used. These are of course, not confined to Saskatchewan; the same types of insulation are used all across Canada and we have been relying upon the Canadian standards. And so far as I am aware this type of insulation is used across Canada. I take the point raised by the hon. member for Souris-Cannington that something further could be done to warn citizens of Saskatchewan that they perhaps should not make this choice. It may not be appropriate for residences or anywhere that formaldehyde gas might be a problem, and I think the hon. member and his colleagues make a good point when they suggest that additional information might be put out by our government.

The question of whether we, as a province, should be attempting to ban a particular type of building material, which is used generally across Canada and has been approved generally by people like Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, is a much more difficult question, since all of the provinces have been trying to have uniform building standards so that building costs would be kept down with contractors using Canada-wide standards. I do, however, take the point raised by the hon. member and will ask my colleagues to pursue particularly the point of further information to the public.

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — A question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, the effects of this particular product cause aggravated respiratory symptoms and rashes covering the whole body. It is known as a carcinogenic agent; it causes birth abnormality at certain stages of pregnancy. (I might point out at this time that the particular woman happens to be pregnant.) What is your department prepared to do to urge our colleagues to take some type of remedial action?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate what the Premier has said. The Premier, as of a few minutes ago, has instructed us to investigate and I shall carry out that order.

Swift Current Health Region

MR. D.H. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. You were quoted in a recent edition of the Swift Current Sun as saying the government has plans to 'tear down the health region.' First of all, is this true and secondly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I'll take the Attorney General.

Appeal of Sentence in Howard Thompson Case

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for Kindersley asked me a question respecting the case of Howard Thompson. I took notice. The answer is, the Crown is appealing the sentence imposed by Mr. Justice Noble.

Licensing of Insulation Installers

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — I would like to direct a question to the Premier, as a result of his answer to the Leader of the Opposition. You said your position as a government was to make certain funding available for the applicants on the one hand, and I accept that. On the other, you said that you were licensing those who were participating in the installation of the particular insulation which is being used. I think the obvious question is why do you not, through any means (order in council) change the regulations by which you license these people who are in the business of insulating homes so as to prohibit the use of this insulation and thereby resolve the problem?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it has been our view, up to now at least, that the citizen who obtains money from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation through the Warm Up Saskatchewan program, or money through any of the other building or housing repair programs, ought to be free to choose for his building any type of material which is authorized by people like Canada Mortgage and Housing and which is generally used across Canada and approve by the Canadian Standards Association and other like bodies.

Our licensing of the contractors was simply to ensure that they had some minimum skills and they would provide bonds and other guarantees of performance of contracts included. We have not attempted, through the licensing procedure to regulate the materials or the tools which they used.

The member for Moosomin raises the point of our, in effect, changing the licensing standards to approve of materials used. I say this would need consideration since we would not wish to set up an agency of the Government of Saskatchewan to test materials when there are already Canadian agencies doing that job. Secondly, we would not, I think wish to effectively bar from Saskatchewan materials which are used widely and approved widely across Canada by Canadian Standards and the like, unless the evidence was strong and overwhelming.

Now obviously information is coming forward which might cause us to take the position that the Canadian Standards Association and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and other bodies like that are wrong in authorizing the use of this. If so, then we will clearly have to consider that. We have not heretofore thought that was an appropriate stance by our government.

Social Service Assistance Arising from Insulation's Effects

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. The family in question in Saskatoon includes three children and since December these kids have been in the hospital no less than 50 times. The doctor ordered them to move out of the house for obvious reasons.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Does the member have a question?

MR. BERNTSON: — The question is, since this family is not a wealthy family, since they are making payments on a house they can't live in and also paying rent on another house which they have to live in, why was it that your department would not consider some sort of assistance to them when they were at your office in Saskatoon?

MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services): — Well I am not perfectly sure your conclusion is correct, that in fact no income was provided to them. I want to indicate the department was in contact with them. As you will appreciate, administration of any assistance under the department is covered by regulations and in accordance with the regulations I am advised that the members of my department did in fact contact the people and review the provisions of help which were possible within those regulations.

Autonomy of Swift Current Health Region

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. In respect to a recent article in the Swift Current Sun and an apparent dispute between your department and the Swift Current Health Region, are you aware that the doctors in the Swift Current Health Region have indicated they will proceed with direct billing should the plan be lost, and are you further aware that Health Region No. 1 now saves the taxpayers of Saskatchewan some \$150,000 per year in administration costs.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I did have an opportunity to read the article that appeared in the Swift Current Sun. I don't know where the information was received that I said we would tear it down. I can't recall having talked to a Canadian Press reporter, but some time or other I may have in the last year or so. But, Mr. Speaker, I am also aware that the doctors said they would start billing people by mode 3. I am somewhat surprised and shocked at the attitude the doctors took. If the decision to change the administration in the health region was decided by the people of Swift Current, that should have no bearing on the method the doctors use in providing medical services for the people of Swift Current. That should not be a decision made by the medical people; that should be a decision made in consultation with the government and the people of the health region.

The last thing I want to respond to is the saving of \$150,000. I really don't see where they get those figures from. I am told that we would probably save \$150,000 rather than it costing us \$150,000.

MR. HAM: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker,. I totally agree with the minister that it will be the people of Swift Current who decide and, I hope, not the Government of Saskatchewan that decides as to whether we lose our health region.

But further, Mr. Minister are you aware that this health region which was founded in 1946 is guaranteed by legislation, and is cited as the first health care system of insurance in North America? Would you not agree that tampering by your department and some NDP MLAs is extremely unwise in light of the support the plan has from people in the Swift Current region?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, yes, I am aware that it was established by the former CCF government and I think we are all proud of that fact. Mr. Speaker, the MLAs of that area are consulting with the people on problems which they themselves bring to their attention, and I think that is a duty and a responsibility of the MLAs. I indicated to the member yesterday that a letter was sent from my office to the secretaries of the various rural municipalities and town councils, because of fairly numerous complaints I have received from people not knowing whether the tax was provincial or regional. They didn't know whether they should be requesting services from the region or from the province. And in order to clarify that we asked for some advice from the people in Swift Current. As I indicated yesterday, maybe what we need to do is to send out a brochure from the provincial government in conjunction with the health region, in order to clarify

the confusion which exists at the present time.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to make sure that the people who are running Health Region No. 1 clearly understand where their jurisdiction begins and where their jurisdiction ends. In that regard we have had consultations with them and we intend to have further consultations in the future.

MR. HAM: — Is the minister not aware that it was the people of southwestern Saskatchewan who in fact founded the Health Region No. 1 and not the CCF?

MR. ROLFES: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the health region was set up in 1946 (Tommy Douglas was the premier of this province) and in conjunction with the people of Swift Current, they agreed to set up the health region. As the member himself said, it was brought about by legislation and I think that legislation (if I remember it correctly) was passed in this House.

Bonding of Insulation Installers

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — A question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Mr. Speaker, all the contractors and the people who do business in the province must be bonded. Have you notified the bonding agents that there possibly may be a claim because of the problem with the insulation?

MR. ROBBINS: — There is a penal bond in effect. If the legal people acting on behalf of the family take the approach of going to the courts, the penal bond could take effect.

MR. KATZMAN: — Supplementary question. Is it not true that SGI is the insurer and they are indicating that they will not accept responsibility? That is why you are protecting them.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, that is totally incorrect.

Ultimate Responsibility for Insulation Problem

MRS. DUNCAN: — A question to the Premier. This whole horror story has involved many agencies and departments of your government — consumer affairs, social services, health, labor, attorney general. You are in on it through SGI. These people have not had a satisfactory answer from anyone. They have been shifted from here to here. No one wants to take responsibility or even assist them.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member has to have a question. I can't accept comments.

MRS. DUNCAN: — My question is, Mr. Premier, who is ultimately going to be responsible?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think we have to understand how this problem arose. A citizen of Saskatchewan decided he would insulate his home. He took advantage of a program of financial assistance offered by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. That was a decision he made. There is certainly no regulation of government which required him to so do. I am unaware of any direct involvement by the Department of Labour or by the Department of the Attorney General or by the Department of Consumer Affairs. If these are matters in which these departments should have acted pursuant to laws and

May 2, 1980

regulations in force, I would invite hon. members to direct the particular circumstances to me.

Nor am I aware of any involvement by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office. If there is an involvement, I would assist in looking into the matter if members opposite would indicate what the involvement was. It is our purpose to assist citizens to make decisions on their own and not our purpose to regulate all the decisions made by the citizens of Saskatchewan. Clearly there have been unfortunate circumstances arise in this case, clearly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I am having the greatest difficulty answering the question asked by the hon. member for Maple Creek, since we are getting so many other question asked by other hon. members, who doubtless will wish to put them when they are in order.

My answer is this: hon. members will know of the involvement of the various agencies concerned. I have not been made aware of any action by any agency which hon. members opposite thought to be inappropriate. If they will assist us by indicting the agencies which they feel have failed to perform the duties given to them by . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Answer the question!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

Proposal to Federal Minister of Agriculture on Two-Price Wheat

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Because of the two-price wheat system, the farmers in western Canada are losing an average \$1 million per week. What was the full proposal which you made to the federal Minister of Agriculture dealing with this two-price wheat system?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, the proposal we put forward to eh Minister of Agriculture was a very simple proposal — that the minimum be increased from \$4 to \$5 (\$5 being the production costs per bushel) and the maximum be \$6 per bushel.

MR. SWAN: — Supplementary to the minister. Would you not agree that merely to place a different set of minimum and maximum figures will do very little to rectify the problem but rather it will let it be an ongoing problem? farmers can continue to lose over the long haul vast number of dollars because of the subsidizing of the people who consume grains within Canada.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, if the objective of the two-price system or the Two-Price Wheat Act is a benefit to producers rather than consumer then I think it's a good act. That was the concept of western farmers in asking the federal government to implement such an act. I think on the basis of that concept we must continually provide adjustments to the act. It's time for an adjustment now.

SECOND READINGS

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth) moved second reading of Bill No. 88 — **An Act to provide for the Preservation, Interpretation and Development of Certain Aspects of Heritage Property in Saskatchewan.**

He said: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking today on second reading. I want to

begin with a general observation on one aspect of provincial culture which I believe is particularly relevant to the act under consideration. I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that all of us are busy people but all of us seem to find time for the things we think are important or the things we enjoy. Once or twice a week I try to get down to the Provincial Library and scan the table just to see what's on the legislative library table. among the things I like to look at are the weekly newspapers. I find half an hour or so with the weekly newspapers is a reintroduction to the topics of the day as they exist in the province's non-metropolitan areas.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, there is a new thread running through all these journals and it's news of Celebrate Saskatchewan. As they have on past occasions and I hope they continue to in the future, the people of Saskatchewan know how to stage and how to support a birthday party. You can read all about it in the weekly press, not merely stories of committee meetings and community projects but you also see repeated on a growing number of papers the imprint of a stylized wheat sheaf which is the symbol of Celebrate Saskatchewan. Yesterday evening we saw the same thing on the Leader-Post in Regina.

Mr. Speaker, I mention this just to let you know the public support for the provincial birthday party is to merely widespread now but it continues to spread and grow and become more pervasive. From my observations there won't be a single Saskatchewan community which fails to observe in some fashion our 75th anniversary.

In light of this I think it's appropriate to spend a moment to try to determine what it is that motivates Saskatchewan people to act this way. I've some suggestions to offer. I suggest first, that they're celebrating because they want to. Their actions are clearly those that come from the heart. A practical matter of course, is that they have something to celebrate. The general economic distress which is so widespread in

May 2, 1980

Canada will have much less of an impact here.

But along with these suggestions, Mr. Speaker, there is the matter of a deep-rooted love of heritage. The people of Saskatchewan are proud of their accomplishments, understandably proud of what they've accomplished in three-quarters of a century. By historical standard, that's only the twinkling of an eye, and in that period the people of many races have developed an undeveloped territory and turned it into a land of seemingly endless promise in agriculture, in natural resources, in human resources particularly in human resources.

Mr. Speaker, you know, as does every other member of this House that 75 years in the history of man is only the briefest span of time but it has been sufficient to give us an identifiable heritage and an identifiable culture. It will come as no surprise to anyone here when I say that tangible reminders of our heritage are under fire and in deep danger of eradication. In many Saskatchewan communities, the enemy of heritage is progress — successful economic progress. Every burgeoning Saskatchewan community (and there's no shortage of them) finds itself facing a planning problem in which there's no single, identifiable answer. At a time when developers want to plant a shopping centre here or an apartment building there or a string of town houses close by, the municipal authority faces that common conundrum. Do we wreck or do we preserve? Do we demolish or do we enshrine?

Mr. Speaker, it's a fact of progress (and you can see it in every Saskatchewan city, town and village) that the price of progress is high, high indeed when reckoned in terms of our heritage. There are hundred of communities with unresolved items on the order papers of the municipal councils. Those items represent some of the communities toughest problems. There are no easy answers to such questions. Should that abandoned school become a museum or a supermarket? Do we try to preserve the railway station or let the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) cart it off? Do we try to preserve the first town hall? And so it goes, right from Moosomin to Maple Creek, from North Portal to Uranium City.

Depression times, Mr. Speaker, were great for purposes of preservation, if nothing more. But that's behind us. All of us are thankful. Today we face the reality of progress, costly progress. Part of that costs deals with the irreparable loss of more of Saskatchewan's landmarks. A scholar once referred to Saskatchewan as a region of the mind and that's quite true. Saskatchewan has no identifiable, natural boundaries. It's a creation of politicians in 1905 spanning prairie, parkland, and boreal forest.

Despite this, and may because of it, Saskatchewan has developed a union and special culture based on many cultures and groups. We're the only province with more than 50 per cent of our population in rural areas. We're the only province with more than 50 per cent of our population not of English or French extraction. Each group has brought with it special cultural baggage such as crafts, language, lifestyles. But each has been modified by the land and by other immigrant groups. The result is a cultural hybridization. The whole is greater than the parts. Strongly influenced and altered by the environment we, as the people of Saskatchewan, have a unique cultural heritage but with that heritage comes an obligation. We must pass on some tangible reminders of that unique cultural heritage to our children, to our children's children and to our children's children's children.

In *The Grapes of Wrath*, Mr. Speaker, John Steinbeck describes the plight of the Okies — farmers forced to flee the American dustbowl. In one, I thought particularly apt

quote he said:

The women sat among the doomed things, turning them over, looking past them and back, saying, 'How could we live without our lives? How can we know it's us without our past?'

We must ask this of ourselves. How can we know it is us without our past? Steinbeck, of course, wrote of a time which saw the destruction of a way of life through natural and economic calamity. Today in times of prosperity in Saskatchewan, we face the same loss of our past, but from an entirely opposite reason. Each new urban development results in the demolition of an earlier existence. Each pipe line, each power line, the dam or road constructed, each mineral deposit developed could result in the destruction of a potentially significant archaeological resource. With our booming economy, this rate of heritage destruction is becoming appalling. We feel it is time, Mr. Speaker, particularly in 1980, to halt this uncontrolled destruction. We have no wish to curtail development; we see a portion of the past made part of our children's Saskatchewan inheritance.

We wish to give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to decide on the costs we will accept for economic development. Before these reminders of our past are destroyed or altered by development, we want to be able to evaluate them. We wish to see the people of Saskatchewan able to make a valid decision based on all the information. We want to see if there are at times, alternatives to destruction. We want to see if we can obtain a rational mixture of conservation and development. We don't wish to see everything preserved. That is clearly impossible, rather, we wish to see preserved portions of our past of significance to the people of Saskatchewan.

We must remember in many cases we are talking about non-renewable resources. Once they are gone, they can never be replaced. That is not just true of the Ukrainian and Russian shacks in Saskatchewan, with thatched roofs, it is true of some of our larger buildings as well. This Legislative Building could never be replaced in the form it is now. Many of the materials no longer exist, most of the skills have been lost. It is trite, of course, to say that this building has played a unique role in the province's history; construction began almost three years after Saskatchewan became a province. It was a tremendous effort for such a young government. It showed the optimism and confidence that our predecessors had, all of which of course, has now been verified. As heirs to this heritage, we have an obligation to ensure the continued existence of significant aspects of our past. In these days of world social and economic instability affecting our everyday lives, we and our children require an anchor, a sense of perspective, in order to relate to our surroundings. A society without a past is like a man without memory; he acts blindly.

Events have taken place in this province which have had a tremendous effect not only on the lives of the people of Saskatchewan but on the people of Canada and the world. Saskatchewan individuals have contributed to world literature, art, science, agriculture, technology. Saskatchewan has pioneered political and social reforms and these have left behind reminders that we as a people should recognize.

These men and women and these events should not be forgotten. Today we are coming to realize that it's more important to enhance the quality of life than the quality of our possessions. If we fail to do so, Mr. Speaker, we reach the ultimate irony, that of an affluent society dwelling in an environmental slum.

May 2, 1980

As we change from a consumer to a conserver society we learn to appreciate the tangible reminders of our predecessors. More and more studies and projects are showing the economic and environmental benefits of recycling older structures and areas.

Mr. Speaker, this being 1980, many institutions, many groups, and many individuals have adopted a Celebrate Saskatchewan project. These vary from the mundane, an individual keeping a diary, to some rather fanciful projects. Last night I saw the Leader-Post and the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix together had produced a historical map. Perhaps this act, Mr. Speaker, might be viewed as the Celebrate Saskatchewan project of the Legislative Assembly, our contribution to preserving our heritage.

Mr. Speaker, the government is now introducing legislation in response to serious public concern over the features of our past. We've been working on this act for more than two years. We have looked at legislation and programs now in operation in Canada and other countries. We've consulted with the Saskatchewan Heritage Advisory Board, with other government departments, with rural and urban municipal governments, with the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, with concerned groups and individuals from across the province from historical societies to boards of trade and chambers of commerce. We have held eight public hearings.

This has resulted in a report by a consultation committee which I introduced a couple of weeks ago, the Bergstrom report. All this was undertaken to ensure that we prepare the best possible legislation to suit the present and future needs of the people in Saskatchewan in the area of heritage conservation.

I think it's indicative, Mr. Speaker, of the difficulty of legislating in the area, notwithstanding the expensive preparation, that there will still be some House amendments to the bill. I suspect there will be amendments in years hereafter to this particular piece of legislation. It deals with a most difficult area.

The legislation before this House, Mr. Speaker, gives the municipalities of this province the power to protect heritage resources of significance and concern to them. It's important to note that the legislation is enabling and not compulsory. Municipalities may opt in but need not. We have respected municipal autonomy.

It gives the province the responsibility for protection of property of extraordinary provincial importance. It further gives the province the responsibility for the protection of archaeological sites. It gives the public the opportunity to participate in heritage decision-making to advisory committees in a process of appeals. It establishes a heritage review board and retains the Saskatchewan Heritage Advisory Board. It gives both municipalities and the province the authority to issue a stop order for a short period of time to ensure evaluation of what may be an important historical resource.

Mr. Speaker, when we prepared this legislation we had to decide on the implications of designation. Is designation a form of expropriation or is it a matter of zoning? That is a key question. Designation as proposed in this legislation would not affect the ownership of the property nor prevent its transfer or sale. Rather, designation affects the use of the property and the activities which can take place on that property.

We accepted the recommendations of the Bergstrom report that designation is a matter of zoning, land use planning. Designation indeed, Mr. Speaker, is a kind of zoning for a very particular purpose. At the same time we recognize a decision of

this nature, taken either by the province or the municipalities affects the landowner. Therefore, at almost every step in the process, we have built-in appeal procedures in almost every case, through a court of law or court of record. These procedures are provided to assure a fair public review.

Too often in the past, Mr. Speaker, decisions affecting the environment of cities and towns were taken sub rosa, with no public input or consultation. Buildings have been demolished overnight with no means of public input. Major archaeological sites have been intentionally obliterated. Renters have found their homes and offices demolished with no consultation.

While this legislation in no way guarantees these events won't be repeated, it allows the public forum, for the government, for the owner and the interested public, to discuss their concerns and hopefully reach a satisfactory resolution of a common concern.

Mr. Speaker, the government believes that in a period of prosperity and growth such as this province faces in the next decade, it is necessary to ensure that we are not blinded by the promises of development. We must strive to retain and preserve those portions of our past which make the Saskatchewan experience unique. We are proposing, by this legislation, a set of instruments that the province and the local municipalities can use to determine how they can best cushion and ameliorate the changes we will face in the years ahead. We have a duty, an obligation to future generations which we cannot ignore.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to provide for the Preservation, Interpretation and Development of Certain Aspects of Heritage Property in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in support of the bill. I want to begin by thanking the Minister of Culture and Youth for bringing forward this bill at a time when a mechanism for preserving heritage and archaeological property in the province was very badly needed.

As all members will know, we have lost, over the last few years in Saskatoon, some of our finest buildings. One can go back a few years to think of the old ire hall which was torn down. More recently the Capitol Theatre was lost. Many other valuable buildings in the city have been lost. I think this bill provides the means for enabling the city of Saskatoon and all other municipalities in the province to act with speed and in the same way provide the appeal avenues, which are needed for developers in the business community, to ensure that all sides of a question are heard with respect to views on the heritage property and a decision can be judiciously made.

We know, over the past few years, a large number of archaeological objects have been moved across the Saskatchewan border and have been lost to the province. Once again this bill will put a stop to this. I think that, very rightly, the protection of archaeological property rests with the provincial government rather than with local bodies. I am very pleased that the minister has taken that course.

I also want to say I am pleased to see that this bill provides municipal governments with the full slate of powers which I think they need to ensure that heritage property is protected. There is no sense in placing the onus for heritage protection on the

May 2, 1980

municipalities unless they have all the powers which are needed to ensure that this can be done. This is something that I would welcome all members of the House to consider. If they see additional powers that the municipalities may need to more fully undertake their responsibilities in this field, I think that is something important to look for and to make sure they are in this bill. But I think the powers that are laid out now are adequate. I want to thank the minister for including many of my suggestions in this particular area in the bill.

The bill also provides municipalities with the flexibility they need in approaching the decision of whether to preserve a site and how much and what part of the site to preserve. Members will notice that under the legislation the municipality can opt to designate the entire site. It may choose to integrate an existing heritage site into a new development. It may wish to set a series of conditions with respect to preservation of certain parts of the site, or it may simply want to act to preserve artefacts from the site in the event that demolition is to take place. I think this, again, is an example of improvement over the Ontario model which in many places has been followed in the bill. I think we have strengthened the Ontario model. The current legislation should provide municipalities with basically the mechanism they need to make sure local input is achieved before a decision is made and to begin to act to make sure we don't have the loss of any more valuable heritage properties in Saskatchewan.

I want to again thank the Minister of Culture and Youth. I know this piece of legislation will be well received in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I want to very briefly support the position the hon. member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has just taken and also the remarks made by the minister in his delivery this morning.

I would like to say that in the city of Moose Jaw we have had a typical example of the lack of legislation up to this date enabling the municipality to take some concrete action in the preservation of some of the historic sites. I can only mention one, of course, that the hon. minister is well familiar with and that is the Victoria School which was demolished here within the past year or thereabouts. The Victoria School itself was the first school in the Northwest Territories. But unfortunately the big ball went to work on it and that was the end of that historic site. We do have another site in Moose Jaw now, one of the old bank buildings, which probably has some very historic remembrances for many, many people in the area. I think the municipality of Moose Jaw, the city council, is waiting for the legislation to be passed so it will have a vehicle with which to proceed preserving not only the bank building but possibly other buildings in the area.

It is remarkable when one looks at the history of our province (even though it is a very short history) that the way we are going now we will not have any of our historic sites left unless there is immediate action taken. I think all of us watched television the other day, Mr. Speaker, and saw in Amsterdam where the new Queen was being installed. There they said it was a new church that the ceremonies were taking place in. Now if I remember correctly, the new church was 300 years old. I think in this province we have to recognize that we must keep some of our history. Even though it is a short history down the line we have to leave something for our young people to remember this province and remember Canada by.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the minister for introducing this bill and having it on the order paper. No doubt it will record unanimous support. It will give the municipalities the right to proceed in the way they would like to proceed.

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I will just be very brief at this point. I would share the minister's observations about the need in all communities in the province, small and large, to preserve what we would call heritage property. I think there's very definite need and I also agree that this is a very apt time to do that in our Celebrate Saskatchewan year.

I believe that certainly it is a complex bill, as the minister has said, and as everyone will know who has had even a glance at it. I do believe it has some very wide-reaching implications for owners of property which could come under designation, and I would like to look at it much more carefully, Mr. Speaker. so with that in mind, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 87 — **An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to the House these amendments to The Teachers' Superannuation Act. These amendments result from the successful completion of a new collective bargaining agreement with teachers. And under that agreement we undertake to move forward and place into legislation such changes in teachers' superannuation as are required to be covered by legislation as quickly as possible.

The members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, will recall the unanimous approval they gave to earlier amendments to The Teachers' Superannuation Act during the fall sitting of this legislature. The legislation arising out of these amendments significantly and favorably altered the pension plan of teachers in Saskatchewan. In order to place the proposed amendments that I have here today before you in their proper context, I shall highlight briefly the substance of the most significant amendments to the act that were approved during out last fall session.

The average earnings formula plan, as it's called will provide, effective July 1, 1980, a pension based upon the average of the five best-salaried years in a teacher's career for past and current teachers. The government will begin matching the contributions of teachers, thus providing to the participants in this plan greater assurance that the cost of their retirement benefits will be met both now and in the future.

Also effective on July 1, 1980, what is called an annuity plan will be established, based not upon the average earnings formula principle, but upon the principle of payment as you go. The annuity plan will yield benefits comparable to those of the formula plan and because the plan will grow in value through matched contributions from teachers and the government together with interest, it will essentially be a fully funded plan with no additional costs that have to be met by future generations. The annuity plan will apply to teachers entering the profession on or after July 1, 1980, and to those teachers currently participating in the average earnings formula plan who consider it in their interest or to their advantage to transfer to the new annuity plan.

Concerning this last matter of transfer, Mr. Speaker, there are several significant advantages to be taken into account by teachers when contemplating a transfer of participation from the average earnings plan to the annuity plan. This applies particularly to teachers who decide to change career paths after providing only limited service to the teaching profession. Those teachers who do not have their teacher-related pension contributions locked into the formula plan because of their age and/or service, and who do not elect to accept a refund of their contributions upon leaving the profession, or those teachers whose contributions are locked into the formula plan

May 2, 1980

and who elect to transfer to the annuity plan, will enjoy the advantages of a pension plan in the form of an annuity for the period of service provided as a teacher.

Such an annuity, Mr. Speaker, will be based on the moneys in the teachers superannuation account, which will consist not only of the teachers' personal contributions to the formula plan together with interest, but also of matching government contributions and growth of the combined total, over time, at prevailing interest rates. Mr. Speaker, another provision provided for teachers through amendments passed in this House last fall is that teachers who are locked into the formula plan, by virtue of at least 10 years of teaching service, and who are at least 45 years of age, now have the option of transferring their participation to the annuity plan. Existing legislation, however, does not provide a similar transfer option to those teachers who have taught for at least 10 years but are not 45 years of age. Mr. Speaker, new section 34(2.2) of this bill proposes that all those who are locked into the formula plan by virtue of having provided 10 years of teaching service will be provided also with a two-year option to transfer to the annuity plan, effective July 1, 1980. The additional advantages relating to the transfer option which I cited earlier, Mr. Speaker, will therefore become available to this group of teachers as well.

A second amendment of note contained in this bill, Mr. Speaker, applies to the provision of refunds. New section 34(5) provides that teachers, who are locked into the formula plan because they have completed a minimum of 10 years of teaching service and who ceased teaching prior to July 1, 1980 will be able to apply for a refund of their contributions prior to July 1, 1981. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, provides a further element of flexibility within the teachers' superannuation plan.

Mr. Speaker, the other amendments contained in this bill may be categorized in two ways. First, amendments of a housekeeping nature are proposed for section 11, providing that the staff of the teachers' superannuation commission may also participate within the scope of The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act, and for section 48 to provide consistency with previous amendments which were approved for other sections of the act at the fall sitting. And second, amendments to section 55(7) are proposed in accordance with the request from the federal Department of National Revenue with which the teachers' superannuation plan is registered.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks. I move second reading of An Act to Amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I spoke in some detail and length in the fall with the first amendments to the act. All I would say is that I think the opportunity for people to transfer from the average earning pension plan to the annuity plan is a benefit for teachers. We will be supporting these amendments.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 89 — **An Act Respecting the Prevention and Suppression of Fire Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today is designed to upgrade the standards of fire protection and suppression in this province. The protection of life and property from fire is a continuing concern of this government. This fact is illustrated by a number of regulations implemented over the past two years to increase the

effectiveness of fire prevention.

In June of 1978 improved regulations governing fire safety in apartment buildings took effect. Effective December of 1978 stringent regulations pertaining to oil burners, oil burning equipment and appliances using combustible liquids were implemented. Regulations concerning the installation of automatic sprinkler systems became effective in February of 1979. Improved fire safety standards in hotels were covered in regulations taking effect in April of 1979, and in this same month regulations governing concrete and masonry fireplaces, chimneys, flues, and factory built fireplaces and chimneys were instituted. I am now suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that The Prevention Act itself be amended to make it consistent with requirements of present day fire protection and investigation, and as effectively enforceable as possible.

By your leave, Mr. Speaker, I'll briefly run through the amendments and provide the formula for some of the more important aspects of it. One of the major amendments concerned in say, new subsection dealing with the liability of inspectors, the subsection stipulates that no civil action applies to the minister or inspector for matters or things done by an inspector in good faith in the performance of his duties. The intent is to provide a deterrent to unwarranted actions being instituted against the minister or inspector. This subsection is consistent with similar legislation in other parts of the country and is in fact contained in many of our provincial safety service acts, such as The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act, The Gas Inspection and Licensing Act, etc.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment does not prohibit legitimate civil action being taken regarding any wilful or unlawful act of an inspector. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, there has been a substantial increase in acts of vandalism on fire alarm systems and fire protection equipment in assembly, educational, residential and institutional occupancies. In many cases, tests have shown that tampering has rendered the equipment inoperative. This endangers life and property in the event of fire. To remedy this situation a new section is proposed to make tampering with fire equipment an offence and to recommend a severe enough penalty to at least reduce, we hope, such acts of vandalism.

During alterations and renovations to hotels, schools, places of public assembly and other occupancies the required means of egress are often blocked or in some situations have been removed, constituting a serious hazard in the event of fire. A proposed amendment would make this an offence, with the contractor involved liable to a severe penalty unless he had received written permission of the fire commissioner authorizing blockage or removal of the exit.

A number of definitions in the present act no longer conform to those used in recognized national codes and standards. This creates conflicts and confusion between groups using these standards, such as architects, engineers and contractors and those charged with enforcing the act and its regulations. Several proposed definitional amendments will remove these areas of confusion. For example, it is proposed that the definition of apartment building and institution be changed to conform with the national building code. In addition it is proposed that the definition of a flammable liquid be amended to comply with the National Fire Code of Canada. As well, it is proposed that new definitions such as combustible liquid be added to the act to promote administrative consistency. In keeping with the National Fire Code of Canada, a combustible liquid is defined as any liquid with a flash point at, or above, 37.8 degrees Celsius and below 93.3 degrees Celsius.

May 2, 1980

The schedule of fines for offences under the act has not been revised for a number of years and does not today reflect the dollar values of the 1980s. The proposed amendment would delete the minimum fines in the applicable sections of the act and increase the maximum to an amount which will serve as a deterrent. Now, for example, upon conviction for failure to comply with an order of a fire inspector, a negligent person is liable for a fine of up to \$200 per day while non-compliance continues.

Some amendments are required to provide flexibility and avoid unnecessary amendments. For example, the act presently specifies that certain installations and equipment must meet with the approval of specific agencies, such as the National Research Council and the Canadian Standards Association. It is proposed that the fire commissioner be given the power to designate approved agencies, thereby eliminating the need to amend the act when these agencies change.

The foregoing represent the major areas of amendment concerning The Fire Prevention Act. Mr. Speaker, I will not bore the House by explaining in great detail the remainder of the amendments contained in the bill. The other amendments primarily relate to the current legislation, correcting and deleting out-of-date phrases, making certain aspects of the bill more all inclusive, and altering appeal and reporting-time periods. For example, an amendment would prohibit the sale and installation of non-approved smoke or heat alarms, thereby reducing the danger of fire hazards. In addition some amendments concern an expansion in the scope of the appeal process. An increase in the time limit for lodging appeals is also incorporated in the amendment.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments we are considering today do much to modernize and standardize the fire prevention service throughout the province. They simply make more effective an already effective piece of legislature. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Minister, first of all let me comment that the intentions you indicate on the bill are basically, as you have said, to bring the act more up-to-date with modern conditions. As the minister is aware, arson is becoming a major problem in the province of Saskatchewan and across Canada. Investigation of all fires is a very important aspect, especially in cases where people think arson may be involved. These amendments seem to indicate it would be easier for the officials of your department and officials appointed by your department to assist them when the overload is there to do a better job.

There are some areas of concern, and you touched on one of them, which is the flash point of some particular gases. They are not to be allowed in apartment houses, and so forth. In some of the rural areas this may cause a problem. I will be asking later to adjourn debate because I will be meeting with some rural fire people to check the opinions on certain parts of this bill.

Mr. Minister, the definition section does make some interesting suggestions. Take five or more dwellings. I think of several apartment houses and big homes that have four groups of people living in them. I wonder if they are covered or not? I realize you are bringing this in line with another code but I suggest maybe there is additional wording we could put in there to tighten it up a little bit. We have three or four families living in one older home (and you see many of these in Saskatoon and Regina) but it is not called

an apartment building. I realize when you get to the word dwelling further on in your descriptions, you may be covered there, but I am not certain and that is why I bring it to your attention. Hopefully, in closing debate, you can indicate whether I am correct or incorrect on this issue. I hope they are covered.

As you go through your bill, you get to the suggestion of making provisions for training courses in fire-fighting and fire prevention. I would hope your department, in co-operation with municipal affairs and rural affairs, will be able to explain to all the citizens, where fire protection is not available, the benefits of the volunteer fire brigades, and the coverage and training available to them. I also hope you would make recommendations to assist them in buying the best value for their money to protect the citizens of their area.

Your investigations into fires disturbs me a little because I am not sure you will find enough qualified people in rural areas to assist you in the time frame you indicate they have to be investigated within. Hopefully you will indicate in your closing remarks how you are going to cover that problem. I refer to some small towns where they have the volunteers only and not a paid fire department. Do you plan to use the larger communities, full-time staff to assist you or do you intend to give training to rural people so that volunteer brigades can assist? I am certain you can clarify that as you go.

No action proceedings against the minister, local assistant or municipal inspector — I think you cleared that up. If I am correct, Mr. Minister I would appreciate a nod of the head or not. You said where they went beyond the normal point action can be taken? What is considered normal? Am I correct — in your speech you just made?

MR. SNYDER: — Any willful or unlawful.

MR. KATZMAN: — Willful or unlawful. Find, that solves the problem I was having with the one.

In your rural municipality — the portion there I agree with you. Investigation of fires, as I said earlier, is an important issue as is the time frame. I am glad to see that you have put in the power to enter upon a premises to put out a fire because I understand in one case (and this was many years ago in Saskatoon) the firemen were refused permission to go into a building. That didn't last long; they went in anyway but it seemed very foolish that should happen.

The investigation shall begin within three days, not including Sunday. Once again, as I referred to earlier, staff requirements bother me on this one. I think it is very important that investigation take place as soon as possible so that those who are affected do not have problems with their insurance companies because of suggestions that there may or may not have been arson. The faster your people make the report, the faster that whatever insurance company is involved will get the claim solved and the people who are affected will be covered.

I don't quite understand what the \$2 for reporting a fire is all about and if that's just to cover the cost and time of filling out the paper. I assume that you have had discussions with somebody to clarify it. You indicate that each fire insurance company shall furnish to the fire commissioner, on forms provided, monthly statements of each fire that occurs in the province which it has an interest in. I understand that's how it is presently. Is there a time limit? For example, for November you would have to have the return in by

December 15? Is there enough time limit left there? It doesn't seem to indicate that in the bill or it may be covered under regulations. I would be concerned about that because as one who has done filing of sales tax and other things, sometimes the time lag between the end of the month and the time of reporting is very short. And some of these companies may not even have offices in this province which would complicate the problem even more.

The clause, arson presumed — I am wondering if we have enough legal power to make sure that we are totally covered. And as I indicated when I started to speak, arson is becoming a major problem in the country. During the hard times it seems to be a way out for some people which is an unfortunate circumstance. When we get into arson, are we suggesting that the person who lit the fire is responsible, or are we talking about somebody who hired him to light the fire? I refer to the case in Saskatoon of some lumber yard company which became very interesting as it proceeded through the courts. In fact, if my memory serves me correctly, somebody was hired to light the fire, the person hiring him was charged and was let off. Then in the subsequent court case where the fire lighter was charged, the person who hired him admitted he hired him to light the fire. It was a rather interesting circumstance, and I hope there is sufficient protection here to make sure that all those who would cause willful damage can be prosecuted.

Mr. Minister, it is unfortunate that the member for Saskatoon-Centre can't keep his nose into his business so that we might get through these estimates without the remarks he likes to make under his breath, but loud enough for the whole House to hear. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh yes, he has.

Mr. Minister, I'm not sure — in your section where you allow the appeal to a judge, if that is appealable again, as is in most cases, from a lower court to a higher court, because you indicate that the decision of the judge shall be final. I don't know if that means he can go to the next level or not.

Those are some of the issues, Mr. Minister, that are bothering me, and I am concerned. You later on indicate about entering a building and you don't know who the occupant or the owner is. I'm just wondering how often you would get into that kind of situation and if it is required to be written in this piece of legislation?

The fine section which you make reference to in your speech — not more than \$1,000, and a further fine of \$100 for each day after conviction upon such an offence. The question there becomes: is it the date of the conviction, when it was laid down? Is there an allowance of say, 30 days to repair, and then the fine begins? How do you decide that, or is it just as the words indicate — that is \$1,000 and then if you are found guilty today, \$100 for every day it takes you to clean it up? I'm wondering if there is sufficient time allowed there.

There is some concern about where you suggest in 23(1) in the hotel section — the using of heating material — and I question how this would affect the kitchens of some of these particular establishments, and the way they keep food warm for major events, as we had last evening.

Once again, the standard provision that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations always bothers me, and I would wish to see some of these regulations ahead of time to see how they go with this bill. I don't know if that will be possible from the minister, but regulations in some cases, even though they are supposedly

compatible with the bill, will make some additional requirements above the bill that we are not aware of. Therefore, I think it would be important to have an indication of what your regulations are to be.

On tampering with exit doors, I agree with you 100 per cent. It is unfortunate when you see and hear of major fires where people are killed because some stupid fool (there's no other way to explain it) piled something beside the door and people couldn't get out. It is a tragedy. I'm glad to see this bill is trying to take some strong action. The only thing I question is that the fine may not be heavy enough for anybody who would do such a foolish act which might take lives of others. Tampering with fire equipment, false alarms, and so forth, is a very tough area to police. Hopefully you have something in mind that will assist you in doing it.

Mr. Minister, as I indicated earlier, the principle of this we agree with. As I indicated earlier I will be meeting with some fire people over the weekend on this particular bill. I was planning to adjourn the debate on this issue but I think, if the minister would like to respond to some of the questions, I could do most of the other things I need on item 1 in committee of the whole. Therefore, in principle we agree totally with the idea you're trying to protect. In principle we agree with this bill. Therefore, rather than delay it, I will ask more on item 1 after I have my meeting with these people over the weekend. We will be voting in favor of the principle of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — CO-OPERATION AND CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT — VOTE 6

Item 1 (continued)

MR. CHAIRMAN: — When we adjourned the other day we were dealing with the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, item 1. Is item 1 agreed?

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — I have a number of other questions, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to ask the minister.

I notice with some degree of pleasure that efforts are being made by the department to implement some co-operative programs in the school system. I also notice there is no requirement at the present time that those programs become a part of the school curriculum. I would like to urge the minister, in conjunction with the Minister of Education, to work towards making co-operative programs a basic part of the school system. In addition to that, to work at making the history of the co-operative movement a basic part of the school curriculum. I think it is very unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the school system in Saskatchewan now teaches a broad variety of social studies programs and that the history of the co-op movement, which is a central part of the history of our province, is not a basic part of the curriculum. So I would be interested in the minister's comments on that area and whether he might consider working with the Minister of Education to make that a reality?

HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that one always wants to work with various groups of people and particularly when you are dealing in educational matters, you do want to deal with the people in the Department of Education. That is exactly what we as a department did when we put the co-operative material as resource material into the schools, we

May 2, 1980

worked with the Department of Education and with people who deal in education. Certainly this would be no different if we were to suggest to the Department of Education that what we now have as resource material go into the curriculum. I don't think it would be right for me, as the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, to suggest that this material should go into the curriculum. I think we can work with the department and with the people in education to look at the situation to see whether it is feasible. However, I think we have to leave the basically with the people who deal in curriculum and so on and so forth and I think that's the Department of Education.

I think we can assure the member we will certainly be continuing to work with the Department of Education to see that, if anything, can be done in that regard.

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, I have another question along this line. One of the very fundamental concerns I have with respect to the education system in the province is that it's primarily, in my view, based on competition rather than co-operation. I think it is somewhat ironic that our society here in Saskatchewan, which is one which has its historic roots very much based on co-operative principles, is essentially still continuing to operate an educational system primarily based on competition. The very fundamental nature of the system, of course, is a system of grading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. State your point of order.

MR. SWAN: — I understood that Peter was discussing the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development and the member is raising the Department of Education. Now which one have we got in here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well we have the Department of Co-operation in here and . . . Order! It's my understanding that the hon. member was discussing a co-operative education package the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development had put together and that he was discussing it in connection with the schools. I think it is probably relevant. I call on the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland.

MR. PREBBLE: — My question is whether the minister would be prepared to consider working with the Minister of Education to look at how the school system in this province could be organized on more of a co-operative basis, to see how the basic principles of co-operation could be built into the way we run our school system? I would like to urge the minister, for instance, to work with the Minister of Education and the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development to work with local schools to see whether:

1. Purchasing could be done on a co-operative basis;
2. Student co-ops could be organized in each one of the schools across the province;
3. We could run co-operative cafeterias in the school system run by the students;
4. The students could look at the co-operative purchase of school supplies;
5. The students could organize co-operative garden projects.

I would like to ask the minister whether he would consider this and whether any type of review is under way right now, in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the school trustees and the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development with the Minister of Education, to look at how the competitive nature of the school system might be reduced?

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with the member with regard to competition in the schools. I don't think there is any question that we do have a competitive system. We (as a matter of fact, just two weeks ago) have started with regard to competition, the co-operative games. At that time we had a well known individual in co-operatives come to Saskatchewan from Ottawa, Dr. Terry Orlick. He had seminars in Regina and Saskatoon addressing that very point of competition. I

May 2, 1980

think the seminars went well. Certainly, some of that will find its way into the schools because where you have to start the process is in the schools.

With regard to other co-operatives, I think we are always interested in developing co-operatives of any kind. I think looking at such things as co-operatives for students, cafeteria co-operatives, book co-operatives or whatever, we are doing studies and research on these kinds of projects at all times. I am very interested in that as a matter of fact.

I was just speaking to some students two or three days ago with regard to the possibility of setting up a purchasing co-operative in a school right in this very city.

With regard to co-op gardens, I am very interested in that as well. As a matter of fact, when I was the minister in 1974-75 the opportunity to visit at Antigonish, Nova Scotia which, one might say, is one of the greatest co-operative areas in this country. I visited those people and found that some of the sisters and the priests at Antigonish had lots of co-op gardens. They were especially good for senior citizens. The senior citizens, they told me, were saving up to \$25 to \$30 a month on their grocery bill by having these co-operative gardens. At the same time, they were able to get together during the day while they were looking after their gardens and certainly the items which the hon. member mentioned.

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, what planning has taken place with respect to the completion of a co-operative gardens model? I notice that is referred to as one of the projects which is mentioned in the annual report. I wonder if he could inform the House on that matter?

MR. CODY: — Yes, we have a model of a co-operative set -up to do gardening. The model is available for anyone who wishes to have it. I would certainly be quite prepared to give the model to the hon. member. If he has people he thinks can develop a co-operative like this, we would be more than happy and more than interested in trying to develop it.

MR. PREBBLE: — I thank the minister for that. I would enjoy getting a copy of the model. I would like to say that I think there is a need for the department to meet with various municipalities around the province, Mr. Chairman, and to urge municipalities to encourage the establishment of co-operative allotment gardens, particularly in the urban areas in Saskatchewan. I think of many of the new subdivisions, for instance the urban areas in Saskatchewan. I think of many of the new subdivisions, for instance, that are being developed in Saskatoon. Often, in the midst of trailer courts and apartment blocks, there's very little garden space. I think one of the worth-while projects that could emerge out of this is space being set aside in the subdivision planning for co-operative garden allotments. I wonder if the minister might consider his department pursuing that project? I think that one of the other areas where these gardens could make a contribution is in terms of their provisions for handicapped people. Now that's something I'd very much like to see.

MR. CODY: — Yes, I think we can certainly consider those things. You only have so many people to go around to develop various projects and programs. However, I think the point is well taken and certainly we will ask the department to see if there is a possibility of doing a little bit more, not only research but development, in the area you mentioned.

MR. PREBBLE: — I have a question, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the grants to credit unions — the \$52,000 in the budget this year for assistance to credit unions for counselling with respect to low-income earners. I want to say to the minister I'm very pleased to see that grant in the budget.

What I'd like to propose to the minister is that we go beyond this as a government and sit down with some of the credit unions and see whether a matching program, a joint arrangement, if you like, could be worked out with respect to reducing the interest rates that low-income members of credit unions are currently facing. The proposal I'd have in mind, Mr. Chairman, is if a particular credit union were willing to reduce the interest rate on a loan by 1 per cent or 2 per cent, under such a program the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development would match that reduction. So if a local credit union were willing to reduce interest rates by 1 per cent to low-income borrowers, we would accordingly subsidize by another 1 per cent for a total of a 2 per cent reduction. I wonder if the minister would consider that kind of a possibility.

MR. CODY: — Well, once again, yes, we would consider it. But one has to be very careful when one's talking about this kind of program. We don't want to have a program which may appear to be discriminatory. This could be one that could be in that category. I know the officials of the department have talked to people we have helped get counselling and asked them the question, do you think you would like to have a reduction of interest rates? They said no. They don't want to be singled out as a different class of persons being helped in this regard. What they're really looking for is some help in getting their debt package in order, that kind of thing.

That's exactly what this program is meant to do. Not to suggest that one couldn't have the program. If some people were in need and we could convince them in that regard, of course we could do it. But I think one has to be very careful when you start looking at programs which could be to some degree discriminatory.

I would want to say to the member that we are always in consultation with the credit union movement and this is one of the programs I'm sure the officials have talked about with the credit union movement. We'll certainly keep it in mind and do so in the future.

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, one of my concerns with respect to development in Saskatoon right now is the shortage of trailer court space in the city. We haven't had a trailer court built in the city for many years. The private sector seems to be unwilling to move into that area since it's obviously not as lucrative as some of the other development projects they may undertake. The city of Saskatoon also seems to be unwilling to move into this area. I think that one of the logical initiatives the department of co-operation could be taking is with respect to attempting to organize co-operative trailer courts in the city, trailer courts that would be owned by the residents themselves, in which they would have an equity position — trailer courts which, for a change, could be laid out in such a way that there would be recreational space as part of the court, some other open space areas and decent lot sizes for a change. I wonder if the minister would consider this as a priority for staff within the department of co-operatives in the coming year with respect to Saskatoon?

MR. CODY: — Well, I am not suggesting that it would be a priority because we are here to develop co-operatives. We are not in the housing business necessarily. We do have co-operative housing programs and what have you, but at the same time if you are looking at housing, it really belongs rightfully in the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. We have offered assistance to the city of Saskatoon with regard to mobile

homes; the response has been just mediocre from the trailer people as well as from the city. I think one has to tread lightly on this. This is not to suggest that we don't want to have co-operative trailer courts because they would be a better operation than a private one, but nevertheless we want to tread reasonably lightly on this.

I want to say again that we have offered this assistance. We are also working at the present time with a trailer park operation on the east part of Saskatoon, that is, Parkland Villa. They are wanting us to develop a co-operative. As soon as we get some indication that the city might be willing to do a portion of what their necessities are (which is water) then we will have a better opportunity to try to develop that trailer park into a co-operative.

I say tread lightly, however, at the same time I think your suggest is a good one. We will certainly be working with any group which comes forward. However, I don't think we would want to be fronting it, because we would be treading in an area where the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation rightly should be.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you brought in a subject which I was sort of debating to leave alone, but the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland want to get into the Parkland Villa situation (that's where he was aiming) as well as the Sutherland trailer court problem and the one out in Mayfair.

I think the minister is aware that almost a year ago the Parkland people came to you and your department put so many conditions and clauses in their way, there was no way they could agree to those conditions, for them to have removed the present owners at the trailer park and then to have become a co-operative. Over a year ago they tried to make an arrangement for your department to assist them, and your department put so many strings in their way, they were unable to do it. That's why we have the mess today for the benefit of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. They are part of the problem, not part of the cure, because the people went to them for a cure. If the minister wants to respond, I'll come back after his comments.

MR. CODY: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Rosthern is completely incorrect. I didn't expect it would be any different, of course. He certainly is not correct. Let's face the facts. When you set up a co-operative, you have to set it up so that it becomes a viable organization. It is no different from any other kind of organization. It has to be viable. We cannot at any particular time say, yes here's a co-operative for you, then have it fail. What would you say then? I know what the member would say. He would say, well, they didn't look into the viability; they didn't do that. They gave grants when they know they shouldn't have and a whole raft of things.

You have to look at the viability of the operation before you can have a co-operative. In this particular case, the place wasn't even for sale basically. How can you develop something that isn't for sale, with a group of people? They could have purchased it at a very high price but at the same time that high price would have made it non-viable. After all we have to have some strings attached before we can set up a co-operative.

MR. KATZMAN: — I'm glad you put the key word on there — viability. This was part of the reason you attached some many strings to your proposal. In your department's opinion it wasn't viable. I would argue with the minister that the land wasn't for sale, but we can argue that one till the cows come home because we both know the situation today.

Mr. Minister, let me ask the obvious question, which goes back to Mr. Prebble's statements. The city of Saskatoon has not developed any trailer parks, he gets up and says. Yet it's interesting to know that the city of Saskatoon, in the last while, made available many trailer lots for the citizens of the area, and yet the citizens didn't want to buy them. They refused even though the city of Saskatoon was trying to assist, and if it would have worked out we wouldn't have the Parkland Villa Estates problem today. But it didn't work out.

Is the member suggesting or is the minister suggesting that by the co-op route you will be able to provide lots of citizens wishing lots for trailers at a lower rate than the city of Saskatoon can, when they're doing it at cost? They're doing it not for a profit, but at cost. Or is the member suggesting to the minister (and is the minister accepting the suggestion) that you are going to go into the developing of lots and become a landlord rather than a co-operative where the members each buy their trailer park lot (50 feet by 100, which is what we're talking about)? Or in that area is he really suggesting (and is the minister in the backhanded way he usually does things, agreeing with the member from the back row) that yes, we will go into the business of developing and make some funny looking arrangements that indicate we're selling them? That's what I read coming between the two members — not a true co-operative in the spirit of the co-operative where the people are assisted to buy a lot to run as they want, and so forth, as the suggestion to you was — a new village, a new town, the status of a proper town. They would buy out the people in Parkland, would form a town, but you people put in too many strings and you and I both know, Mr. Minister, as a town they would qualify for the problems that they are having and the city of Saskatoon might bail them out. And we're back into Parkland Villa on that comment.

So I suggest, Mr. Minister, you said viability and therefore your department couldn't co-operate with Parkland's suggestion. I suggest the city of Saskatoon should be able to provide cost basis much cheaper than your system under a co-op which suggests lots available to them, and offers them to them. And actually Mr. Prebble is asking you to get into some thing that right now the city of Saskatoon seems to be looking after on their own. Maybe there's no need for you to get in there when somebody else is doing the job or trying to do the job, and the people are saying we don't want it. We don't need to get into things that people don't want us into.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member for Rosthern has asked a question of the minister responsible for the department and I think it's incumbent upon the minister to indicate whether he's prepared or not prepared to answer the question, as opposed to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland getting to post another question to the minister response for the department. I think this committee would be a lot more efficient if the minister was to indicate clearly to the member for Rosthern that he's going to reply to the question and answer the concerns of the member for Rosthern that relate to the city of Saskatoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. That's not a point of order. Members may ask questions, and ministers may or may not answer them. It's really up to the minister and it's a question of debate. I'll call on the hon. minister.

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason I didn't answer is because I didn't hear a question. I heard some comments, and as far as I'm concerned I take those comments and listen to them. If I can do something about it, I'll do something about it and if I can't I won't. I don't see any point in my answering something that wasn't posed as a question. If he wants to talk about lots in Saskatoon and what have you, I think he would want to

May 2, 1980

be talking to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban), or the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, or anyone like that. We're certainly not in the lots business or anything like that. If there's a group of people who come forward with some lots and say we want to have a co-operative, we'll try to develop them into a co-operative. But we have nothing to do with selling or buying lots or anything of the kind. So I don't think the question is even relevant as far as this department is concerned.

MR. KATZMAN: — A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The minister just made an indication on what he will and what he won't answer. I would hope he would do the same for both sides of the House (which he has just indicated he plans to do) and not be selective to whom he gives answers and whom he doesn't answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — That's not a point of order. The member knows it's not a point of order.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I want to attempt to wind things up here this morning. We don't have too long. I think it's incumbent upon me to draw to the attention of members in the Assembly that the minister responsible for the department and the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland are clearly in a concerted effort here to raise the government's concerns in this particular department. The whole thing is just a hoax. It's a waste of the Assembly's time. The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland sat with the minister and told him the questions he was going to ask him and the minister told the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland the answers he was going to give him. The whole thing was orchestrated. I think it's nothing short of embarrassment . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. State your point of privilege.

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, the member has no basis for knowing that at all, absolutely none. I just want to point out to the member that the answers from the minister can hardly appear to be planned when the minister has indicated to me that he very clearly disagrees . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — That's not a point of privilege or a point of order. It's a question of debate.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — State your point of order.

MR. ROMANOW: — My point of order is that the hon. member for Moosomin impugned the integrity of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland by suggesting (not suggesting, stating) that the question put were "cooked up questions." I don't want to make a big deal out of it, but I do say you can't go around saying that the member is acting not in good faith. We all assume that hon. members all act in good faith, on this side and the other side. That's my point of order.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, may I speak to the point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, I don't think it will be necessary.

MR. BIRKBECK: — May I proceed then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No. One moment, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I earlier ruled that the point of privilege raised by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland was not a point of privilege. In my view, as Chairman, it was a question of debate. The Attorney General has raised, on the same point of order, a question similar to the one by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland on which I again rule. In the view of the Chair, it's a question of debate. And I would point out to the hon. member that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has had an opportunity and always has an opportunity to participate in the debate.

I think that members may not reflect on the integrity of the hon. members on either side of the House. I didn't get from the remarks of the member for Moosomin that he was in any way questioning the integrity of the member. He was simply saying that in his view the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland had asked some questions and had given some notice to the member. That's done all the time. I've seen hon. members on the other side give ministers notice that they were going to ask a question. I think that's just a question of debate.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly would hasten to clear matters up and tell the members of the Assembly that I in no way am attempting to impugn the integrity of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, a very hon. member indeed. Although I do disagree with him on some of the points he was making during his questioning of the minister, I suppose it would be my responsibility to comment on some of those points.

He firstly suggested the co-operative movement as a part of Saskatchewan's history, as a part of Saskatchewan residents' roots, if you like, should be enshrined in the educational system. Certainly, I think, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, that has to be entirely out of order as a suggestion to your department and to the co-operative movement here in the province of Saskatchewan. Maybe the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland doesn't understand and I don't make any apologies for him in that particular area. There are many times when I don't understand certain workings of certain departments as well. He has maybe missed something here in this particular area. I would direct my comments more to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland in this particular area than I would to the minister.

There is a curriculum committee in place that would determine whether or not co-operatives should be enshrined in the educational system. That curriculum committee is made up of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, representation thereof, the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and of course the local school trustees board. I think the responsibility of that committee is to ascertain whether or not the co-operative movement in the province of Saskatchewan, as a part of our history, should be placed as a permanent part of our educational system. I would rather, as a member of this Assembly, place my trust and my confidence in that particular committee, to make that decision.

As the minister has said on many occasions, it's not his responsibility to say what group should form a co-operative or what educational system should be speaking about co-operatives. That is entirely a responsibility of individuals in our society who are in support of the co-operative movement. And if they feel that's essential and necessary then I think I would again trust them to make their representation to a curriculum committee in that regard.

I appreciate the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland expressing his views on his desire

May 2, 1980

personally to see the co-operative movement, as our history enshrined, in our educational system. I accept that as his views. I'm not saying that it is or it isn't mine. I'm only saying his manner of bringing that to pass, if you like, is entirely inappropriate, but there is a proper channel by which to direct those kinds of ideas and thoughts.

Secondly, he makes reference to co-operative gardens, and I have to question the importance of such an issue. I don't know where the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland lives precisely. I don't know whether in his block, if he lives in Saskatoon-Sutherland area (I'm sure he does live in his riding), he has initiated a co-operative garden practice. If there isn't one there, I would suggest the member is rather out of order in suggesting that it should maybe be in the backyard of the schools instead of swings and teeter-totters. I think he has to show his own initiative, and if there is a co-operative garden already in place out there, he could hold that up as an example.

He has asked the minister to supply to him personally the report on the model which the minister says is already complete and in place. Although I'm not planning a co-operative garden in my area in Moosomin (I just purchased a new home there late last year), I would none the less like to see the model just in case it is a very feasible project, and I might want to proceed with such a venture.

Again, in that particular area, speaking of co-operative games, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland alluded to the competition in the school system. He said the competition should be removed. The minister's reply to that was that we have co-operative games and they are nothing short of leapfrog. We did it all the time at school, and I don't know that playing leapfrog at school is going to remove the competition from the system.

Further to that I also believe that competition is the essence of learning. Certainly in anything, whether it is in education or in sports. I have found that you are never any better than your competition. Possibly that is one of the reasons why, on this side of the House, it has been so difficult to improve because as I say, you are only as good as your competition. We are not progressing at the rate we would perhaps like to. I think there is not too much of an issue there, rather a light concern made by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland.

Again, I will express respect for the member's ideas in that area. I do. I respect them. He believes that and I hold absolutely nothing whatsoever against the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland for suggesting we should have co-operative gardens in the backyards of the schools and in our cities, in the blocks and maybe around the trailer courts. I think that is entirely the responsibility of the member for Saskatoon Sutherland in fulfilling is responsibilities here in the House, as a member.

Now, I have to agree with the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland on his third point, or rather, Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased to see the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland supporting me in my comments yesterday with regard to reducing interest rates through the credit union system.

I accept the minister's response to the question of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, that it would be insulting, if you like, to the integrity of low-income earners, to make low interest rate loans available only to low-income earners. I accept that from the minister. I think that was a very responsible reply by the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development.

That is why, in my discussions in this area, it was my feeling and intent that the government should move to make sure the credit union system, Credit Union Central, has adequate working capital. If it wanted to move in the direction of an interest supplement to the credit unions in the way the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland described it; if they reduced the interest rate 1 per cent, then the government would respond with a further reduction of 1 per cent in terms of financial or dollar input into the system. I think that may be a credible way to approach that but it should not just include low-income earners. It should include the people the credit union systems themselves feel should be the benefactors of such reduced rates, if that were to be the case. I think that all makes sense and I commend the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland for raising that question along the same lines as I had raised it with the minister. I have to respect the minister's reply to it and yet going further, I have to say that maybe has to come from the credit union system.

Maybe it is the responsibility of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland and me to approach Credit Union Central and talk to their people and say, we feel the government would be prepared (and the minister has replied that he is prepared) to work with the credit unions in this area. We could have them make a submission to the government and let them outline the way in which they want to have a program of reduced interest rates to the people who are suffering the most put into the system. I think it should come from there and maybe as I say, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland and I should feel it incumbent upon us to speak with them and have them present the brief and let the government respond in that fashion.

On the fourth point, the matter of department responsibility in terms of co-operatives. I think the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland was referring to trailer courts. Again, I have to support the minister's reply to the particular line of questioning there in that it is not the department's responsibility to tell people they should form a co-operative. It is not their responsibility.

It is their responsibility to help people who make representation to the department for assistance to put a co-operative together. Therefore again, if the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has a trailer court he wants to get started, he should be encouraging people in that particular area who require a co-operative trailer court — if he sees that as necessary and he has some support in that area — to make a representation to the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development and then with the two groups working co-operatively, maybe such a program could be put in place. I am not going to dispute whether there should or shouldn't be. Maybe I would suggest it is a good idea put forward by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, but again I have to support the minister in this regard that it is not his responsibility to be going out, running around and looking for business for the co-operatives. It has to come from the local people and that goes right back to my opening comments on this department. That's where we have to have it; it has to be with the local people. We have to maintain local autonomy. We cannot have decision coming from the minister down; we have to have them coming from the people to the minister. That is the way the system has to work.

In rounding this whole line of questioning by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland out, and replaying to some of the arguments he has made (which I respect and I will emphasize that), it just has to be local autonomy, local co-operatives putting their presentations to the minister. It is not likely our responsibility, as members of this House, to tell the minister what he should be doing in formulating different

co-operatives. With that, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding any further new ideas along the lines of gardens in the backyards of our schools and our homes and so on and so forth being formed into co-operatives, I would be prepared to let the estimates of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development move right along and be complete shortly (I hope within five minutes). Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment very briefly on a couple of points the member for Moosomin makes. I think the fundamental difference in terms of the approach that he is suggesting and the approach I am suggesting to the minister, Mr. Chairman, is that I am asking the department of co-operatives to provide some leadership in getting new ideas before the public that they might consider and before committees that they might consider.

I just want to briefly take each of the points that he has raised and respond. I think it's very appropriate, Mr. Chairman, that the department of co-operatives become involved in encouraging the school system to look at, first of all, implementing co-operative history programs in the schools. I say the department of co-operatives should be going to the curriculum committee and should be saying, here's something that you should look at seriously. It should provide some kind of blueprint with respect to an approach to the history of co-operatives in the province that might be considered in the school system.

I say the department of co-operatives should be advertising on radio and television to encourage people who are interested in establishing themselves in the trailer court to get in touch with them if they are interested in organizing a co-operative in the city of Saskatoon. I think it's therefore, Mr. Chairman, a difference of approach. I say the department of co-operatives should be initiating discussions with the credit unions of the province about looking at how we might better help persons who are low-income earners and are members in the credit union. And I see nothing wrong with the government's taking those kinds of initiatives to discuss ideas and to encourage people to become involved in the co-operative program rather than always depending on persons to come forward. I think that that's great and that both avenues are quite appropriate, Mr. Chairman.

The member may think the idea of co-operative gardens is a silly one. I think the record will show that you at least said the idea was of little importance. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that if we have a bit of a vision about how new subdivisions and area of the cities and town we plan might look, I think we could readily see that a co-operative garden project would be very much appreciated by many new residents. And I get the member for Moosomin to look at communities in Europe; you can go into all kinds of small towns in Britain or Austria or Switzerland and see co-operative garden projects at work. And you can see the contribution those garden projects make to person on low income and the recreational opportunities they provide for local people near their homes. So I think it's quite appropriate that the department of co-operatives become involved in that kind of project.

I want to just ask one more question of the minister and I will have completed my line of questioning. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I am very concerned about the fact that many of the co-operatives in the province are constantly having to struggle with, and are in some cases moving away from, the original traditional principles which were the basis of their movement. I think there's a constant danger that some of our co-operatives will begin to operate more as though they were simply a part of the private sector, and that's always a danger when one is operating in a mixed economy. I think

that some of the co-operatives in the province need encouragement and support to maintain the co-operative principles that work in their organization as they get larger. They need support to look at how to introduce progressive labor practices in the operation of the co-operatives. I have been disappointed that on occasion co-ops in Saskatchewan have failed to purchase local produce; or for instance if one takes the example of retail food co-ops, they have often opted to purchase their supplies from outside Saskatchewan rather than within the province. They've largely opted to do that because they wanted a year-round supply from outside and they've often ignored local growers. I think those kinds of areas, Mr. Chairman, are areas that the department of co-operation needs to be working on with the co-operative movement in the province to see how we can better make use of always buying locally when we can. We need to constantly be at work in the co-operative movement supporting the government and the government supporting the co-operative movement in terms of how to maintain the principles of co-operation, actively working in the system to try to ensure that we don't move away from those principles, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I'd like to ask the minister what work the department of co-operation is doing with the co-operative movement to ensure that the basic principles of co-operation are alive and well in the operation of co-operatives throughout the province?

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, what we are doing in the department is working together with the co-operative movement and particularly with the Co-operative College of Canada to do just exactly what the member is saying, to have education programs for people at the board of directors' level, at the management level and so on. The co-operative movement, however, also is concerned with regard to the movement itself and its principles. In that regard, they have presently a very major research project underway through the Co-operative College of Canada. This project is one which they call Future Directions. It's being done by Dr. Jack Craig of York University. He is doing this Future Directions project and hopefully the co-operatives will find that some of the principles which they were built on are going to be kept going for the future.

We hope that this project will be fruitful and I think it will be. But we in the department are working together with the Co-operative College of Canada to formalize far more programs with regard to the principles upon which the co-operatives were initially based, so that they don't stray away from those principles. In that regard, it will be education towards management and education of board of directors and so on and so forth.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the member has asked for the department and the minister to initiate leadership in the co-operative movement. I again emphasize that the leadership is there. I have confidence and trust in the leadership from the people in the province of Saskatchewan who believe in co-operatives. It was the people who put the co-operative movement together in the first place. I have to caution the member and the minister for taking leadership in this area, when you take a look at the leadership that the Minister of Agriculture took in the Department of Agriculture. We've lost 8,000 family farms. We have \$119 million invested into land bank. We have FarmStart and all of these things and nothing's going well in that department.

We have to look at the Minister of Finance. He has taken leadership. What has happened there? The Minister of Mineral Resources — look at that, \$2.5 billion in the resource sector in potash alone; \$500 million, a half-billion, by the year 1981. I'd be ashamed to think what would happen if our minister took leadership in the department of co-operatives. It could well mean the demise and the total end of the whole

May 2, 1980

movement in the province of Saskatchewan. Relative to the other departments, the leadership role that they've taken, certainly I don't want to see that kind of initiative coming from the top down. I want to see it come from the grass roots up to the minister. That's the very simple point I want to make in that particular area.

The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland questions whether or not co-ops are well and alive. He questions whether they're well and alive. My goodness, if you don't know the success of the credit unions in the province, if you don't know the success of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in this province and if you don't know the success of the Federated Co-operatives in this province, then you're totally out of tune and you'd better say in your co-operative gardens.

Those are the two points that I have to make and I don't think the House should be belaboured any longer with further questions from the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. I think, from this side of the House, the minister has done an admirable job of answering the questions. I would ask the committee to proceed and move along. Let's round things out.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 and 3 agreed.

Item 4

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I have to go out to receive a phone call so just before we finish with co-op estimates, I want to take just a moment to thank the minister for the work he has done in preparing for the estimates in the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. I suppose maybe more importantly, I want to thank his officials, not just for being here to assist the minister in replying to the question from the opposition and of course from the government side of the House as well, but also to thank the officials who are here today and all the officials of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development for the fine work they are doing in the department. We congratulate you whole heartedly. We are very proud and pleased to have you as part of this department. Those are my comments. Thank you.

Items 4 to 6 agreed.

Vote 6 agreed.

DEPARTMENT OF CO-OPERATION AND CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT — CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENT — VOTE 64

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 64 agreed.

MR. CODY: — We'll bring the rentalsman people in. But while they are coming, we could do page 95 which is the Department of Telephones.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — O.K.

DEPARTMENT OF TELEPHONES — ORDINARY EXPENDITURE — VOTE 38

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 38 agreed.

OFFICE OF THE RENTALSMAN — VOTE 25

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Mr. Minister, would you like to introduce your officials?

HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — Yes, I have with me today the chairman of the mediation board and acting rentalsman — this curly headed gentleman is Bill Tait. The lady back here is Venus Coates, a board member. This good looking lady here is Donna Kellsey. The gentleman here is Ken McKenzie, the deputy rentalsman.

Item 1

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) I have just a few questions I would like to ask. First and foremost, Mr. Minister, I noticed the other day you mentioned you were removing rent controls in the cities. You are going to have rent review.

MR. CODY: — Maybe I should answer you now on that. No, that is not the fact. It was an error made in the newspaper. It wasn't the fault of the press necessarily, or anything like that. It is a fact there was an error made. The rent control will remain in Regina and Saskatoon at it is today.

MR. TAYLOR: — If the press didn't make the error, was it you or your department that made the error?

MR. CODY: — No, I don't know how the error was made. I have no idea. My understanding is that someone got hold of a chunk of paper which was wrong.

MR. TAYLOR: — Maybe you and the Minister of Education should have a little talk about these errors, because had one the other day too. Get hold of the ship a little tighter you fellows, if these errors are taking place.

I notice you have cut down on this department. I note four fewer employees here, but your budget hasn't gone down that much. However, looking down in item 3, provincial mediation board, you have gone up by one employee and there is quite an increase there in the budget. I know one would have to take into account the raises, say 10 per cent or something like that, that the people were given. I'd like to know what position this is in the provincial mediation board and what the salary is.

MR. CODY: — We transferred a person from the rentalsman's office to this position. He's an assistant deputy rentalsman. Now he is in the mediation board. It's a position in Saskatoon.

MR. TAYLOR: — What is the salary and who is the person who is carrying out this position?

MR. CODY: — His name is Wes Ashwin. And it's \$25,000.

MR. TAYLOR: — How do you account for the rest of this increase in subvote 3, if that salary is only for \$25,000? It doesn't show any more staff. What is the reason for the considerable increase there?

May 2, 1980

MR. CODY: — It's just a general increase in wages and the basic increases in travel. We're doing a lot more rent review work today and our staff has to travel a lot more than they have been travelling. That's a good portion of where the increase is.

MR. TAYLOR: — What would be the increase in wages? Am I right in saying about 10 per cent.

MR. CODY: — 8.5 per cent.

MR. TAYLOR: — I know that you have rent review. I'm getting a number of question in the rural areas from people (often these are widows) living in rented accommodations in small towns in my constituency. They don't have a great amount of income and their rents are going up. They want to know what recourse they can take. I would ask you what recourse can a person take who is living in rural Saskatchewan and has a substantial rent increase?

MR. CODY: — Basically speaking if it is an area which had been under rent control and which will now be under rent review, those people have the opportunity of asking for a review of their rent after it has been increased. But if they are in an area where there is no rent review, or in Regina and Saskatoon which have rent control, there is basically very little which can be done. Also, if they are people who are living in a basement suite or renting one-half of a duplex, rent review or rent control does not apply. Under the amendments to The Residential Tenancies Act, which I have on the order paper, they will be under the act. However, they will not be subject to rent review or rent control.

MR. TAYLOR: — Are you saying there are some areas of the province that are under rent review and other areas which are not? Where are these areas? I will outline the situation for you a little more. As you know, in many of these towns, above business blocks there are apartments. Is there no place where the people in these can go for an appeal or to have this situation looked into?

MR. CODY: — Basically speaking, this stems from the date the rent control was put in. It was in communities of between 2,000 and 5,000 people, anything under that is not covered.

MR. TAYLOR: — Do you not think you should have some type of mechanism? I don't believe in controls but I do know this is a situation which is developing, Mr. Minister. Would you consider having your department look at this, that people in the small towns because of the interest costs and building of homes, and as I say, a lot of these people are widows . . . I think it is rather unjust if they have nowhere to go and are subject to rather large rent increases. Would you look at doing something for these people? I could bring specific cases to your attention. But if it is happening in my constituency, I am sure it is happening throughout rural Saskatchewan. Regardless of the size of the town, there is rental accommodation and maybe you should be looking at putting something in place to alleviate the problem.

MR. CODY: — Well we can certainly look at it; there is no question about that. But at the same time, it is a very costly operation to have rent reviewed in every particular community in the province. At the same time we also realize that there can be a problem with regard to high increases and hefty increases. But at this point in time we have not considered it. I suppose one should be looking more seriously at some of the smaller

communities, as you are suggesting. I will take that comment seriously and we will consider it.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, I don't want to belabor this. To deal with one of these situations now, if I had the person in question write to your office, the Office of the Rentalsman, there would be some consideration and a look into this. Could I have that assurance?

MR. CODY: — Yes, you can.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Minister, the senior citizens' high-rise homes in Regina which are less than five years old, do you have any control on the rents in these units at all?

MR. CODY: — No, they are exempt because they were built after October 3, 1975. And even if they weren't they would still be exempt because they are under CMHC (Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation).

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, would you explain your policy with respect to a landlord's obligation to store a tenant's belongings when he has vacated the premises that he was renting and for which he owed back rent?

MR. CODY: — As I understand it, all the landlord has to do, basically, is make an application to the mediation board or I guess to the rentalsman's office (same thing anyway) indicating that the tenant has vacated the premises and they will then give an order to have the goods removed.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — What period of time will it take for the department to make a decision and remove to where?

MR. CODY: — I'm told the department treats those applications as urgent and they would likely be given an order in 48 hours to have the tenant's goods removed. However, they could not dispose of them or get rid of them completely for 30 days after the order was made.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, can you explain to me why the responsibility should be the landlord's to store a person's belongings and particularly when that tenant, who has vacated the premises has left with a bill owing on the rent? What action would be taken for the department to see that the landlord was compensated for his losses in storage and in the back rent?

MR. CODY: — Well, at the time they make the application or when the rentalsman gives the order, that is a consideration. They do consider putting in a sum of money that the landlord can get from the tenant for this storage and basically that's the only way we can do it. Because after all, you have to realize that the agreement which the tenant and the landlord have is, normally speaking, for 30 days. They have a lease agreement and that agreement simply doesn't indicate that the landlord can throw the tenant's goods out. Nor does it indicate that the tenant can leave without paying. But it happens from time to time, and I guess there's really not a great deal that one can do, other than get an order to dispose of the person's goods, after they have been there for 30 days.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Minister, you know who I am referring to and I'm sure you're aware — well, you wrote a letter to the individual. And the order that you are referring to by the Office of the Rentalsman was dated April 22, authorizing the removal

May 2, 1980

of the belongings of the individuals involved, who left without owing money and could not be found. As I say, it was on April 22 that you issued the order. They vacated the premises on April 1 (which is three weeks, not a couple of days or 48 hours) and the request was made or the authorization to remove the abandoned property from the premises and to store the same until May 16, 1980. Will you explain to me how an individual or landlord if he can't find the tenant is going to collect anything from garbage? As you well know nothing but garbage was left behind because they didn't want it. They can't find them, and still, according to your department, they have to provide storage facilities at their costs without any way, shape or form anyone's going to reimburse them for it.

This is continually going on in various areas, and you know your protection should cover both, not just tenants, but other people as well. They are individuals and the cost is coming out of the pockets. Why would you want to be covering those people who don't really have responsibility, or show responsibility by the mere fact that they aren't paying their bills and leaving a place in disorder, dirty? Your order is slanted toward that individual, not toward the protection of the owner. I don't think there's very much fairness there and I think you should be looking at your rules and regulations on that.

As I say, I'm sure you know the individual I am referring to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You don't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . This one was written on April 18, not that long ago, in Saskatoon and I think you know who I'm talking about.

The problem that exists is a serious one, and I feel your department should be reviewing those rules and regulations and providing some kind of protection for the person who has his money invested and is taking the loss in the first place. He has responsibility, whereas the other one doesn't.

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we always are looking at the regulations and the legislation, to up date and try to get it to work better for both people. This legislation, The Residential Tenancies act, incidentally works as well for the landlord as it does for the tenant, and we would not want it to work any different. After all it would not be fair if we were to look at the situation differently for the landlord than we do for the tenant.

I do realize, however, the member brings up a good point and that is the landlord in those cases does have a very serious problem. But what can we as a department or as the rentalsman's office do? There's basically nothing you can do. We have to have a certain set of standards. We have to have a certain set of deadlines. We have to have a certain set of criteria that has to be set up. From time to time working from within the framework causes a hardship on one or the other.

In this particular case there may have been a hardship. But at the same time I don't know exactly the one you are referring to. If it's one in Saskatoon one can be assured we will be looking at the situation more seriously and closely than we already have. We have looked at it but we have only in that particular case. I think you have in that particular case received information from one side only, one side of the coin. You have received nothing from the tenant. Until such time as we have received something from the tenant on which we can base judgment by having both sides of the story, I don't think we can really say the situation has been a hardship. Now true, we don't like to see people having to hang onto these goods for any extra length of time, but we still have to look at the whole situation, the whole story, before we can make a final decision on these things.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You made a statement at the beginning of your comments that the regulations work for both the tenant and the landlord. Could you explain to me how that kind of regulation can possibly help a landlord in any way, shape, or form? Can you explain to me what in that regulation is of any advantage, of any benefit to a landlord?

You then said or asked, what can we do? Well, I'll tell you what you can do. Stop protecting the irresponsible. Why does your department see fit to give protection only for those who show irresponsibility and not the other way around? You say it works both ways. Well, if it's going to work both ways, then stop slanting it in favour of those people who, as I say, are showing irresponsibility.

MR. CODY: — True, we don't want to protect the irresponsible. That's for sure. But at the same time, how do you know when you have an agreement between a landlord and a tenant and you have a piece of legislation, who is going to be the irresponsible person? who is to say? In whose judgment is an individual irresponsible? I can't be out there looking for the irresponsible people and having them evicted. That's just simply not possible. You never do know until a problem arises such as the one you have enunciated here. Until you have a problem like that, there's nothing you can do. But surely, we can't have an act which has one section saying this is for the irresponsible, this is for the responsible, this is for the in between. It just simply doesn't work. Legislation is all-encompassing. This particular piece of legislation just simply works that way.

With regard to that particular instance, sure the regulation in that area probably is slanted toward the tenant. But there are a lot of areas in The Residential Tenancies Act that are certainly good for the landlord as well.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'd like you to explain that. Where is it good for the landlord? You stated, well, you're not going to go around looking to evict the irresponsible. I agree. Landlords when they rent to individuals are prepared to and do accept the risk in renting to them. That's a standard procedure with any landlord. They take those risks as you well know. Your department does not intend to protect a landlord against loss of income, for example. There's no protection within your rules and regulations to protect a landlord against loss of income or against damage to the property. If there is, I'd like to know where that legislation is. but I'd like you to explain to me as well what you just said. Where does the landlord have that kind of protection? Where can he be protected from that?

As you well know, you have a file as thick as I have on that same individual; it's all the same.

MR. CODY: — Well, there is protection in this act for landlords. There's little question about that. Let's fact the facts. They can come in the rentalsman's office and in 48 hours they can have an eviction notice. If you had the old landlord and tenant act, which you had several years ago, it would take you three months to get rid of a person. Who would pay them? The same person, the landlord, would be stuck. But it may take three months to evict a person because you have to go through the court system and the whole operation. The Landlord and Tenant Act simply was an old, outdated operation. The Residential Tenancies Act gives these opportunities to landlords. Within 48 hours — bang! — you can have an eviction order and away you go. There's little question that there is good protection in this. You can ask the landlords, if you would like, and they will tell you that this is the best act they've ever had to work under.

May 2, 1980

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You mentioned eviction can take place within 48 hours. What cause can be used for eviction within 48 hours?

MR. CODY: — Disturbances, damage to property, non-payment, that kind of thing.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 and 3 agreed.

Vote 25 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:54 p.m.