

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 12, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the House, the Hon. Jim Fleming, Canada's Minister of State for Multiculturalism. I believe he is seated in the Speaker's gallery.

He is of Celtic origin, born and raised in Kitchener, Ontario. He was educated there and at the University of Toronto. He spent a number of years as a journalist in the print and broadcast media; he worked for the Toronto Star, the CTV national news and at several Toronto radio stations. He worked as an executive assistant to the Leader of the Opposition in Ontario before successfully winning his York West riding in the 1972 federal general election. He has been successfully re-elected in 1974, 1979 and 1980. With Mr. Fleming are Miss Susan Scott and Andrew Cardoza.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask those people to rise to be acknowledged and ask all members to join with me in welcoming them.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce to the Assembly, on behalf of the member for Regina South, Mr. Rousseau, who will be in a little later this afternoon, some 52 students from Dr. A.E. Perry School in Regina. They are accompanied by Mr. Byron Kimble and Mrs. Joanne Friesen. I hope they find the afternoon interesting and informative. I look forward to meeting with them after question period to ask if they have any questions. I hope all members will join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member for the constituency of Cumberland, I want to welcome to the Speaker's gallery this afternoon some constituents of his from the community of Kinoosao, or Co-op Point as it was earlier known. There are seven adult students who are attending this afternoon an upgrading community program and are here in the legislature, I understand, with Mr. Vandrewal, who is their teacher. We welcome them to the Assembly.

Your member of the Legislative Assembly, the Hon. Mr. MacAuley, is away on Canadian Parliamentary Association business in London and that is why he is not here this afternoon. I am sure he would want me, on his behalf, to welcome you to the Assembly. I trust, Mr. Speaker, other members of the House welcome these adult students here this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Drought Committee Subsidy Program

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Agriculture. During the drought conditions which prevailed in 1977, at the urging of this opposition, your department implemented a drought committee and provided transportation subsidies for hauling feed and the relocation of cattle in some areas of the province. Would your department consider implementing a similar program to help alleviate the pressures being experienced by some of the stockmen in our province today?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Maple Creek will recall that program was a joint federal-provincial program. My understanding is that discussions are about to get under way at the deputy ministerial level with Agriculture Canada, and likely will involve not only Saskatchewan's department but also the departments in Manitoba and Alberta because the whole West is facing similar drought conditions.

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that due to these severe conditions many livestock producers are being cut back re allocations in community pastures and many do not have the alternate grazing facilities, thereby forcing them to place their produce on a less than break even market? Does your government have any immediate plans for alternate grazing for these producers before it reaches a disaster stage?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, my reports are that the staff of community pastures is discouraging bringing the cattle in as long as possible so that the available pasture on the farm is used up before coming into the community pasture. To my knowledge there hasn't been any farmer, who was set to come into the pastures with his livestock, cut back. I asked for a report, Mr. Speaker, and I report this to the hon. members opposite and members here; in the northwest part of the province the conditions are somewhat better than they are in the remainder of the province. Indications are that there will be available to us possibly 2,000 head to be moved into that area. That is being examined and perhaps some action can be taken to that extent.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Securing adequate feed supplies and adequate water sources have always caused recurring problems in the livestock industry in Saskatchewan, especially in the southern regions. What long-term programs are available to stockmen through your government to help stabilize the feed and water supply problems which continually face these operators?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I can't recite to the hon. member the ongoing long-term programs of either the Department of Agriculture of Saskatchewan or PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act) or the federal government. The hon. member will know there is a pumping program in place within the department right now. I think one of the problems faced, of course, is that there isn't water to pump. Therefore, the contact with the federal government . . . I assume that one of the items which will be discussed is the emergency well program which was in place, I recall, three years ago as a program to be pursued under the emergency situation.

Drilling of Deep Wells

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The programs which now exist as they relate to well drilling offer grants for each well regardless of cost of the well. Now in the most severely drought-stricken areas of our province the water is deep water from 700 feet to 1,400 feet. Now, would the minister not agree that there should be some program to encourage people to drill deep wells in these areas? I am talking specifically of the Southwest. Dr. Meneley, formerly of the Saskatchewan Research Council, in 1977 in a report to the Saskatchewan Research Council said:

Water supply problems that will arise can be resolved for the most part by providing incentives for developing deeper wells that are less affected by drought.

Would the minister not agree that the time was in 1977 and earlier but it wasn't done? Shouldn't we now, since it wasn't done, offer some incentive to drill these deep well?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am not sure of my recollection being accurate but I believe that there is an ongoing program in PFRA for wells for individual farmers.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. The program that you alluded to is a fixed grant for each well and not a percentage of cost. These deep wells cost upwards of \$100,000 apiece. My question is, we do have a serious problem facing us in the Southwest if rain doesn't come in a hurry, would the minister consider cataloguing all feed supplies in the province, particularly dehydrated alfalfa, the stocks they have available at these plants, and what projected supplies they might have available for the summer or into fall, and making this information available to the stock growers in our province? — because quite frankly there is a serious problem with feed.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I should report to the hon. member and to the Assembly that these are the same kinds of questions the federal Minister of Agriculture faced today in the House of Commons. And I think he indicated his efforts at his end to co-operate with the western provinces on dealing with this issue at the deputy minister's level. One of the first things that happened as I recall three years ago was the cataloguing of available feed supplies. Part of my answer earlier (relating to the pasture situation in northwestern Saskatchewan), would be part of that cataloguing process. I suspect that that will be taking place and once it's complete I can provide it to all hon. members, particularly in the southwestern part of the province.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll just take this opportunity to say to the Leader of the Opposition that I don't understand how a cataloguing of feed supplies is a supplementary to the grants for digging deep wells. I think it's not a supplementary. I would be prepared to allow the member to have a supplementary to the original question that was asked.

MR. BERNTSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The questions relate to a drought, not particularly to feed or water but to both. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a water and feed-related question. Would the minister not agree that since we have about 0.5 million irrigable acres not irrigated in the province around Diefenbaker Lake, and since we haven't developed our deep-water aquifers in the province, it's time now to channel our efforts in this direction and that this would in fact stabilize the feed and water problems in the Southwest?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I can report to the hon. member that developing further irrigation projects in the Outlook area is a proposal that's under consideration by the government and that the policy related thereto will be announced in due course.

Computer Office Equipment

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the minister responsible for Sask Tel. Mr. Minister, I have been advised by members of the computer industry that Sask Tel has plans to become or is contemplating becoming involved in computer office equipment and in particular in word processors. Can the minister advise this Assembly if in fact Sask Tel is planning such moves in that field?

HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is an area which is under consideration. There's no question about that. Let's face the fact that word processing is something that one can term in communications; as a result of that we consider everything in communications and that is one of the areas we are considering. No real final decision has been made in that regard, but if and when there is a final decision made I can certainly advise the member.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary to that, Mr. Minister. The plans you have in mind right now, do they entail the selling of computer hardware as well as providing computer services, etc.?

MR. CODY: — Yes.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Minister I was under the impression that Sask Tel by and large was to deal in the telephone and that type of field. It seems to me that you are going quite a ways afield when you go into the whole computer field. Number one, you have a computer corporation that is doing that. But number two, is it your intention that the telephone should be a monopoly situation and for various reasons (so you can spread the cost through rural Saskatchewan), is it your intention as well to take the computer thing into a monopoly situation for Sask Tel?

MR. CODY: — No.

Buy Canadian Labelling

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Welcome back to western Canada, Mr. Premier. I note last week, probably in your absence, the CTV network presented an extensive program on the Buy Canadian policy of the federal government. It was discovered by CTV that the Buy Canadian labels were being manufactured in the U.S. Would you not agree that this is a bit of a sham, or a small indication of our dependence upon the United States?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, so far as I am aware the labels were not manufactured by the Government of Saskatchewan. I want to assure the hon. member that any Buy Saskatchewan labels we may acquire would not be manufactured outside Canada. I want to assure hon. members that whatever the federal government may have done in this regard, on which I am not informed, the Government of Saskatchewan does not favor the policy of buying labels which, say Buy Canada, and acquiring those labels outside Canada.

Restaurant Association re Two Successive Days Off

MR. LANE: — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour has had representation from the Saskatchewan Restaurant and Food Services Association. I believe the Hotels Association of Saskatchewan is expressing some concern over legislation to establish and guarantee two successive days off. The restaurant association, of course, is concerned because their two important days (the most profitable days) are Saturday and Sunday. It would work an extreme hardship on that industry. Would the minister be prepared to commit himself today to exempt from that legislation the restaurant association?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Well, I'll tell the hon. member for Qu'Appelle there has been an overture made to my departmental officials by Mr. Freestone of the restaurant association. I think obviously there will be some problems, particularly in an industry such as the food and restaurant industry where a large portion of its business is done on a busy weekend.

What is being contemplated at the present time, I believe, is to have a House amendment to The Labour Standards Act in order to provide for section 13 of the act (which is the two consecutive days) to come into force on proclamation. That will give us the opportunity over the next number of weeks to listen to representations from a variety of people. One of those, of course, will be the restaurant association.

I'm not prepared at this moment to indicate what blanket exemptions will be provided. I think judgment will have to be made in keeping with the kinds of representations that are made to us. We'll be looking very carefully at those exemptions without attempting to detract in large measure from the general thrust of providing two consecutive days off for employees.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the Minister. I have a 1980 survey of wages and working conditions which has been sent to members of the restaurant association, sponsored and sent out by the Saskatchewan Department of Labour. Given the fact that the Department of Labour is belatedly attempting to survey this particular industry, and your comment admitting that perhaps the legislation is going to cause some hardship, do you not believe the Department of Labour has really been ill-prepared for this legislation, that it should have consulted the service industries to be affected by this bill before implementation, and that is' not really a proper way of proceeding to bring in blanket legislation and then find out how it's going to hurt people after?

MR. SNYDER: — I think I indicated to the member that it's not intended that that section of the act come into force on the date of assent. It will provide an opportunity for consultation of a large number of people. I expect there are some industries which could be given blanket exemptions. I'm thinking, most assuredly, of those industries such as nursing homes and hospitals which I think without question can be covered by the two consecutive days off and I think in most circumstances are, but to provide that one of those days shall be a Sunday obviously will cause some difficulties. We are prepared to take into consideration all those circumstances surrounding individual cases, and will be governed by the kinds of representation presented to us and the kinds of judgments we will draw from that.

Administration of Federal Food and Drug Act

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, about a week ago I raised a question with you in this Assembly regarding a supreme court decision which appears to render most federal standards under the Food and Drug Act unconstitutional. At that time I suggested to you that in effect nobody was minding the store, and nobody was regulating purity and food content at that time.

You suggest in reply that your people and your department did not agree with this assessment, and that you would get back to me on it. About a week has gone by and my question to you is, are you prepared to acknowledge today that no one at this point in time is administering the Food and Drug Act as to the purity and content of food products in Canada?

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I can only essentially reiterate what I told the hon. member a few days ago. The advice of my legal officers does not go to the same extent as the hon. member's legal advice. There is a committee established on an interprovincial basis which is looking at this particular problem involving the jurisdiction of food and drug.

We may or may not need some legislation, either provincial or federally, but I'm not getting the advice yet that we need to move at this particular time.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Attorney General, also during that question I raised the point that virtually all charges or all matters before the courts, particularly several which received a great deal of publicity last fall regarding the misuse of beef product by a very prominent Ontario supermarket chain, were being dropped by the federal food and drug. Would the Attorney General promise also to verify this, and would he be prepared to confirm today that his people have told him that this is true, which is further proof that at this point in time nobody, federal or provincial, is administering the laws of food purity in Canada and in the province of Saskatchewan?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that today. I have not yet received a report from my officials as to that aspect of the question.

MR. THATCHER: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since about one week has gone by and this matter is not really a joke, may I ask the Attorney General if he has consulted with or plans to consult with the Minister of Health and the Department of Health in the hope that if the feds aren't going to do it, at least somebody in this province is going to examine what sort of foods are being sold through the fast-food outlets or on the supermarket shelves, so the people of Saskatchewan can have some assurance that food labels contain what they say they do?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member's question is based on the assumption that in fact there is no underlying legal basis for the inspection and examination of standards and quality with respect to food. I simply don't accept that assumption at the present time. I have indicated to the hon. member that this is a complex legal matter which is being reviewed by my officials and officials in other provinces. It may very well be that some form of legislation or other action is required, but at the present time my advice is, as I have indicated to the member, that no necessary legal action is required and standards are being protected and are still in force.

Delay in Completion of Lampman Senior Citizens' Home.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — I would like to ask this question of the minister of SGI, and possibly the minister of Sask Housing. The contractor working on the senior citizen's home at Lampman has once again pulled out of this job. These 16 senior citizens' homes are approximately one and one-half years behind schedule. They have just been sitting there. Because of disagreement with CMHC (Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation) and SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance), the contractor has now left his job. I wonder if you could tell us what state this is in, Mr. Minister?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Mr. Speaker, I will have to take it as notice because I am not familiar with it other than the fact that I thought the Lampman one had been cleared away. It's possible the minister in charge of Sask Housing may have some information for you.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would you take it as notice then, Mr. Minister, that it is a disagreement with CMHC and SGI; how far is SGI going to go on the settlement of the poor work done by Manor Homes? In many cases they have found the pilings aren't even under the footings and it's just a botched up job. I wonder if you would check into this. The people of Lampman and the town council there are very discouraged with this.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, we can assure the member we will check into it further and report back to him.

Canada's Constitution

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Premier. I realize you're just back, Mr. Premier, but you may have had an opportunity to read in the Globe and Mail the comments by Mr. Stuart Smith, the Leader of the Opposition in the Ontario legislature in which he stated it was agreed by all members of that Assembly that the people of the province of Ontario, with reference to the constitution in Canada, wished to maintain the status quo. Would the Premier agree with Mr. Smith's comments?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity on Saturday morning to read both the Globe and Mail and the Toronto Star outlining their reports of the debate which took place in the Ontario provincial parliament and I did not gain the impression that the hon. member for Nipawin did. My impression of the outcome of that debate was the resolution, which was unanimously passed, expressed the view that all members agreed we in Canada should pursue renewed federalism and that this would involve substantial changes in the constitution, in short a substantial departure from the status quo. That is the understanding I have of the position taken certainly by Premier Davis and certainly by Mr. Cassidy and as I understood it, also by the Liberal Party since the motion was, again as I understood it, passed unanimously.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier will be aware that Mr. Broadbent, the Leader of the NDP in Canada, has not yet taken a position as to whether or not he supports the Quebec referendum or is opposed to the Quebec referendum. The Premier will also be aware that Mr. Smith and other members of the legislature in that debate stated unequivocally that the people of Ontario would prefer to maintain the status quo and that only leadership would enable the people of Ontario to change their minds from the status quo. My question to the Premier is quite simply

this: does the Premier believe the present leadership in Canada is the leadership that will lead Canadians toward a united country?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is substantially yes but not with all the present leaders in their present leadership position. A comparatively small change among the current leadership but into different offices would I think put the country in a position where we could proceed with the speed and with the conviction that we would move to a renewed federalism which would be accepted by all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — My final supplementary is quite simply this: given the fact that Mr. Broadbent has refused to take a position as to whether he supports the Quebec referendum or not and given the fact that the Premier (obviously from his comments) would prefer to see Mr. Broadbent in the position of Mr. Trudeau, does the Premier believe that Mr. Broadbent could better lead Canada and unite Canada than can Mr. Trudeau?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the preliminary statement of fact by the member for Nipawin; he does not state Mr. Broadbent's position, as I understand Mr. Broadbent's position. With that qualification I say yes indeed, I would like to see Mr. Broadbent as the Prime Minister of Canada. I would feel very much more assured than I am now or than I would be if Mr. Clark were Prime Minister.

Grain Car Co-ordinator

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — A question to the Premier. Press reports out of Lethbridge, immediately following the four western premiers conference, indicated the four premiers endorsed the extension of the powers of the grain car co-ordinator to facilitate the movement of grain in the Prairies. I wonder if you could explain to this House how that squares with the contradictory offering of the Minister of Agriculture, during the grain car debate the other day, in which he said, we do not agree with the terms of the co-ordinator, we didn't agree with him when he was appointed. It is not appropriate that the co-ordinator should take the power . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

FIRST READING

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — I wonder if I could get, under your direction, Mr. Speaker, the page girls to distribute proposed Bill No. 112. I don't know if that is quite in order. Let me explain to the House my situation. I am asking leave of the Assembly to introduce first, second, committee of the whole, and third reading of an amendment to Friday's Bill No. 111, the back-to-work legislation, so-called, for the dairy workers. The amendment adds one additional union local which was not included in the description of unions covered by the bill and should have been. Accordingly I will ask leave to introduce and move for the first time, An Act to amend The Maintenance of Operations of Dairy Producers Co-operative Limited and Palm Dairies Limited Act.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yu have heard the proposal by the Attorney General. Leave is required. Is leave granted?

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Attorney General has requested leave to proceed with second reading of Bill No. 112. I understand the bill will be around shortly, as soon as the number can be stamped on it. Does the Attorney General have leave? Carried.

SECOND READINGS

HON. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 112 — **An Act to amend The Maintenance of Operations of Dairy Producers Co-operative Limited and Palm Dairies Limited Act.**

He said: I will just give a brief explanatory, if I can. Mr. Speaker, this is a very short one sentence amendment. The amendment includes in the definition of union local no. P-241-4 of the United Food and Commercial Workers, which local union was inadvertently omitted from Bill 111 passed on May 9, 1980. I am advised by Department of Labour officials that there was a local P-241-4 registered and certified for a couple of the locals in Wynyard (and one other rural area which escapes me for the time being), and then was subsequently in effect unregistered as a trade union. That is the basis on which the bill was drafted. On a closer check of the registers we now find that this local has resurfaced just recently and been certified in Saskatoon, and that accordingly it needs to be included within the work-to-order legislation. It deals with the local of dairy workers in Saskatoon. Mr. Speaker, that is the explanation and with those brief words, I move second reading of An Act to amend the Resumption of Operations of Dairy Producers Co-operative Limited and Palm Dairies Limited Act.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I think one simply has to read into the record the question on Friday, May 9. The first question I asked the Attorney General:

My first question (and out of abundant caution) would the Attorney General give the assurance that in the definition section, the definitions of employer and union, include all of the parties affected by the strike?

The answer was:

Mr. Chairman, I take the responsibility, I guess. I am advised by the deputy minister of labour on whose advice we rely here, that definition . . .

In fact the opposition did ask the Attorney General at the time, because of the pressure of the legislation, that some effort be made by Department of Labour officials obviously to be a little cautious and certain because an error in something like this could have had some rather devastating consequences. The matter was raised at the time. I hope the Attorney General has brought to the Department of Labour's attention the fact that they were asleep at the switch.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — I think it is incumbent upon me as well to alert the Attorney General to the question period and to the debate on Thursday of last week. At the time it was presented by all members of the opposition that the Attorney General should bring in this kind of delay legislation the day before, in order that an appropriate analysis of the provisions of the bill could be put forward by this Assembly prior to its being passed. The problem on Friday, of course, was that the members were all pressured to get home on Friday afternoon since we sat late, and the Attorney General would be aware that that did not lend itself to an accurate bill. I would sincerely hope

the Attorney General will make note and give the assurance to the Assembly that in future legislation will not even, though it is suggested by the opposition, be brought in in such a slipshod fashion as this.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I take full responsibility for the omission. I simply would advise the members of the House that the bill was drafted in a rather quick fashion for circumstances which I think are well known. This was an error which I think is understandable under the circumstances, namely that all the records indicate that the union had in fact been decertified or was at least no longer operative. Also, it is a union which is honoring the general intent and spirit of the bill which was passed on Friday, so no hardship or harm was done in that regard. I think we want to limit these occasions but on occasion it will be inevitable.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 112 — An Act to amend The Maintenance of Operations of Dairy Producers Co-operative Limited and Palm Dairies Limited Act.

Sections 1 to 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The committee reported progress.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 112 — An Act to amend The Maintenance of Operation of the Dairy Producers Co-operative Limited and Palm Dairies Limited Act.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should simply advise the House that we are expecting His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, to come sometime later during the afternoon to give royal assent to this bill. With that word, I move that the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

SECOND READINGS

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 109 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to propose the amendments to The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act. These amendments will further limit the ownership of agricultural land in Saskatchewan by individuals who do not reside in the province. They will also restrict the involvement of corporations that are not in the business of farming and not owned and controlled by Saskatchewan farmers. This additional protection is essential to ensure that Saskatchewan farmland is owned and controlled by Saskatchewan people both now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, next to our people, our rich and abundant supply of agricultural land is Saskatchewan's most important resource. It is the basis of our province's most

important industry. The use of land and the development of the agricultural industry has been responsible in large part for the prosperity we enjoy in this province today. The land has been very good to the people of the province, and will continue to provide prosperity in the future. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan will not stand idly by and watch the ownership and control of our agricultural land shift into the hands of individuals and companies that do not reside in the province.

The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act is one of those government long-term commitments to rural Saskatchewan, and the people of the province. It is a commitment to ensure that Saskatchewan farmland does not become a speculative commodity to be bought and sold at the whim of real estate brokers, corporate speculations, or foreign investor.

Members will recall the special committee on the ownership of agricultural land which was established by this Assembly May 4, 1972. The committee's job was to investigate the effects of the purchase and ownership of agricultural land by non-resident foreign and corporate persons. The committee consisted of 11 members on both sides of the Assembly. It was chaired by the hon. member for Melville, Mr. Kowalchuk, who is still in the Assembly and vice-chaired by the then hon. member for Cannington, Mr. Weatherald.

The committee held 13 public hearing throughout Saskatchewan and travelled into the United States. The committee surveyed rural municipalities and gathered information as to existing regulations throughout Canada and the U.S. The committee submitted its report in the spring of 1973 recommending in essence that legislation be enacted to restrict ownership of farms in Saskatchewan to family farm-operations, and to co-operatives.

Two minority reports were submitted — one concerned with how stringent the divestment requirements were in the committee's recommendations, and the other proposing that restrictions be placed on non-Canadians rather than on non-residents. The fact that there were two minority reports on an 11 member committee gives an indication of the emotion that existed concerning that issue even at that time.

In April 1974, the then minister of agriculture, the hon. member for Kelsey-Tisdale, introduced the Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act, restricting non-resident individuals to a maximum of \$15,000 in assessed value of land as calculated for municipal taxation purposes. Under the 1974 act, non-agricultural corporations were invited to a holding of 160 acres with the added provision that those corporations already holding in excess of 160 acres were to reduce their holding to 160 acres by January 1, 1994.

To ensure that Saskatchewan farmers could maintain their farmland and pass these lands on to their children and relatives, an exemption provision was provided. Additionally, in order not to discourage potential residents who wished to come to Saskatchewan to live and farm, the farm ownership board was given the authority to grant three year exemptions to potential residents. Farmers living outside of Saskatchewan but within 20 miles of the border were exempt from the act to permit them to carry on operations on both sides of the border. The 1974 legislation made provision for the farm ownership board of not less than three members to oversee the legislation.

The Farm Ownership Act of 1974 was a bold innovative step. Prince Edward Island was the only other province in Canada which had legislation restricting non-resident ownership. Their legislation was upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada, which judged that a province did in fact have the constitutional authority to legislate with respect to ownership and control of land by non-residents.

The 1974 legislation was well received by the people of the province. We discovered, however, that the imposed limitations by that act did not provide an effective deterrent for non-residents. Individuals and companies continued to circumvent the spirit of the legislation. Large land purchases, for example, the purchase near Cupar, made it clear that groups of non-resident could come into an area and gobble up a large tract of land in spite of the legislation which was designed to prevent that very occurrence.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1976 calendar years, non-residents of this province acquired title to almost 150,000 acres of Saskatchewan farmland, of which 40,000 acres were purchased by foreign interests. In 1977, non-resident purchases totalled almost 140,000 acres of which 50,000 acres were purchased by foreign interests.

The people of rural Saskatchewan called for further limitations on non-resident activity in the farmland market. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the United Grain Growers, the National Farmers' Union and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture all demanded further restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, this government responded to those demands by amending The Farm Ownership Act. Effective September 15, 1977 the \$15,000 assessed value limitations on non-residents were lowered to 150 acres. The amendment reduce the limit from approximately seven quarters of average assessed land down to one quarter. One hundred and sixty acres was the consensus as to an effective lower limit below which there would be little incentive to purchase. The 1977 legislation was a deterrent to an extent, but the demand for land in Saskatchewan increased and the techniques were found to circumvent the act by those who were intent upon just doing so.

In the 1978 calendar years non-resident acquired title to an additional 120,000 acres. In 1979, purchases were almost 110,000 acres. In the last three years, in 15 municipalities in the Regina, Weyburn and Indian Head areas, foreign individuals had acquired 53,000 acres of some of the most productive grain land in the province. Foreign controlled corporations acquired title to an additional 10,000 acres in the area.

The farm ownership board was powerless to do anything. In a number of cases, these corporations were incorporated outside of the province, which resulted in the board having no power of investigation. It was little wonder that the people of Saskatchewan became concerned. It was little wonder that young Saskatchewan farmers were frustrated as they watched prices escalate beyond their reach and as they saw title after title to neighboring lands transferred at high prices to faceless names or to numbered corporations.

Delegates to the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities annual convention (I suspect the largest on record) were almost unanimous in calling for the complete elimination of foreign interests from the Saskatchewan farmland market.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments before the Assembly came in response to the plea from rural Saskatchewan to remove non-resident and non-agricultural corporate

purchasers from the Saskatchewan farmland market. Let me now outline the proposed amendments in some detail. The amendment to section 2(b) of the act will reduce the proportion of the shares which must be owned by non-residents to a simple majority, i.e. 51 per cent from the previous 60 per cent. This is to ensure that a Saskatchewan farmer using the corporate approach to farming may transfer shares in his farming company to family members who may be neither farmers nor Saskatchewan residents. The control, however, will remain in the hands of the Saskatchewan farmer.

A new section 2(c.1) has been added to provide for a clear definition of 'farmer' should that prove necessary. 'Resident person' as defined in the present act has been changed in order to exclude farmers living outside of Saskatchewan but within 20 miles of the Saskatchewan border. In future, these farmers carrying on farming operations on both sides of the border will require the permission of the Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Board in order to own or control additional landholdings in Saskatchewan.

The proposed amendment in section 7 of this act is for the purpose of conformity with the limitation of 10 acres to be established under the new section 8.2.

Section 8.2 of the act will impose a limitation of 10 acres upon those who do not reside for more than one-half of the year in Saskatchewan, where such a landholding is acquired on or after May 6, 1980. Non-residents who acquired more than 10 acres before May 6, 1980 will not be required to dispose of their holding since they can only hold the land during their lifetime, in contrast to corporations which can exist in perpetuity.

The amendment to section 9 of the act will ensure that non-residents who acquire landholdings in excess of 10 acres through a will or the operation of The Intestate Succession Act, after May 6, 1980, will have five years to dispose of those holdings exceeding 10 acres.

Section 10 continues the policy of permitting Saskatchewan farmers to transfer their landholdings to close relatives who may live outside of Saskatchewan.

The proposed amendment to section 11 will limit non-agricultural corporations to a landholding in the province not exceeding 10 acres. Those corporations acquiring land in excess of 10 acres will require the written consent of the farm ownership board.

The change in section 12 of the present act will require all non-agricultural corporations to reduce their landholdings to 10 acres by January 1, 1994. Additionally, agricultural corporations will be given a one-years period during which they must conform with this act.

The new section 13.1 establishes an offence for a resident person to acquire a landholding on behalf of a non-resident person or a non-agricultural corporation where such an acquisition contravenes the act.

Section 14(1) is amended in order to require that non-agricultural corporations with holdings in excess of 10 acres submit a yearly disclosure statement to the board. This continues a policy established in the original act.

The amendment to section 15 will provide the Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Board with the authority to grant exemptions to non-resident individuals in circumstances where such an exemption is justified (for example potential residents of the province or farmers farming land on both sides of the border).

The changes in section 16 are in order to establish penalties for violation of the new provisions of the act. The level of penalties remains unchanged from the present act.

Should clarification of 'farmer' be required for purposes of the act, the amendment to section 24(a.1) will grant the Lieutenant-Governor in Council such authority.

The final provision deals with retroactivity. The proposed amendments will come into force retroactively.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is of fundamental importance to the continued prosperity of our province.

In Alberta, the Agricultural and Recreational Ownership Act limits non-Canadians to the purchase and ownership of 20 acres of agricultural land in Alberta.

In Manitoba, the Farm Lands Protection Act limits non-Canadians to the purchase and ownership of 20 acres of agriculture and in both provinces, however, the restriction it should be noted is on non-Canadians. There is no restriction on non-residents. In Quebec, recent legislation limits non-residents of Quebec, to the acquisition of not more than four hectares or 10 acres of agricultural land without the authorization of the commission for the protection of agricultural land in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are the custodians of a rich and abundant supply of agricultural land, land which will generate food production for the world now and in the future. The land has provided prosperity. It will continue to do so. We must therefore, Mr. Speaker, care for this resource to ensure that it is not abused. We must also protect this resource for future generations of Saskatchewan people and ensure that our sons and our daughters do not become tenants in their own land to absentee and corporate landlords. I urge members on both sides of this Assembly to support this act — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act — and I am pleased to move second reading of the act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I recall when The Farm Ownership Act was initially brought into this legislature; at that time I had some remarks to make about the problems that would ensue as a result of that act. Mr. Speaker, I want to make eminently clear to members of this legislature before commencing any remarks that I am not in any way objecting to the intent of this act. The intent of the act is to enable Saskatchewan people to own Saskatchewan farmland and with that intent I could not agree more.

However prohibitive land ownership legislation does not work in Prince Edward Island, does not work in Manitoba, does not work in Alberta, does not work in Saskatchewan and will not work with these amendments. It won't work because when you prohibit by law there will be intelligent seekers to thwart that law. Intelligent lawyers will attempt to find loopholes in that law. There have been lawyers who have suggested over the years that for every law passed by the Government of Saskatchewan, with intelligent study at least 10 loopholes can be found. Prohibitive legislation is not the solution.

In 1977 when this act was passed initially, I suggested in this legislature (and I'm going to suggest again in this legislature) that the way to accomplish the aim is not to prohibit but to tax non-resident owners, and tax them to such an extent that it will not be profitable for non-resident owners to own land in Saskatchewan. Only in that way will there not be loopholes found in the legislation. Now, Mr. Speaker, you will recall in 1977 I stated that there would be loopholes found in the act and that it would not work. The minister, by his own admission today, has stated that thousands and thousands of acres were purchased by non-residents in 1978 and were purchased by non-residents in 1979. The point is that this kind of prohibitive legislation just simply doesn't work. It doesn't accomplish the aim; now that's if the aim is to enable Saskatchewan citizens to own Saskatchewan farmland.

On the other hand, if the aim is to make all private ownership of land in Saskatchewan difficult, if the aim is to create another means by which the land bank commission and other organizations can continue to acquire government lands, the perhaps this law might work. But it certainly will not work to the aims stated by the minister today. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more to say on this subject and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. G. MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 100 — **An Act to provide for the Establishment of the Doukhobors of Canada C.C.U.B. Trust Fund.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to propose second reading of a bill to establish a perpetual trust fund, the income from which will be utilized under the direction of an appointed board to further the culture and heritage of the Doukhobors of Canada. The Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood Limited (commonly known as the CCUB) was a federally incorporated company whose directors were Doukhobors.

In 1925 the company borrowed money and issued bonds which were secured by a mortgage on property held by the company mainly in the provinces of British Columbia and Saskatchewan. In 1938 the National Trust Company Limited as trustee for the bondholders had the assets of the company placed in receivership. In 1945 by order of the Court of Queen's Bench, Regina, the Toronto General Trust Company was appointed receiver and was succeeded by the Canada Permanent Trust which held surplus funds from the liquidations, until they were placed in the hands of the Court of Queen's Bench, Saskatchewan, on February 14, 1973 through an action by the Attorney General of this province (the present Attorney General, of course) Mr. Speaker.

The Government of Saskatchewan is aware of the interest which the Doukhobors of Canada have with respect to the final disposition of the proceeds and has had extensive

discussions with the major Doukhobor societies of the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan. I might just point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are really three groups in the three provinces. There's the major Doukhobor group in British Columbia, the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, which is headed by John Veregin and has the support of about 7,500 orthodox Doukhobors. The major Doukhobor society in Alberta is the United Doukhobors of Alberta at Cowley, Alberta. And Saskatchewan, of course, has a number of Doukhobor societies in areas of the province. The large concentration of course, is at Veregin and Kamsack with Canora and Pelly areas thrown in, also at Saskatoon, Blaine Lake, Kylemore and Arran. So we have quite an interesting distribution of Doukhobor people throughout the province. Discussions took place with these various societies across Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia and also discussions involved with governments of the other two provinces as well.

As a result of the discussions and the negotiations, the Doukhobors of Canada, CCUB Trust Fund Act is being submitted for approval of this legislature. This bill will require the Minister of Finance to establish a perpetual trust fund from the principal sum paid into the Court of Queen's Bench in February 1973, in the amount of \$222,078 plus interest accrued to the date of the transfer to the Minister of Finance and the proclamation of the bill. The trust fund will be managed by appointed representatives of established Doukhobor societies in the three provinces concerned, under guidelines set out in the bill and in regulations. The fund will be retained in perpetuity with interest earnings only being utilized for grant purposes to further the cultural heritage of the Doukhobors of Canada under the direction of the fund board.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased, after years of struggle by various individual Doukhobors and groups of Doukhobors, to have resolved the complex issue of distribution of the remaining funds held by the receiver. The Government of Saskatchewan is instrumental in having these funds paid into the Court of Queen's Bench and in subsequently obtaining agreement from the main Doukhobor representatives in the provinces to establish the trust fund (which the proposed bill will, in fact, establish). The establishment of the fund in question will without doubt have the effect of uniting the Doukhobors of Canada. It will further their cultural ties, assist in making the citizens of this country aware of the important role played by Doukhobors in the development of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. I want to put on record, Mr. Speaker, our strong feelings about the effort by former deputy minister of municipal affairs Ted Walters in getting this bill in place and also in travelling to the other provinces, talking with the governments, and talking with the society. I also extend a thank you to Mr. Fred Bloudoff of Veregin who accompanied Mr. Walters in the negotiations. I think it's their efforts that we want to pay tribute to today as we move this bill through second reading, which I in fact do now, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Would the minister accept a question before he takes his place?

MR. SPEAKER: — Would the minister permit a question?

MR. MacMURCHY: — If I can answer it.

MR. COLLVER: — I listened to the list of organizations and trustees. Did you include in that the Sons of Freedom side group of the Doukhobor sect, or not?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I'll have to check that. I didn't include them (I don't think) in my remarks, but I will check for the hon. member. I will report to him that Mr. Walters and Mr. Bloudoff did have discussion with the Sons of Freedom. They were in British Columbia and met with them, and got approval from them for this approach.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Just a couple of short points, Mr. Speaker. The official opposition will be supporting this bill. I join with the Minister of agriculture in congratulating Mr. Walters. This was a difficult problem to resolve, to find a proper structure so that all people in the Doukhobor movement were properly represented and felt properly represented within this trust committee, so they can get on with spending or investing what amounts to their money. For that reason, I think he is to be commended and I trust that what comes out of this legislation will in fact serve its purpose.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope to received that information before . . . Oh, can we have that information before committee of the whole for the bill? If the minister would give me that assurance, that would be fine.

MR. MacMURCHY: — AS soon as I get the information I'll send it across to the hon. member.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you and to other members of this Assembly, a Benedictine monk from St. Peter's Abbey at Muenster, Saskatchewan, Father Andrew Britt, who is in the west gallery. St Peter's is known by most people in western Canada for its newspaper, the Prairie Messenger, which many of us read regularly. It's also known as an outstanding educational institution. In fact, I was educated at St. Peter's College. I would ask all hon. members not to judge St. Peter's educational process on the basis of what it has done for the member for Rosemont, but I would point out that the Hon. Minister of Health was also educated at St. Peter's College at Muenster. I think we should probably judge the institution on the fine job it did for Mr. Rolfes. I'm sure all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, will want to join with me in welcoming Father Andrew to our midst this afternoon and to ask him to extend to all the other monks at St. Peter's the very best wishes of the Saskatchewan legislature. Father, would you like to stand up?

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

HON. MR. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones) moved second reading of Bill No. 90 — **An Act to amend The Residential Tenancies Act.**

He said, Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise today on second reading of Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Residential Tenancies Act. It is a pleasure because it is a piece of legislation which shows this government's ability to keep in touch with the needs of people and also our ability to listen and act on the concerns of those people.

Mr. Speaker, the province of Saskatchewan through the rentalsman and the mediation board have, at very little expense, been able to capably resolve hundreds of disputes which previously tied up our courts and more times than not, did not provide an adequate solution for these folks. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our sister western provinces are doing away with this type of program, we are standing alone and moving to improve upon its operations. I ask the question, why? Of course, it's very simple; it's because this government is listening — listening to people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I have met with landlords not only to explain the program, but also to get them to give us their indications as to what we can do to improve the program. I've also met and heard from many tenants and obtained ideas from them as well, Mr. Speaker. I would like to reaffirm the decision to maintain rent controls in Regina and Saskatoon as it seems a number of rumor have been started lately to the contrary. The reason for such a continuation is the economic pressures now present, as a direct result of consecutive federal government decisions to have interest rates at what I term near ridiculously high levels. This means a larger demand for rental accommodations and an extremely low level of vacant apartments available to meet the demand.

Mr. Speaker, six and possibly seven of our other nine provinces have rent review or rent control legislation in place in varying forms. Alberta and Manitoba have indicated at this point in time that they will be completely out of rent control and rent review in a short time. The balance of the provinces would appear to be moving in the same direction as Saskatchewan with the development of landlord-tenant relations under one act which would include appeals of one sort or another concerning rent increase to a rent review board.

Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly point out an example for the benefit of the hon. members. I have in my possession a copy of an ordinance order from the city of Palm Springs passed last fall which limits rents on residential units for three-quarters of the increase in the cost of living, as indicated in the consumer price index for the city of Los Angeles. I mention this, Mr. Speaker, because it is the type of material we receive from various sources. This particular piece, I must say, we received from a landlord in the city of Regina.

Now turning to the specific amendments. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is, for the most part, housekeeping. It is also consistent with our government's program to decontrol, implemented in October 1977. As you are aware, The Residential Tenancies Act does much more than simply control rent increases. In fact, Office of the Rentalsman statistics indicate that 60 per cent of its workload consisted of disputes between landlords and tenants regarding rent arrears, damages incurred to premises, disturbances with other tenants, disposition of abandoned property and so on.

The first amendment, subclause 2(j)(vii) and 2(j)(viii) provide for the benefits of The Residential Tenancies Act to apply to premises which had preciously been under The Landlord and Tenant Act. At the present time the benefits of the act are only available to the large scale landlord, not however, to those who need it most, specifically the landlords who rent out a single premise.

The provincial mediation board has experienced a significant increase in the number of requests for mediation of disputes between landlords and tenants in single-dwelling

premises. For example, statistics show that in 1977-78 there were 231 cases recorded, while in 1978-79 there were 488 cases; 1970-80 saw 688 cases being handled. Furthermore, The Landlord and Tenant Act provides very little protection for either party in disputes. For example, it could take up to three months for a landlord to evict a tenant for damages to that premises. To aggravate the situation, follow-up would require legal counsel, and the need to proceed through the district court system. This would further increase costs to a landlord who may have already suffered considerable expense due to the damage done to his property.

A second example of this lack of protection would be when a tenant is in arrears of rent. The landlord would wait two months before proceeding with action to evict that tenant under the act. Again, any action would involve legal assistance and the court system, creating further delay and expertise to the landlord. This is an unsatisfactory situation. If you compare this to The Residential Tenancies Act, we note that in the case of landlords suffering damage to their property, under the act, the rentalsman can grant immediate possession to the landlord.

Regarding the matter of rent arrears, action can be taken against the tenant if he becomes 15 days in arrears of rent. Both the examples I have cited point out the inadequacies of the present legislation in dealing with a very serious problem. We have documented evidence by way of photography to illustrate evidence of the severity of this problem.

By this change, I want to stress the point that the premises we are discussing specifically single-dwelling premises, would be exempt, as they are today, from rent control and rent review.

With respect to the amending of section 7, this is consistent with the decontrol program implemented by our government in October 1977. It established a decontrol program and a rent review program. Under rent review, as you are aware, tenants must appeal a rent increase if they feel it is not justifiable. Placing administration of The Residential Tenancies Act under the provincial mediation board makes for a smoothly co-ordinated running operation as the mediation board handles rent review.

As you are aware, landlord and tenant relations have historically been the responsibility of the provincial mediation board. It was only when the federal government introduced rent control under the price and wage control program that the Office of the Rentalsman was formed. At the inception of the Office of the Rentalsman, it was only intended to be a short-term solution to a very severe problem. As has been pointed out, the control of rents is a major responsibility for both the Office of the Rentalsman and the provincial mediation board.

Statistics show that in the fiscal years, 1979-80, 1,950 cases of landlord-tenant relations were handled by the rentalsman and the mediation board combined. The board is responsible for section 35 covering the damage deposit area, and part 2 covering the rent review section of The Residential Tenancies Act. The amendment to section 46 is an attempt to provide for applications for rent increases that were received by the Office of the Rentalsman, although he had not dealt with it prior to the decontrol date. The effect of this amendment would be to make the application for increase which must be served on the tenant a notice of increase which the tenant could use to apply for a rent review. This removes the need for a landlord to serve another notice and create a further delay of three months.

In proposing the appeal of subsection 5 and 6 of section 78, we find that the present provisions are unclear and appear to create difficulties for both landlords and tenants regarding the question of possession. The effect of this amendment would be that if a tenant does not vacate pursuant to a landlord's notice to vacate, the landlord may apply to the Office of the Rentalsman for an order of possession. Following a hearing the rentalsman shall make an order which he considers just and equitable under the circumstances.

What seems to be the required protection for the tenant in this type of dispute is already provided for under part 1 of The Residential Tenancies Act, making it unnecessary for this provision in part 2 of the act.

Regarding the amendment to section 80.1 — this will remove the problem which presently exists where similar suites have different rent levels assessed by appeals from tenants. It is the experience of the rent review board that landlords prefer to keep rents standard in each building. It is also important to recognize that when the rent review board is hearing an appeal the landlord is concerned with his revenue and expenses on a total block and not just on a specific suite. The amendment means that when over 25 per cent of the tenants appeal, the decision of the rent review board will apply to all similar suites within a block.

Regarding the amendment to section 81, we feel that that appeal procedures should be allowed for persons who disagree with the decision of the rent review board. Basically speaking, we now have appeal procedures under the rent control section. We will now have appeal procedures under rent review as well. That has been a right and we do not feel we should remove this right at this particular time. As we gain experience in rent review, further consideration may be given to the part of the act.

The amendments to sections 20, 57, 60 and 75 are housekeeping amendments, Mr. Speaker, correcting printing errors made in the statute revision process.

With these short explanations, I move second reading of Bill No. 90.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)) moved second reading of Bill No. 99 — **An Act to establish the Department of Rural Affairs Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 99, a bill to establish the Saskatchewan Department of Rural Affairs.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, much of the activity of local government was centred around the physical development of rural and urban communities. Rural municipalities, until recently, were largely concerned with the development of an adequate system of roads and bridges and with the administration of limited agricultural, social and recreational programs. Financial questions and balance sheets were the major items of concern.

Mr. Speaker, these were and still are serious matters of concern to local governments. However, as our society becomes more sophisticated and complex, local governments

are faced with new challenges which in many respects overshadow the more mundane day-to-day problems. Many of the new challenges which they face today are social and economic in nature. More and more often they are challenges which require a more dramatic rural-urban interface. These challenges, Mr. Speaker, deal with such diverse concerns as providing better opportunities and services for disadvantaged people, to housing, to community planning, regional planning, or industrial and country residential development. Many of these problems demand an active role by the provincial government, and more often than not participation by both rural and urban local governments.

The more complex these interrelationships become the more important it is that there be an adequate and timely co-operation between all of the affected senior and local government bodies.

As the complexities of local government increased, Mr. Speaker, so did the pressure to create separate roles for the rural and urban components of local government to ensure that each component was adequately represented at the departmental and the ministerial levels. The result, Mr. Speaker, has been the establishment of two ministries, one for rural and one for urban affairs.

There are those who have said that this could be a step backward rather than co-operation between the two service areas. This, Mr. Speaker, is because they have not seen fit to listen to what is being said by local governments in Saskatchewan. In fact, they have not listened to the points being made on this subject by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Association of Urban Municipalities — two of Saskatchewan's most important organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this government know that rural and urban governments must be heard. The members of this government know there must be co-operation between provincial and municipal governments. The members of this government know that the legitimate aspirations and concerns of both rural and urban municipalities must be fairly met. Because of the very close interrelationships between local government and provincial government, close co-ordination at all levels is of utmost importance. The Department of Rural Affairs act now before us will ensure this co-ordination and co-operation in all municipal matters, particularly those involving both rural and urban municipalities.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, clearly establishes the terms of reference and the authorities of the Department of Rural Affairs. As a result, the program capability of my department will be strengthened in several areas. The legislation authorizes a community planning branch within the Department of Rural Affairs. It's a program which has been requested in the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), and its member municipalities. It's a program which will address the complex problems of rural planning and which will provide the requested services to rural municipalities. Assisting rural municipalities with zoning and zoning by-laws will be an important aspect of the community planning program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me assure you that the importance of rural-urban co-operation and co-ordination has been seriously considered. A cross reference system has been worked out with the Department of Urban Affairs. This system ensures that both rural and urban departments will be fully involved in all matters which concern their respective jurisdictions. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, procedures are spelled out for resolving differences which may develop from time to time.

We will also be increasing our research and planning staff to enable the department to do a better job of keeping policy and program development closely aligned with the changing needs of rural municipalities. We will, Mr. Speaker, listen to the recommendations of rural municipalities for improvement of program, for new programs, and for sport services, to ensure effective local government. A research branch will devote its attention to the recommendations of rural municipalities and in this way programs will keep pace with their changing needs.

Mr. Speaker, under authority of this legislation now before you, this department will provide a full range of advisory and financial management services to rural municipalities.

As circumstances in rural areas change, it can be expected that additional responsibilities will be added to this department. Industrial and mineral developments are having a substantial impact on the rural community. Expansions in the heavy oil area are creating pressures in those areas. Rail line abandonments create changes in traffic and shipping patterns, which result in realignments of road systems. As more and more urban people exercise their desire for a more rural lifestyle, the problems of assessment and taxation of small holding are becoming a major concern in rural municipalities. This government's determination in further developing the Department of Rural Affairs in the areas of community planning, research and policy development and advisory services as related to municipal management and finance will enable my department to service the needs of rural municipalities more effectively and more efficiently in the future.

In respect to the matter of close co-ordination between the Department of Rural Affairs and the Department of Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize again that we have worked very closely together with my colleague the Minister of Urban Affairs in development of a co-ordinated package of legislation to enable us to efficiently serve local government in Saskatchewan.

I am pleased to advise the members of this legislature that the legislation now before you provides for a department of the Government of Saskatchewan which will devote its full and undivided attention to providing services which are now being requested by rural municipalities in this province.

These priorities, as presented to us by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and by rural municipalities include: first, the completion of an agreed upon designated system of municipal roads. This system includes 18,400 miles of main farm access roads, 10,000 miles of grid and 5,200 miles of primary grid. By the end of the 1986 construction season, we hope the construction program will be basically complete except for a little over 3,000 miles of primary grid.

Second is the provision of community planning services through the Department of Rural Affairs community planning branch. This service will assist rural municipalities in establishing municipal land-use policy through zone and controls.

Third is the provision of full municipal management and finance advisory services. This will include: (a) a financial management service to rural municipalities, including review of financial statements, budgets, accounting procedures and authorization of accounting forms; (b) processing tax cancellations and by-laws for approval including

the certificate of validity for debenture by-laws after compliance with local government board regulations; (c) drafting proposed legislative amendments and advising municipal officials as to the interpretations of statute law; (d) ensuring the proper bonding of rural municipal secretary-treasurers; (e) the municipal on-the-job training program and approval of all grants under this program to municipalities; (f) issuing permits to rural municipalities employing unqualified person as secretary-treasurers and processing applications for certificates of qualification for persons employed in rural municipalities; (g) the preparation of hamlet directory and hamlet organization; (h) collecting statistical reports and municipal directory information for rural municipalities; and lastly, generally acting as an advisory and a consultative service to rural municipalities.

These are the programs, Mr. Speaker, which will be covered by my department in the initial stages. I urge all members of the legislature to support this bill to establish a Saskatchewan Department of Rural Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill No. 99, a bill to establish a Department of Rural Affairs. I should like to take a few moments at the outset to discuss the concerns expressed by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities in conjunction with this bill.

First of all this government created a Department of Rural Affairs that was seemingly not functional because it was originally lacking various essential branches. Then when the rural municipalities pointed out this fact, the government turned around and set up these branches before Bill No. 99, or in fact any bill had passed the Legislative Assembly authorizing such action. In both cases, Mr. Speaker, this government was wrong in its actions. This government has taken a shoddy and haphazard way of setting up a department much to the detriment of the rural municipalities. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, I labelled the Minister of Rural Affairs the ‘minister of nothing’, because his department still does not legally exist and in actual fact until Bill No. 99 passes this Assembly and receives royal assent, he still is the ‘minister of nothing.’

Mr. Speaker, over one year ago there was a call for the immediate establishment of a Department of Rural Affairs but the present administration ignored the request. It is only now they are taking the necessary action for the creation of this department. For the record, I should like to read a letter I have received from a Mr. Jeff Corfield which was addressed to the deputy ministers of urban and rural affairs. That letter expresses some of the concerns being voiced by rural councillors. It says:

Dear Sirs:

I was very pleased to received your formal notification of the establishment of a community planning branch within the Department of Rural Affairs effective April 1, 1980. To me it makes a lot of sense to split municipal affairs into urban and rural. After all we're the first province in Canada to take this bold and innovative move and that says a lot about our competence in these matters. I see the new rural branch will have a director and senior planner, now being recruited. This is logical as what we need in Saskatchewan is more top level executive types in Saskatoon and Regina.

Why hire junior staff who would go out and work with the municipalities. Our

resources can be better utilized than that. Why go to all the trouble of putting an office in Swift Current when you can simply send somebody out in a government car from Regina. Couldn't agree more.

A new perspective in rural Saskatchewan was just what the doctor ordered. It's not urban resources which are causing planning problems in rural areas; it's larger farms and new technologies. Urban impact causing land subdivisions and the need for zoning controls just don't hold a stick to the land use problems posed by two R.M.'s by industrialized farming. Why didn't we think of this earlier? I quite agree. It just makes good common sense to use municipal boundaries to determine areas of responsibility. After all, why send one man to Battleford to talk to the town and R.M. in the same office building when you could send two?

As a taxpayer, I would violently object to any government who would try to implement a system which did not uphold the values of duplicating services and creating inefficiency. Well done chaps. Your automatic referral system in co-ordinating committees sounds just the answer to me to get urban and rural planning problems solved in an effective manner, without a complicated bureaucracy. Why send out one man to talk to an urban municipality and its rural neighbor when you can send two and have them meet in a co-ordinating committee through an automatic referral system? Brilliant!

I am pleased to see each of you entrenched, each in his own office building. That is just the type of thinking we need to get urban and rural municipalities working together. Now that you have set the example, you will no doubt be severely reprimanding all those urban and rural municipalities which presently share the same building and administration staff. In time perhaps they will begin to see the error of their ways and follow your lead in the name of efficiency and effectiveness. Good on you both.

Yours very gratifyingly.
Jeff Corfield
Lloydminster

Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, take the position that while this creation of the Department of Rural Affairs recognizes the special needs of rural communities in Saskatchewan, we do seriously question the method of establishment. We share the concerns of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities that this new department might not be functional. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the minister took a step in the right direction when he announced on April 23, 1980 that a planning branch would be set up in rural affairs.

We, on this side of the Assembly, welcome such a move and feel it is a step in the right direction — late perhaps but still a positive step.

Mr. Speaker, I serve notice that we in the official opposition will carefully scrutinize every aspect of the Department of Rural Affairs to make sure the best interests of the rural municipalities are being served by this new department. Thank you.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 97 — **An Act to amend The Education Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to this Assembly Bill No. 97 — An Act to amend The Education Act. While these amendments as proposed in Bill No. 97 are relatively minor in nature, they do further improve legislation which is already regarded as exemplary in the field of school law in Canada.

I sat last fall at the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and listened with pride as I heard the president of the Canadian School Trustees' Association describe The Education Act in Saskatchewan as the most progressive legislation dealing with education anywhere in Canada. He pointed out the degree to which this legislation provides responsible governing authority to local school boards in our province, and pointed out that no other legislature in Canada has seen fit to give that kind of responsibility and authority to school boards within their provincial areas.

This education act, Mr. Speaker, became law on January 1, 1979. It reflects our constitutional and political heritage and embodies the aspirations and expectations of our citizens for our children and their future. It emphasizes democratic practice in the shaping and governance of the educational system, and offers a new focus and emphasis for the rights of pupils as well as for the rights of their parents. It defines in clear and straightforward terms the role of governing authorities, educators, teachers, parents and members of the local community, so that each sector is better able to accomplish its particular educational goals.

The Education Act as it now stands recognises the right of all young people to an education appropriate to their particular needs and abilities, in order that each and every young person in our educational system will develop to the full extent of his or her potential. It recognizes, Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities of school boards to provide such an education to our young people.

I should mention, in order to bring into context these amendments, that The Education Act in addition has rationalized the role of the province in local government affairs by eliminating many of the old statutory limitations and previously required ministerial approvals in departmental regulations relating to school board operations. It heralded the creation of the school division and the board of education for each school division as a replacement for the many different types of school districts and boards previously existent. The act also inaugurated triennial school board elections and local school board advisory committees in urban divisions. It saw the abandonment of the concept of the ratepayer and Burgess in favor of the concept of elector, who among other things is now eligible to vote on money bylaws.

The Education Act as it now stands gives strength to the policy making and legislative roles of boards of education and makes specific provision for locally employed directors or superintendents as the executive arm of the board. In matters of school attendance and discipline, The Education Act has shifted the focus away from enforcement toward the treatment of symptoms and the handling of diagnostic and remedial approaches in an effort to remove the causes of such problems. The responsible participation of the pupil and the parent, as well as the school is fostered in this approach.

Turning now specifically to Bill No. 97, Mr. Speaker, and looking at the sections, clause 7(c) in the existing education act is repealed and a new subsection 7(1) is proposed to empower the Minister of Education to provide for payments of various miscellaneous grants not exceeding \$10,000, rather than requiring approval for these from the

Lieutenant-Governor in Council as is currently the case. I should point out that with these amendments, Mr. Speaker, grants in excess of \$10,000 will still require an order in council as authorization for payment. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will reduce by about one-half from about 50 to 25, the annual number of grants requiring order in council for payment. I should add, however, that such grants will still continue to require the authorization of treasury board and the approval of this Legislative Assembly during the consideration of estimates.

Also proposed in Bill No. 97, Mr. Speaker, is a substitution of a new section 43 for the existing section to clarify the intent of this particular section. The intent of section 43 was to permit a non-resident of a school division to be a candidate for election as a member of a board of education, provided that he or she, in addition to age and citizenship qualifications was the owner of assessable property in the division which he or she sought election to the board.

It was not intended that such a candidate be exempt from the age and citizenship requirement which applies to electors who reside within the division for the prescribed time prior to the vote. However, it is possible to interpret the present section 43 to mean that a person may qualify for nomination solely on the basis of ownership of property in the division, and may or may not be a Saskatchewan resident or meet the age in citizenship requirements imposed on the electors.

The proposed amendment contained in this bill is intended to remove this ambiguity and make it clear that all candidates must comply with age, citizenship and residency requirements.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, amended clause 105(1)(b) as it is in this bill empowers boards to delegate responsibility by resolution for certifying accounts on behalf of the chairman to other members or officials of the board and thus expedite the processing of payments of accounts passed by the board. Currently, the board chairmen must themselves certify all accounts before payment can be made.

The proposed amendment to section 238 essentially broadens the avenues of choice available to parties of the collective bargaining process in the event of a dispute during this process. At present, mediation service is available to the parties where the arbitration process, which is one of the routes for handling collective bargaining negotiations, has been chosen under section 235 as a process for settlement. But it is not available where the conciliation process has been selected unless the education relations board on its own initiative provides for mediation services. It is felt that because mediation services have been significant contributors in solving disputes, the availability of mediation services should become an option guaranteed by law when the conciliation process has been selected.

The amendments proposed for section 238 would give effect to this recommendation and result in access to mediation irrespective of whether arbitration or conciliation have been elected pursuant to section 234.

Section 246, concerning the establishment of a conciliation board, is also amended, simply to reflect the proposed amendments to section 238 and is not designed to alter the meaning or intent of the present section.

Proposed amendments to sections 239, 240 and 243 of the present act are designed

to eliminate the avoidable delays in the implementation of the arbitration process and in the rendering of a decision when this method is chosen during the collective bargaining process in order to resolve agreement disputes.

Also, the amendment to section 249 is intended to expedite the conciliation process when chosen by parties of collective bargaining disputes. The proposed amendment to section 249 is intended simply to expedite the exchange of information between the bargaining committees when a conciliation board is being established.

I should mention for the information of the members of the House that the sections of the bill to which I have been referring, dealing with collective bargaining, have been agreed to by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (STF) and the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association (SSTA) through their representatives of the education relations board.

The final amendment of note to which I would like to draw your attention is the amendment of section 314. The intent of section 314 in the existing act is to enable boards of education to borrow for current expenditures by hypothecation of the tax levy and, as necessary, future grants payable particularly in the first four or five months of the fiscal years when tax collections are low and grant payments are generally deferred until the legislative grant appropriation is available. Traditionally borrowing on the security of the tax levy has been sufficient for 90 per cent to 95 per cent of the boards.

In the current year, however, about 20 per cent of the boards have elected to borrow simultaneously on the security of taxes and grants apparently upon the assumption that section 314 may be interpreted to give them the option of borrowing on either or both. In effect credit has been set, in most cases, far in excess of actual borrowing requirements. The object of the proposed amendment to section 314 is to remove any possible ambiguity in subsection (1) and to discourage commitment of grants except where necessary.

The amendments generally make it necessary for boards to assess their borrowing requirements in relation to revenue from all sources, and to make it clear that borrowing on the security of future legislative grants should be undertaken only when borrowing on the security of the tax levy is insufficient to meet requirements of the board.

It is also proposed that section 314(2) be amended so that when a board borrows using the security of legislative grants payable to the division, notification of this fact to the Minister of Finance will only be necessary if the board is requested to do so by the person making the loan. The intent of this amendment is to reduce both at the local and the provincial government departments, the workload associated with this borrowing option.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that all members, upon reviewing these proposed amendments to our education act, will find that they are indeed, while not major, significant improvements to the current act. I am sure these amendments will be supported by all members of this Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I move second reading of this bill.

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — I just wanted to say a few words. I am a little bit concerned when I see bill after bill being introduced giving the minister the authority to make \$10,000 grants. The way the education grants are structured — you tell me it is

the best grant program when I ask you questions in question period. To establish a \$10,000 grant by which you can bypass the grant program, I don't think is really consistent with what you have been telling me. So I am opposed to that particular portion of the bill.

I think many of the other changes are changes which will be perhaps beneficial to the operation of the education system. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley is unavoidably absent today. I would expect that he may have some comments and perhaps some amendments which he would like to make to this bill in committee of the whole. But we will be basically supporting the intent of the bill in second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services) moved second reading of Bill No. 96 — **An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Ed Tchorzewski, on March 13, presented a balanced budget to this House with very minor increased in taxation. Bill No. 96 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act provides for one of the minor increases in tax effective on and after March 14. This bill increases the tax on cigarettes to 1.2 cents per cigarette or 30 cents per package of 25. The previous rate was 27 cents per package of 25.

The member for Kindersley will be interested in this. The tax rate on every cigar (I have seen him smoking the odd cigar recently), having a retail value of more than 20 cents will now be 12 cents. I am sure the member for Kindersley wouldn't smoke cheap cigars. This is an increase of 1 cent per cigar. However, the tax rate on the two categories of cigars, having retail values of up to 10 cents or between 10 cents and 20 cents, does not increase at this time. This may influence his buying habits in cigars. I don't know whether it will or not.

The tax on fine cut tobacco and pipe tobacco is increased from 11 cents to 12 cents per 25 grams. If you want that in imperial measure, it's 10 ounces. These modest increases in tax are expected to yield additional revenue in the range of \$2.5 million to \$3 million in the fiscal years ending March 31 next. These new rates of tax announced in the budget have not resulted in any objections from smokers. No one has contacted me critical of the tax. Unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I fear the tax increases will not induce many smokers to cease or desist from partaking in what is a very dangerous habit.

Saskatchewan now has the same tax rate, and I hope members opposite will note this, as Quebec and Ontario, a slightly higher rate than British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland have considerably higher rates than we do in Saskatchewan. Alberta has a significantly lower rate and that has come problems for us, obviously, with Alberta being located right next door.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill No. 96 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time on division.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services) moved second reading of Bill No. 85 — **An Act to amend The Queen's Printer's Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this particular bill serves two purposes. Firstly, it includes some housekeeping amendments to clarify the intent of some sections of this act and simplify their administration. Secondly, it moves authority for print procurement and for the office services agency from The Queen's Printer's Act. Print procurement, a buying function, will be handled by the purchasing agency and it is provided for in that particular act. An amendment to The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act this session will provide authority for the office services agency in that particular act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I simply point out to the members of the legislature that these legislative changes reflect organizational changes in the department intended to improve efficiency. It will give the Queen's Printer the time required to oversee the publication and distribution of provincial statutes and the Saskatchewan Gazette and to research the viability of a central agency to distribute all government publications. Mr. Speaker, I therefore take pleasure in moving second reading of Bill No. 85 — An Act to amend The Queen's Printer's Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, the member for Regina South, has some serious concerns with this particular bill. At the moment he is enjoying the hospitality of the Hon. Ned Shillington and the Hon. James Fleming, MP, at a new conference and reception at the Hotel Saskatchewan Blueroom. I'm sure you would all agree his words should be hard in this Legislative Assembly, but since he's unavoidably not here I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services) moved second reading of Bill No. 84 — **An Act to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act.**

He said: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this bill essentially does two things. Firstly, it transfers the legislative authority for the office services agency and the distribution of statutes from The Queen's Printers Act which was mentioned in my comments on the previous bill. As with the amendments to The Queen's Printer Act, these changes are intended to reflect reorganization in the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services.

Secondly, it removes the requirement that all costs of the service provided by an advance account must be recovered from the recipient of that service. It is the intention of the government that this provision will only be applied to the executive aircraft.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I should have a word of explanation with respect to this particular matter. The Department of Revenue, Supply and Service Act was drafted when the department was established in the year 1977. At that time it was intended that all costs of services provided by an advance account should be recovered from the identifiable or direct recipient of that service. For example, when a CVA vehicle is leased to a public agency, all costs attributable to that specific vehicle are recovered from that public agency.

However, I wish to stress, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the executive aircraft is a different

kind of service. It is a central government service that must be available for use at all times. It is not utilized by one specific department or agency. As with some other resources, the aircraft incur fixed costs whether they are used or not. However, what is different with the aircraft is that the fixed costs represent a significantly high proportion of the total costs, in fact, the major costs. They cannot reasonably be identified as the responsibility of one user or another. We believe, therefore, that the fixed costs should not be passed directly on to the user.

We are aware of the fact the opposition, or some members of the opposition, will probably view this legislation as an attempt to present it to the public as an attempt to hide the real cost of the aircraft. That is simply not true. It is clearly definable in the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services in a subvote, what the total fixed costs are — last year \$595,380. The full costs of the aircraft are revealed each and every year.

The opposition may view this legislation as something new and irregular in regard to advance accounts. They will be wrong again. It has been an accepted practice for a very long time that the fixed costs of providing space for advance account operations are not passed on to the client.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are aware that some opposition members may construe the legislation as a means to authorize and encourage misuse or abuse of the government aircraft. That is simply not true. Once a commitment is made to acquire a resource it is incumbent upon the government to make practical and efficient use of their resource. We are convinced that charging the variable costs of the aircraft to the user will encourage proper usage of the aircraft. The more the aircraft is used, the more cost efficient it is. Mr. Speaker, efficient use of government resources is something this government always pursues in spite of some of the criticism we receive from the opposition with respect to varied items. I therefore move second reading of Bill No. 84 — An Act to amend the Revenue, Supply, and Services Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A couple of points, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's interesting to me that the minister brings in this amendment, and talks about the difficulty of accounting. Up until this year there appeared to be no problem with accounting. The costs, both fixed and variable, were swung onto the various departments. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan has no trouble in assigning its fixed and variable costs to the various departments, but lo and behold, once the executive use of aircraft was brought to light, and it was brought to light in the sense that several members of the Executive Council were using that aircraft for what I suggest were personal and political reasons, suddenly there are some accounting problems and the minister, in fact last year, went against the regulations, against the rules, and failed to assign the fixed costs to the various departments. So it is very difficult for me, Mr. Minister, to believe you when you say, we aren't trying to hide anything. That is precisely what you are trying to do. You are trying to get away from the problem that the Minister of Mineral Resources took 38 trips to the town of Tisdale at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan, for personal and political uses which cost the people of Saskatchewan thousands and thousands of dollars. But you don't want that to show on the public accounts of the province of Saskatchewan. Somehow you want to hide it under CVA and that's exactly what you're trying to do.

Now I say to the member that the opposition does not object to the executive use of

aircraft. That's what they are there for. Every government uses them. But what I do say to you, Mr. Minister, is that there should be some rules set down. Each year you should present to this legislature a set of logs showing who used the government aircraft, not only the person who signed for it but all the other members (whether they be members of your staff, your research staff, or members of your party). Have their names down as well so that we can see who is using that aircraft. That money should be recovered if it is not being used for government purposes. So I say, you show us the log and tell us who is using the aircraft, not only the person who signs but everyone who uses it, and have them sign in as to where they are leaving from and where they are going. Clearly we can accept that, provided it is used for government purposes and not, as in the past, where it was being used for personal and political purposes. I say that is wrong, and for that reason I will be voting against this bill.

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — I have further comments to make on this bill, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary) moved second reading of Bill No. 105 — **An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.**

He said: This bill follows, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on my bill to amend The Cemeteries Act. This piece of legislation has already received a great deal of public discussion outside of the legislature. Certainly I personally have received several representations from persons within my constituency on the matters dealt with in this bill. I feel confident that other members have found similar reactions from their constituents, Mr. Speaker. I feel confident that this bill has the support of the vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan. There are however some, including the two members opposite, who are suggesting that somehow this bill muzzles certain members of the legislature. I wish, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to state strongly that I do not believe this to be the case.

I was interested in looking at a copy of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of Friday, May 9, an editorial entitled, New Bill a Just One, and I will quote briefly from it:

New regulations tabled this week in the legislature requiring that a third party be registered in the last general election to qualify for provincial funding will likely receive wide public support. Given that these amendments uphold the very important principle that a political party's members must be elected before that party is entitled to public money, such support would be appropriate.

It goes on further to say:

It is entirely possible that those who framed the original regulations governing these matters in the legislature did not foresee any such manoeuvre in Saskatchewan politics. In any event it's fitting that the new provisions now be put in place. It is important too to remember that while the new regulations will deny the Unionest Party certain public funds, they will in no way 'muzzle' its members as has been suggested by Mr. Collver. He and Dennis Ham will still receive their normal MLA pay and will be free to promote the aims of their party.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not restrict the democratic right of

members of this House to form parties and to sit in the House as member of their new party. The member for Nipawin and Swift Current can advocate whatever they wish and call themselves whatever they wish.

This bill does not restrict the rights of members to sit in this House, receive their salaries and indemnities, receive research grants to which members are entitled, and to receive expenses for funds expended in serving their constituencies.

What this bill does deal with is the recognition of a third party in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all members of the Assembly would agree that when the present act was passed last years, a circumstance such as the one we are now faced with was not contemplated. Indeed, had it been, I feel confident the proposed amendments would have been included in the original bill. Indeed, one need only look at the companion piece of legislation, The Election Act, to see how the Assembly views members or candidates as separate from parties.

Under The Election Act there are two sets of rules, one for candidates and one for parties. For a candidate to receive reimbursement for election expenses, that candidate need only comply with the rules and receive 15 per cent of the votes cast in the constituency. However, for that candidate to have his party affiliation on the ballot the party must be registered and must be running a minimum number of candidates in the election. For the party to receive reimbursement for part of its expenditures it must receive 15 per cent of the votes cast in the province and comply with the reporting provisions.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me, at least, that there are two sets of conditions in The Election Act, one for candidates and one for parties. Similarly, this bill proposed that parties meet certain minimum conditions to be recognized as a third party in this Assembly. It does not change the right of members to sit as members of a certain party or to advocate particular positions.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if members of the Unionest Party far the need for the public funds in such a significant way, and if they think waiting until the next provincial election is too long, we will attempt to accommodate them. When the House meets in committee of the whole, I will propose a House amendment to clause 2(1)(d). It will provide that the two members opposite need only have the endorsement of their particular party in the general election or by-election in which at least two of them were elected as members.

I therefore challenge, Mr. Speaker, the members for Nipawin and Swift Current, if they are really interested in pursuing this matter, to resign their seats and ask their constituents to endorse them as Unionests.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — If they follow that course of action and if they are successful and return to this House, then the two members would be eligible for the third party grants.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to comment briefly on some of the other sections of the bill.

The amendment to subsection 3(2) will permit various salaries, allowances, and grants provided for by this act to be rounded off to the next lowest dollar. This will be of

greatest assistance to those who must administer the act and calculate the various salaries, grants, and allowances. I'm sure all members will find this a reasonable measure.

The amendment in section 4 deals with both benefits under the act and appointments to various offices from and under the Crown.

The new section 11 updated to take into account positions now held by members will make it clear that the acceptance of any of these offices, or the entitlement to any benefits does not disqualify a member from sitting and voting in the Assembly.

Section 5 amends section 63 to ensure that grants and allowances payable to the third party are not retroactive to a time before a group achieves third party status or to a time before a member becomes the leader of the third party.

The amendment in section 6 takes into account the new departments of rural and urban affairs. The amendment to section 77 as provided for by section 7 of this bill will permit regulations for ministers travelling and other expenses to be made retroactive to January 1, 1979. These regulations have already been passed but the counsel to the special committee has pointed out a special problem with respect to these regulations. This amendment will make it possible to correct that defect.

Section 8 cures an error in section 89 of the act. Subsection 89(1) should have been subject to subsections 89(2) and 89(3) of the original act. Section 9 will ensure that the defects in the act cured by the amending bill will be cured from the time the original act took effect. Subsection 9(4) provides that the amendments to clause 2.1(d) in section 63 take effect from the date of the last provincial election, October 18, 1978.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate. The bill in my view does not impair the freedom of speech or the right to form political parties. This bill ensures that public moneys will only go to those parties two members of which have the endorsement of the electorate. This bill, with the House amendment I will propose, would permit the members of the Unionest Party, if they seek re-election in their constituency as Unionests, to receive third party grants.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — No, Mr. Speaker, I am not ready for the question. Before I attempt to get started on my opening remarks in this debate, I'd like to make a couple of comments with reference to what the hon. member for Biggar has just said.

First of all, he is attempting, and so have other members of his party, to place the emphasis in this bill on money and grants. But Mr. Speaker, this act does more than that. This act negates the standing of a political party in this Assembly. It doesn't relate to grants only and I would only refer the hon. member for Biggar to the comments by the Premier of Saskatchewan on Saturday, April 25, 1980 in which he said he was disappointed but no surprised at the new development. I quote:

The political system doesn't accommodate independence all that well and I

am not surprised he (Collver) is attempting to put forward some organization.

The reason for the creation of a political party in this Legislative Assembly is to put forward the ideas of that party in the best way possible. The government of the province of Saskatchewan decided in its wisdom last year to create The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act in a way which recognized political parties in the province of Saskatchewan — the Unionist Party has complied with every single stipulation. We are recognized as a political party under The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act. We are, for the information of the member for Biggar, recognized as a political party under The Election Act. We are not only recognized as a political party under The Election Act, but we are duly elected members of this legislature. The act contemplated all of that. The act contemplated that members shall have rights to speak as they see fit, have rights to think as they see fit and have rights to associate as they see fit.

All of the members opposite are not unintelligent. They know history. They know that in 1917, without going to the electorate, the Unionist Party of Canada was formed. Sir Robert Borden was the prime minister; he was succeeded by Sir Arthur Meighen. In 1921, as the Unionist Party under another name they were defeated. But he knows that members of parliament got together in 1917 and created a party without going to the electorate. So he's going against history. He throws forward a facetious challenge about a by-election.

Mr. Speaker, in 1975 I was elected in this legislature for the first time. In that same year the NDP, all of the members of the NDP without ever, ever having presented the case to the people of Saskatchewan, introduced the most far-reaching legislation that has appeared in this Assembly or in Saskatchewan in almost its history; that was nationalizing the potash mines without ever having gone to the people, without ever having presented the idea to the people.

So to suggest that government or members should have to seek re-election because of a change in their stand or a change in their position or a change in circumstances, is the most unworthy of arguments that the minister of members could ever put forward. Every single day in this Legislative Chamber, members change their minds from positions that they have taken at the last election. And if they did not do that they would be ill serving their constituents.

If for example, four or five or two members of the NDP decided, instead of taking the chicken way out and accepting the tradition of the NDP to sit in their place when an important vote is coming up, to stand up for what they believed in, said they would create the Marxist-Leninist Party in the province of Saskatchewan, complied with The Election Act, complied with The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, then they should be recognized in this Assembly as a party as this legislation contemplated last year when it was made. The members know the lessons of history as well as I do. They know that to establish new precedents in this legislature is totally and completely against the rights of every single member of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very disappointed today that when legislation with the impact of this bill is presented to this Chamber, the Premier of Saskatchewan refuses to be here. I am not disappointed, Mr. Speaker, I am appalled — and the member laughs. The member thinks that's funny. He thinks it is funny that a government may bring in a piece of legislation which withdraws the rights of members of this Chamber to do their job to the best of their ability.

He laughs because he thinks that by doing this the government can prove to any other citizen of Saskatchewan who is desirous of formulating an idea, or formulating a political party, that he can be blackmailed into subservience. I say, Mr. Speaker, this party will not be blackmailed into subservience. With or without this legislation our party will present its views to the people.

No matter what any of you think of my cause, no matter what any of you think we may be doing or what you think of the road we may be leading ourselves on, my right to have those ideas, my right to associate with others with those ideas and my right to present them to the people as an alternative is written in blood in this country.

Far better speakers than I have said words to this effect before. They have said, I don't agree with what you say but I'll defend to the death your right to say it. And I won't allow governments to blackmail people into not having ideas because they don't happen to coincide with the ideas of the majority.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Edmund Burke!

MR. COLLVER: — Edmund Burke, 1774, for what it is worth, to the member for Biggar.

Mr. Speaker, the fundamental principles of democracy are at stake here. The fundamental rights of members of this Legislative Chamber are at stake here. I wonder if members to my right have considered all the implication of this bill. Those who were here in 1973 and 1974 when the Progressive Conservative Party represented 2 per cent and 4 per cent of the popular support will remember the majority was desirous of eliminating the PCs from the scene. I wonder if they would like to have been blackmailed from the scene as this bill is attempting to do to the Unionest Party?

It is unacceptable to any free-thinking person to remove the rights of any group within a Legislative Chamber, while that Chamber is in session. This action is detrimental to those members and can be likened to the blackest, most repressive kind of legislation ever introduced in Canada or the United Kingdom or the United States of America.

I wonder if the members are aware of the comments made on a recent radio program by the constitutional legal expert at the University of Saskatchewan, Mr. Howard McConnell. Now if the members are not aware of Mr. McConnell's remarks, I am going to read them into the record because I think it is important that you understand what constitutional experts say about this bill. They are not, by the way, editorial writers for the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix or the Regina Leader-Post, but people who are concerned about the preservation of freedom in this country and the preservation of democratic rights.

Mr. Miller said, Professor McConnell, how does this bill represent censorship? McConnell says, well, I think Dick (and he was referring to Dick Miller, not Dick Collver.) I think, I think Dick, if Messrs. Collver and Ham had perhaps joined a more popular political movement, if they had say, formed themselves into a Liberal or a Social Credit Party in the legislature, they would have been much more likely to have received the financial support which the government is now denying them. I think the fact they represent an unpopular and what some people might call a fringe minority is exposing them to the represent attack by all parties in the legislature, to take away the funding they

would otherwise receive. Miller said this brings up what I think to be a rather important point, and that's the right of the majority. There was a CBC poll on this program a few days ago showing that 60 per cent was in favor of the government's move to limit that funding. Now that's a majority rule! Isn't that how this country is run? McConnell replied, (and I want the members to listen to this and pay attention to this) majority rule is important, Dick, but there is nothing more special in a liberal or social democratic system than the rights of the minority.

Our problem is really, how are we going to protect the rights of the minority? The most unpopular minorities are needless to say the ones who need the protection the most. Now, how are we going to protect the rights and freedom of expression or freedom of political association from being violated by an insensitive majority? Because that's where the danger comes from — two civil liberties. Miller says, I guess then that must be the true test of democracy. McConnell replied as John Stewart Mill once said, right!

Is there any kind of precedent in Canada or North America for a bill of this nature? McConnell says, not recently that I know of, Dick. I think perhaps during the American Civil War certain legislators in the border states who had southern sympathies were deprived of their political rights in circumstances of emergency. Now of course that is an extreme case. But once you introduce the principles that the legislature can retroactively derogate from the rights of a party, by introducing legislation, where is it going to end? It is just a question of degree.

Miller goes on, you said this could help Mr. Collver. In what way? McConnell said, I think if nothing had been done, Messrs. Collver and Ham according to your own CBC survey would not enjoy very much support. This will give publicity to the Unionest Party. It will arouse sympathy for the Unionest Party. It will give them a veneer of martyrdom. It could very well convert what appeared to be a losing cause into one with some prospect, although I wouldn't want to overrate the prospects.

Miller says, what do you think the government should do? Should they withdraw the bill or would that put them in an even more difficult position? McConnell says, I think withdrawing the bill would show a great respect for the rights of dissenting minorities. I sometimes wonder though if you took a hypothetical critic of the left, looking at what is being done here, would he not say, what about your much-vaunted liberal-democratic multiparty system? It's all right; the parties can exist as long as they don't challenge the underlying functions the other parties share. Once they go a little bit outside of them, then they are no longer members of the club. So really, your multiparty system is a sham! You know, I would be afraid of this criticism being made. I think it might even be made effectively.

Mr. Speaker, those are the comments of the constitutional legal expert, Professor Howard McConnell, at the University of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in this Assembly and outside this Assembly about Canada and about what's happening in Canada, whether you agree or not that an option should be presented to the people of western Canada, an option which says either make Canada work or seek union with the United States of America. It is an option which, whether you agree with it or not, is totally irrelevant to this question. Totally! If every member of the Legislative Chamber believes Canada can survive, and wants to go outside this legislature with the Canadian flag and wave it 24 hours a day, that is his right and privilege. But if you want a free country, if you want a country which cares about the rights of minorities, if the Attorney General wants the Ukrainian people

protected because they are a minority, and if the member for Saskatoon Centre wants the rights of the minorities maintained, then you must defeat this bill. Because once a government can take hold of the minority and try to blackmail and coerce them into thinking the same as the majority, then, Mr. Speaker, our democracy is finished. I intend, during the course of this debate, Mr. Speaker, to move the following motion, and I'll be doing so at the conclusion of my remarks that all the words after 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefor: this House declines to give second reading to Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act because —

The principle of the bill is contrary to the rules and principles of this legislature in that it removes the rights of a legitimate and legal political party, as defined by the laws of the province of Saskatchewan.

The principle of the bill is contrary to fundamental human rights.

The principle of the bill is contrary to the Canadian Bill of Rights by which free speech and free political association are guaranteed.

The principle of the bill is contrary to The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights by which free speech and free political association are guaranteed.

The principle of the bill is contrary to the principles of equity since, although not directly mentioned, its provisions are designed to remove the rights of the Unionest Party in this legislature, even though the Unionest Party has complied with all of the laws of the province of Saskatchewan pertaining to political parties.

The principle of the bill is contrary to accepted principles of natural justice by which citizens can expect to rely on laws passed by this legislature, and not have them reversed retroactively.

The principle of the bill is contrary to one of the fundamental principles of democracy by which laws are made prospectively and not after events have occurred.

The principle of the bill is contrary to the most basic tenet of all social democratic societies, and that is that the tyranny of the majority may never be used to thwart the rights of minorities.

The principle of the bill is contrary to the traditions and precedents of all parliaments, including the mother of parliament in Britain, and is contrary to the traditions and precedents of legislatures in other free societies.

The principle of the bill is contrary to the rights of individual members of this Legislative Assembly to associate freely and could be used as a precedent to remove the rights of all opposition to governmental actions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, over the past few days, I have made these views clear to as many people as I could. The Premier of Saskatchewan knows I consider this bill to be a serious, serious affront to this Legislative Assembly. Why isn't he here? Why isn't he in this Assembly to participate in the debate and to find out why I believe these things? Surely, Mr. Speaker, surely we are entitled to at least that, to at least a fair hearing. The Attorney General and the House Leader for this House, decides on the order of debate in this House. We don't decide when the bill is coming in. Now, for what must be

obvious political reasons (and I don't think anybody is going to deny the Attorney General and the House Leader that right), a number of other bills are put before this one to attempt to ensure the press are all off writing their stories some place instead of being here when the bill is presented. Because normally at this time of the day, that's true. Normally at this time of the day the press are not going to be here because they are too busy.

Mr. Speaker, the point is, it is the Attorney General who decides in this debate. Now I can tell you what he is going to try to do. He is going to try to continue to bring this bill before this Legislative Chamber, time after time, before the other business of the people is determined, knowing (because I have told him in advance and so have other people) that I intend to speak for as long as physically possible in opposition to this bill. As long as I am physically capable, I intend to speak in this Legislative Chamber against this bill because ladies and gentlemen of this legislature, you are making a mistake. You are making a mistake against yourselves and every citizen whom you present and every citizen who votes for whatever political party. You are making a dreadful error.

It is going to be the Attorney General's attempt or ploy to try to show, because I continue to speak on this legislation, that I am holding up the business of the people of Saskatchewan. I want everyone to know, I am holding up nothing. Bring forward the other measures, Mr. Attorney General, and you will see how quickly they will go through this House, as quickly as the members of the opposition can handle them. But don't try to attempt to fool the people into believing that I, because I am opposed to the fundamental tenets of this bill, am holding up the natural and legitimate business of the people of Saskatchewan, because it won't wash. You are the one who decides what we talk about. You are the one who decides what time we talk about it. Mr. Speaker, it just quite simply won't wash. The people of this province know better.

The people of the province of Saskatchewan know this legislation is wrong, that the majority must never be allowed to step on the rights of the minorities, whatever those minorities might believe. You know, it is interesting to note (I made special note of it today because I thought perhaps this bill was coming forward) that the Minister of Agriculture stated his government was bringing forward legislation to establish a trust fund by which the Doukhobors of western Canada would receive the money to which they were entitled. He further stated it was his opinion that the Sons of Freedom sect of that religion were in fact included in the bill. If that's true, I commend the Minister of Agriculture and his department because most of you will remember what the Sons of Freedom sect stood for in western Canada. You will remember they stated they would not obey the laws of our land. You will remember they paraded nude because they would not accept the roles of the laws of our land because, Mr. Speaker, it was against their religious convictions.

You will remember Mr. Speaker, that sect was reviled in western Canada, was attacked in western Canada. Yet this government has enough social conscience to make certain their rights as individuals are looked after. Here's an organization that says it wants to work within the laws of Saskatchewan. We want to work within the laws of Canada. We want to present an option, however.

Mr. Speaker, the mistake every member of this legislature makes if he supports this bill is, if you pass this legislation, more people than you can even imagine are going to join the Unionest Party because they know that in the United States of America, those rights are protected. If you pass this bill, they'll say where is our free country? Where is our free society? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this bill is an affront to the dignity of this House. It

should never have been brought here. Never! The bill should never have come before this Chamber because just last year this same legislation was passed and it contemplated history.

Is the member for Biggar attempting to say, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't know about Canadian history and the formation of the Unionist Party in federal parliament? Is he trying to say that the Attorney General or the Premier didn't know about it? That somehow you could pass a bill that would slip by because it seems logical?

I can just see it now, Mr. Speaker, I can just see the discussion. We announced the formation of a Unionist Party and the NDP caucus is sitting around. All of a sudden the first reaction is holy smoke, are the constituents ever against them! Wowee! The senior citizens and the legion are totally against them. I have constituents coming up to me and saying hang them! I have, as one member said, the Hon. Mr. Shillington, some women in his constituency saying, turf them out of the legislature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the attitude and the NDP are sitting around. They say, well we can't turf them out of the legislature. That's impossible. We just couldn't make that step. So let's figure out some way to pick up on all that wonderful anti-Collver, anti-Unionist Party feeling out there. Let's show people that we are doing something. But they didn't think, Mr. Speaker. They didn't think about the ramifications for themselves as individual members.

What's next? If a member like the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland stands in his place (he is not here today), but he says to the absolute amazement of every member of this legislature, Mr. Speaker, I don't support this bill. My constituents told me not to support it. But in the tradition of the NDP, I'm going to abstain. If every member in this legislature accepted that principle of democracy, then why have an opposition at all? As a matter of fact, why have individual members at all? Why not just have a Premier and he appoints all the cabinet? Why not just run one guy?

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's the American system!

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, someone from across the ways said, that's the American system. What nonsense! What absolute and utter nonsense! Over the course of this debate, the member will hear about the American system and will hear that only on the administrative side (not the legislative side) one man is elected and the rest of the administration is appointed. The legislative side — well the executive side for the benefit of the very proper member for Biggar, he's quite right — is elected there in the body of one person. The legislative branch, however, who take their jobs very seriously are elected, and they . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, someone in Saskatchewan is going to tell some of those members opposite that it is not the United States of America which is on the verge of breaking up; it is Canada which is on the verge of breaking up. It is not in the United States of America that people can't agree on a constitution. The people in the United States of America agree that their constitution is the best in the world. It's not the people in the United States. Mr. Speaker, it is not they who are having to fight against a government that would bring in a bill which is this repressive. It is we who are here in the province of Saskatchewan who have to fight against this kind of legislation. And fight we will, Mr. Speaker, because if the government members believe that just by accepting the will of the majority that's democracy, then they forget everything they ever learned at school, business, law or in government.

I have even heard some members opposite talk about the rights of minorities and I intend to refer to those rights from time to time over the course of this debate. I have had them talk about the rights of native Indians; they do have right — individual and fundamental rights.

Mr. Speaker, just before I go into the main body of what I want to say, I'd like to read for the members opposite, because I don't think they have really read it — an act, just a portion of it. I intend to draw the attention of members to all of this act, because it's a good act, it's a good piece of legislation and it's legislation the NDP themselves brought into this Assembly — an action respecting the Saskatchewan code of human rights and its administration. I just want to read one clause from this act. As I said, during the course of this debate I intend to draw to your attention the entire act because this entire act pertains to the rights of individuals.

Clause 4, page 339 — under part 1 of The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act, passed by your very own government:

Every person and every class of person shall enjoy the right to freedom of conscience, opinion and belief, and freedom of religious association teaching, practice and worship.

Mr. Speaker, how can anyone have a freedom of conscience, opinion and belief if government actions can be used to blackmail them into attempting to think the way the majority does. How can it be? How is it possible? You have a law that says, Mr. Speaker, the Unionist Party (this legislature's law) is entitled to certain rights and privileges in this Assembly. It has the rights to a certain number of members on the committees. Ah, the members forget that. This law removes that right. No, I'm not kidding; it removes that right. That means the Unionist Party may not present members to the committees as the other parties do. We must approach the committees as individual independent MLAs. That's your law.

You remove the rights of the members of the Unionist Party to appropriate research and secretarial help that other parties in this legislature enjoy. According to the laws of Saskatchewan, even if you pass this bill, you could not remove the fact we are a legal party in Saskatchewan, legally recognized under The Elections Act in Saskatchewan.

So don't try to hide, Mr. Speaker. Don't have the members try to hide behind the money issue. Let them talk first of all about what in reality they are trying to do. That's on the one hand thwart opinions that don't happen to fall into their understanding of the situation; and number two, remove the recognition of the Unionist Party because they are afraid of me. I didn't say that. The member for Regina Centre laughs. You know who said that, Mr. Member for Regina Rosemont, your leader, Allan Blakeney, and your deputy leader, Roy Romanow. You see. Now why, Mr. Speaker, just because they're afraid? Of what? Of an idea? Are you afraid of the future? We all should be you know. What are you afraid of? Are you rising, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: — If the member would permit me to have the Administrator come to the House before I call it 5 o'clock? I understand the Administrator is about and is prepared to give royal assent.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 4:57 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the bill presented to him.

His Honour then retired from the Chamber at 4:59 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.