LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 10, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Second Report of the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures

MR. ALLEN moved, seconded by Mr. Andrew:

That the second report of the special committee on rules and procedures be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the report you have just tabled is the second report of the special committee on rules and procedures which was established by this House on May 3, 1979. It contains a number of recommendations which the committee has agreed on and which we table today for the consideration and approval of this Assembly.

We ask the House to approve the idea of having an annual orientation seminar for all members of the Assembly so that they may be kept up to date on new developments within the parliamentary field.

We recommend that additional allowances be paid to people who have taken leadership roles in this Assembly, mainly the House leaders who should, we feel, be paid an additional allowance. Also, chairmen of standing committee of this Assembly, we feel, should be paid an additional allowance on a per diem basis for meetings of the committees which they chair.

We recommend that rule 3 be amended to provide an automatic reporting procedure out of committee of the whole and committee of finance at the conclusion of the day. This rule change will not imply that the House or committees may not sit beyond the appointed time of adjournment if there is unanimous consent to remain sitting.

The recommendation which deals with the order of private member's business is simply a housekeeping matter which will facilitate the typesetting of the blues in the House.

The recommendation which deals with certification of bills and recommends that the Assistant Clerk be allowed to certify bills, will facilitate the work of the Clerk's office. The Assistant Clerk may sign these bills in the absence of the Clerk.

The recommendation which deal with exhibits to the Chamber will allow the Speaker to judge what would be considered non-parliamentary and should be prohibited.

The recommendation, which deals with substantive motions in committee of the whole and committee of finance, clarifies what is already accepted rules in parliamentary practice as outlined in Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*. All members will know that we have strayed on occasion from this rule over the last number of years. This recommendation further clarifies what the proper practice is.

We've also recommended that an appendix be added to the green book containing all

the rule changes which have taken place since that green book was brought together, I think, in 1971.

Perhaps the most important recommendation which we make today is on the subject of televising the procedures of the Assembly. We have recommended that the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly be recorded, under guidelines as they be set by Mr. Speaker in the Legislative Assembly, by remote control audio-visual cameras, and that the tapes be made available to conventional and cable television stations for partial or complete broadcast.

This recommendation, Mr. Speaker, comes as a result of intensive study by your committee and by a previous committee of this House. We studied systems which were in effect in the House of Commons and in other provincial jurisdictions. We heard and received briefs on the subject from individual television companies and interested people.

We had two options. We could have gone with the private system, as they have in some provincial jurisdictions, in which the costs would have been borne by individual television stations (private operators), or we could have gone with the Ottawa model. We have chosen the latter. This implies that committees which meet outside the House, for example, Crown corporations committee, would not be televised. We have yet to come to a final decision on televising committee of the whole and committee of finance.

The cost of using the Ottawa model will be greater than using the private option. However, it was the feeling of all members of the committee that, if we were going to have television in the House, we should have the best system available at a reasonable cost. We were mindful in making this decision of the question of cable television usage of the coverage in the House and felt that the Ottawa model would be best suited for this media, while at the same time making tapes available for conventional television stations for their use. It is my hope that we can agree with this report so that we can immediately begin to do the work necessary to make television a reality as quickly as possible.

MR. ANDREW: — In moving with the member for Regina Rosemont in concurrence on this particular report, which is an interim report, I think we have made a step forward in bringing our legislature into the mainstream as it relates to television in the Assembly. It was a debatable point within the committee. We finally did succeed in having TV. I think the important thing is that as a committee, we cannot stop at this particular point in time. Many other very important reforms have to be brought into the parliamentary system of government (in my view). If we are to move ahead and keep in pace with the world around us and not isolate ourselves in the Chamber which some have described as a museum. This committee system is one area which I think is extremely important. I hope all members of this Assembly will give some input into bringing our system in line with the 1980s instead of always walking behind. This is clearly an important step forward and I would ask all members to concur in this report.

Motion agreed.

MR. ALLEN moved, seconded by Mr. Andrew:

> That this Assembly approves and adopts the amendments to the rules and procedures of the Legislative Assembly as they appear in Appendix A of the

second report of the special committee on the review of rules and procedures of the Legislative Assembly.

That the rules and procedures as amended shall come into effect on the first sitting day following the Christmas recess in the present session.

Motion agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce t the Assembly two international visitors. Norbert Gunther is an exchange student for Isny-Neutrauchburg, West Germany and Thor Gaarder, from Gran, Norway is a student farmer. Norbert Gunther is taking grade 12 at the Estevan Comprehensive School under the Rotary International student exchange program and Thor Gaarder has a farm in Norway. His visit to Canada was arranged by Rotary International for a farming practice information exchange and he is hosted by the family of Gordon and Inga Klarholm of Macoun and daughter Barbara who are also seated in the Speaker's gallery. May their visit be informative and educational. I am sure the members of the Assembly will join with me in welcoming these guests.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO AIR CADETS

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce 28 young people, ages 13 to 18, from the Wynyard Regal Squadron Air Cadets No. 568. They are accompanied by their leaders, Mr. Jerry Carter, Mrs. Marlene Kirkstein, and Mr. B.M. Swan. I am advised that the squadron has been in existence since 1953. They presently have 38 cadets from the Kandahar, Elfros, and Raymore districts included in the squadron. They are here today to take a tour of the legislature and to watch the proceedings during the early part of the session. On behalf of all of us, I want to welcome them to the legislature and to indicate that following the question period I will have an opportunity to meet with them.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to welcome that particular group. The reason for that is quite simple. I had the opportunity of teaching in Kandahar a number of years ago. So I would like to welcome them. I would hope that they would say hello to their parents, those whom I know. May I say, happy flying, but not on the road

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Federal Legislation Controlling Offshore Resources

MR. LANE: — I would like to direct a question to the Premier. In today's news conference in response to a question regarding the federal government's introduction of legislation to control offshore resources, your answer basically was that it doesn't really affect Saskatchewan so you have no official position, following the normal constitutional positions which you have taken. But I have off the wire the general

outline of the Economic Council of Canada's report and its forecast is a dismal future for the next few years in Canada. Their economic forecast can be summed up in one word — dismal.

The report indicates, as well, that the federal government will have to obtain revenues basically from two sources, either the provincial government surpluses (which the economic council is predicting will rise), or provincial resources. Now, you haven't supported the West in the constitutional debate on control of resources. Now you are not supporting the Maritimes or the coastal provinces in the control of the resources. Will you not be prepared to admit now that your go-it-alone policy is fraught with danger for Saskatchewan, because if the federal government takes over those provincial surpluses as a source of revenue, you will have no allies left because you have given no support to anyone in this constitutional debate other than Pierre Elliott Trudeau?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misinformed on our position with respect to offshore resources. We have stated publicly and in writing to the Premier of Newfoundland our support for the Newfoundland ownership of offshore resources. We supported that position at the first ministers' conference in September. Any assumption on the part of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that that is not our position is an assumption not based upon fact.

MR. LANE: — By way of a supplementary, your comment to the press this morning was that there was no official position taken by Saskatchewan. Again, by way of a supplementary, an announcement was made the other day that you would be finally wending your way to Ottawa to make an appearance before the constitutional committee. Yet today you indicate that no date n fact has been set. Now this will be the third cancellation by the Premier: December 5 a presentation according to one of your new releases, the original date was November 24, then you were considering December 19.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. If the member has a supplementary I'll allow him to go ahead.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Premier, do you not feel that it's time to get off the fence, make your position clear to the public of Canada and appear before the constitutional committee at the earliest opportunity, i.e. early next week, or your original date of December 19? Why don't you present your position once and for all to the people of Canada and make it clear where you stand on issues instead of beating around the bush and . . .

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, let me comment on the hon. member's speech in a couple of ways. He totally misrepresent my position at this morning's new conference. A simple check of the tape will show that what I indicated this morning was that we had no large financial interest in the decision since we had no offshore resources, nor any Arctic resources, but that we regretted the decision because it indicated an inflexibility with respect to the federal energy package, which package we opposed and continue to oppose, and to which we hope there will be some changes — point number one.

Point number two: with respect to the member's position, the position of the Government of Saskatchewan on the constitutional package is clear to everybody but

the member for Qu'Appelle. There are statements by me, here in Regina, in Toronto, speeches in various locations (certainly in Halifax) which outline our position with more clarity and with more precision than has been done by any other Premier in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the Premier. I've asked on two occasions for you to table your constitutional position before this Assembly, and to date you have refused. You said you could do it with ease early in the session, as a matter of fact the first day of question period. To date you have refused to supply your position to this Assembly.

The Gallup poll announcement today indicates that a majority of Canadians are opposed to the unilateral patriation of the constitution as proposed by the NDP and the federal Liberals. This includes 50 per cent (according to the poll) in the province of Ontario. Are you now prepared to divorce yourself finally from the NDP-Trudeau position favoring unilateral patriation of the constitution, and will you take it upon yourself as Leader of the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan to request the federal New Democratic members from Saskatchewan to divorce themselves from the position taken by the New Democratic Party of Canada and the Liberal Party of Canada?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, if 50 per cent or 70 per cent of the people in Canada oppose the unilateral patriation of the constitution, they can count me among them. I have said on many, many occasions and say again today that our government opposes the unilateral patriation of the constitution. Let me make that clear.

With respect to our constitutional position, the great bulk of it was included in a briefing book which was used by us at the first minister's conference, a copy of which was made available to the Leader of the Opposition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It was confidential stamped all over it then. Perhaps I do you an injustice, sir, but I suspect that the member for Qu'Appelle has available to him that material.

I state with precision that our government opposes the unilateral patriation of the constitution. I say further that we will continue to oppose the unilateral patriation of the constitution. I will make my point with my party members. I hope members opposite will make their point with their party members and with their colleagues from Ontario and New Brunswick, who are the only two premiers in Canada who are supporting Mr. Trudeau.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Question to the Premier. The Economic Council of Canada, in its summary of a dismal economic future, indicates that the advice given by the Conservatives last spring that the constitution be put on the back burner for a couple of years, and that in that time the western provinces attempt to negotiate uniform position where possible, was perhaps correct. Would the Premier be prepared to agree with the Conservatives that perhaps it's time the government of Canada, of all political stripes, put the constitution on the back burner for a couple of years an direct themselves to the real problems facing Canada, namely the economic mess this country is in?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, for those who can recall, at the end of the first ministers' conference the position of the Government of Saskatchewan was stated as one calling for a breather, calling for putting it at least on the mid-burner, not on the front burner, calling for a cessation of the federal-provincial controversy surrounding the constitution. We made that point back in September. The member for Qu'Appelle is agreeing with me today and I am perfectly happy to have him agree with me.

The point to make, Mr. Speaker, is that whether or not the member for Qu'Appelle and I agree that this should be put on the back burner., it's not going to be put on the back burner on that account. It is now before the House of Commons and the Senate and before their committee, and what we have to deal with is the reality of the situation of its being before the House of Commons and the Senate. The reality will not change because people say, "I oppose this, I oppose what those people are doing." What must be done is not only to oppose what they are doing, but to attempt to grapple with the consequences of what they are doing, in order to grapple with the consequences, you have to do something more than oppose. You have to put forward some constructive. alternatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Tax Exemptions Under Options North Program

MR. ANDREW: — Question to the member responsible for northern Saskatchewan. Yesterday in the House, Mr. Minister, you indicated that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan had been advised by Revenue Canada that the various Options North programs were tax exempt, that you had a pre-ruling on that. As the minister I'm sure is aware, in order to get a pre-ruling you have to set out your proposal: the government then responds with a formal ruling. Could the minister produce for this Assembly, first the inquiry and then the ruling on the same?

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, a review of the record will indicate that what the hon. member for Kindersley alleges I said yesterday is at some variance with the facts of what I said. What I did say was that on numerous occasions the Department of Northern Saskatchewan had made inquiries of the Department of National Revenue as to the status of that particular remuneration of those Options North students during that period of their training when they were at post-secondary institutions. Consistently, and as recently as yesterday, the reply from the office of the Minister of National Revenue and from the director of the district taxation office, was that while those students are in full-time attendance at school, they do not have the status of, and are not considered to be employees, and that those living allowances therefore are not taxable.

MR. ANDREW: — The supplementary, Mr. Minister, basically is this. You will agree with me, I'm sure, that in order to have a formal ruling from the income tax department (and I'm sure the Premier will agree with me), that formal ruling must be in writing by the income tax department. My question to you is: do you believe that the telephone call to the department is sufficient? Will you not produce both the question and the ruling, and table that ruling before this Assembly?

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I will take the position of the Minister of National Revenue as to the practicality of that remuneration before I take the words of the member for Kindersley.

MR. ANDREW: — My final supplementary to you, Mr. Minister, is this: would you not agree that to clear the air you should submit this for a ruling by the income tax department and then table it?

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, the only thing which is murking the air is the position of the member for Kindersley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I am satisfied that the Minister of National Revenue and the director of taxation in the district office have taken the position on several occasions that those living allowances are not taxable. If the member for Kindersley does not understand that to be clear air, then that's his problem.

Earth Stations

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier in light of the absence of the minister in charge of Sask Tel. Mr. Premier, in light of the recent happenings in Regina in the CRTC (Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission) meetings which are being held, and the rekindled confrontation between Sask Tel and the cable operators in Saskatchewan, will you now tell this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan (and especially the 400,000 people who will not be serviced by fibre optics) that your government will allow the cable operators to go into the earth station receivers, which is a cheaper rate of supplying cable television to rural Saskatchewan? Will you now tell the people of rural Saskatchewan that they can obtain cable television services through the CRTC-approved facilities? Will your government now admit that earth stations can be approved through the federal government? Will you now allow the people of rural Saskatchewan cable television to which they are entitled?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the member makes a good number of statements with which I am not familiar. Accordingly, I have difficulty responding. I am not aware of any "heightened confrontation" between our government and the cable operators arising out of the CRTC hearings, nor am I aware that the CRTC is taking the position that it will grant licenses to earth stations for cable operators to distribute cable. Since those were the factual suppositions of the hon. member's question, I find myself unable to respond.

Fee Payments to Doctors

MR. SOLOMON: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the member for Thunder Creek, but I would address my question to the Minister of Health. In light of the fact that the recent Saskatchewan Medical Association annual convention raised the matter of inadequate fee payments made to doctors by the medical care insurance commission, and in view of the fact that adequate compensation for doctors is a concern of many citizens of Saskatchewan, could the minister make available to this Assembly a list of doctors who are paid through the medical care insurance commission and what those payments were for each doctor for the latest 12-month period?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I will certainly have to take that question under advisement. I do not have the information before me. Mr. Speaker, so far as I can recall, this has not been done previously. I will want to check with the chairman of MCIC (medical care insurance commission) and with my officials to see if legally I would be

able to do this. I will bring the information back to the House or to the member at the earliest convenience.

MR. SOLOMON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister indicated last week that direct billing was down to less than 3 per cent over the past few months. Could the minister table as well a list of Saskatchewan doctors, by community, including general practitioners and specialist by specialty, who have extra or direct billed their patients within the last two months, so that Saskatchewan residents who require a doctor's service can know in advance which doctors direct or extra bill.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to check my position to see whether I would be able to do this legally. I have to check with my officials; I'm not certain as to the legalities of that.

Secondly, I would like to check with the Saskatchewan Medical Association to see if it has any real reservations as to whether I could do this legally. So again, I would have to take it under notice and get back to the member as soon as I can.

Threatened Resignations at St. Paul's Hospital

MRS. DUNCAN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minster of Health. Mr. Minister, as you are probably aware, the staff of the labor and delivery unit at St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon has threatened to resign en masse if more funding is not made available for additional staff. It is the consensus of the staff that the situation has become critical, if not potentially dangerous, both to the newborn and to the mother, and in their action they have given the hospital one month. I believe you probably have a copy of the petition I have.

Could you tell me, Mr. Minister, why your government has ailed to provide adequate funds to alleviate situations such as this, because as I understand it, the situation is not isolated to this particular hospital but exists in larger hospitals throughout the province?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I happen to have my briefing notes with me. I appreciate that the hon. member via ESP has let me know that you were going to ask me this question.

Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all tell the member for Maple Creek, and the report, that Saskatchewan led all provinces from 1975 to 1976 in giving funds to hospitals. Saskatchewan, for example, from 1975-76 to the present day increased its funding by 50.4 per cent, with Canada as a whole increasing its funding by 41.5 per cent; B.C. 41.3 per cent; Manitoba 38.8 per cent, Ontario 34.5 per cent; Alberta 29.3 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, last year we increased the number of staff to our base hospitals by about 190 members — the total for Saskatchewan hospitals by about 290 members. St. Paul's received a substantial increase — about 16 per cent. St. Paul's Hospital is on a global budget. They make the decision as to where they want to allocate their staff. If they wish to go off the global budget, we can go to a line-by-line budget, but I don't think St. Paul's would prefer this. They want the flexibility. I know there have been some comments made by Dr. Lewis Brand (and we all know Dr. Lewis Brand who made the statement that the member has been referring to).

I have checked with St. Paul's since, and I have checked with my hospitals, and the accusations that are made by Dr. Brand simply are not true.

MRS. DUNCAN: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure, Mr. Minister that the mothers throughout Saskatchewan will be greatly consoled with your rhetoric, but whichever way you cut it, that particular unit-does not have adequate funds to properly staff the facility — and I did not talk to Dr. Lewis Brand. I talked to someone and I do have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Okay. I would like to hear it . . .

MRS. DUNCAN: — I was in contact with personnel in the hospital as recently as last night and the situation has not really changed. But since Saskatchewan is seventh in Canada in per capita spending on health, would you not agree that it is a sad commentary on your government's health care system when a group of very dedicated health workers have to resort to very extreme measures to bring their plight to the attention of your government?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, we are always open to further suggestion from hospital staff. I have indicated on a number of occasions that I think we probably run the most efficient hospital system in all of Canada, and a good quality hospital system.

Mr. Speaker, for the edification again of the reporters and of the member opposite, I quote from Statistics Canada. Statistics Canada says that hospital per capita expenditures for 1978-79 were for Saskatchewan, $249; Alberta, $230; Manitoba, $245; Canada as a whole, $245. We are above the average, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, having said that, I want to make it very clear that I do not equate health care with hospitalization and medicare. There is much more to health care than those two components. And Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, would like to put more emphasis on preventive care, to prevent illnesses, rather than just on treatment-oriented care.

Lands Branch Lease Fees

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister it has previously been raised in this Assembly, by my colleague for Rosetown-Elrose, the very dramatic increases in lease fees by the lands branch this year. I would like to add to that the 100 per cent increase in pasture fees and hay leases.

Mr. Minister my question to you is simply this. In a year that has been very difficult for cow-calf operators, operators who are being subsidized by the federal government to stay in business, operators who are being subsidized by your own government for feed hauling, etc., how can you possibly justify subsidizing the same people with one hand, and, on the other hand, taking it out of them in terms of increased lease costs? Would the minister agree this is a prime, classic example of one arm of government not having the slightest idea of what the other arm is doing?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, in responding to he hon. member for Thunder Creek, I would invite him to take a look at the information I provided to the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose — the formula on which the grazing fees and the community pasture fees and so on are applied. I make that point, consider that.

I ask him also to consider the relationship between the fees being charged by the provincial government and what it would cost farmers to use their own land in terms of keeping their cattle herds — the relationship between private land and public land as it relates to the charges that we put upon the public land.

I point out also to the hon. member that one of the good points of this year's experience was the amazing turnaround that took place in the community pastures and on the grazing land of this province. In fact, the livestock that came out of those community pastures and came out of the grazing leases were in better shape this fall then at any time in the history of the province. I think that has to be taken into account when one considers the lease charges on that particular land.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: — The member may have a further question. However the time for the question period has elapsed and . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Mr. Speaker, with all due respect we didn't start until 2:15.

MR. SPEAKER: — Oh, I have been keeping track.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. BERNTSON: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of privilege. The rules committee of this Legislative Assembly, as well as Mr. Speaker, in my opinion has been impugned by the public utterance of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan last night, and again this morning, on CKCK Television. I paraphrase and I'm prepared to provide you with a transcript, but in effect what he said is that the rules committee of Mr. Speaker was going to Great Britain on a paid holiday at taxpayers' expense. Mr. Speaker, I've sat on that particular committee and its predecessor for five years. I know it to be a hard-working committee. For personal reasons I long ago decided I wasn't going on the trip to Great Britain, but in my view, Mr. Speaker, the effectiveness of this committee has been colored by these statements. I would simply ask Mr. Speaker to make a ruling as to whether the trip arranged by your office for the rules committee to Great Britain is in fact, or any portion of that trip is in fact, a holiday paid by taxpayers' expense.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Of course, the raising of a matter of privilege is of great concern to the Assembly, and I would like to have an opportunity to examine the matter. I'll do that at the earliest possible opportunity, and perhaps bring a statement back to the Legislative Assembly with regard to the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I note again that you are accepting questions from the government side of the House which, in your wisdom, you have decided as a questionable procedure and which (if I may be allowed a prediction) I think will lead to some very strained feelings in the coming days of the legislature — either now or later. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, on may occasions I have noted when the opposition words questions in a similar fashion to the member for Regina North-West, very quickly these questions are referred to the order paper. They are extremely detailed questions and I really wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this is going to become commonplace, could you perhaps advise the House Leader for the government side and ask him to at least teach his backbenchers to ask a proper question, and to differentiate properly between what is appropriate for the oral question period and what is proper for the order paper? And also if the ministers involved could have their

cue cards ready on that day?

MR. SPEAKER: — The member raises something which he states is a "point of order" and I'm a bit at a loss as to understand complete what the point of order was that the member was raising. I will take the opportunity to read the record of what the member said today because I want to be perfectly clear what his point of order is.

I think that the point the member raised with regard to all members acquainting themselves with what a proper question is for the House is a good point to raise, and it should be examined by members on all sides of this House. I further agree that that should be applied to the making of points of order — that they are clear and concise and crisp, to give the Speaker the best opportunity to rule on the point of order. With those few words I will check the record and have a look at what the hon. member for Thunder Creek has raised at this time.

On the Orders of the Day

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Boundaries Commission

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. MacMurchy.

MR. LANE: — I wanted to direct a few comments on the electoral boundaries report to indicate that some of the proposed changes, particularly in the city of Regina, cause me a great deal of concern. I have raised these matters before the boundaries commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you afraid you're going to lose it?

MR. LANE: — Perhaps the hon. member looks at it as a win and loss. If that is how the commission report is approached by you, then I am a little disappointed. Let me take a look at a riding in Regina which includes Glencairn, a subdivision which has artificial boundaries, the Ring Road on one side and Highway No. 1 on the other. It has had problems for some considerable time. The member for Kinistino, who resides there, knows of what I speak. It has not had proper access and it has been isolated from other parts of the city.

What does the boundaries commission do? The boundaries commission includes that part of Regina, Glencairn, with a part of Regina over two miles away from the nearest home in Glencairn and the nearest home to the other side of Regina North-East riding in that particular constituency, the barrier between the two subdivision is an industrial park, a major industrial area of the city of Regina, which has been leapfrogged over to include two subdivision. All I suggest is that it is unfair to the residents of both sides of that riding to have a constituency such as proposed in Regina North-East.

I have raised these matters before the electoral boundaries commission. I asked the commission as well to include in the commission's review an understanding or the information from the cities, the municipal governments themselves. Glencairn, as a subdivision, has much more in common with University Park and the new Gardiner Park, a high-growth area in the city of Regina. Both are on the east side of the Ring Road, both are having problems similar in nature.

The city and the public school system in Regina is looking at building a high school to serve University Park, Gardiner Park and Glencairn, not dividing those, but looking at the area east of the Ring Rod as a unit. The city in its planning and is retail development is using Gardiner Park, University Park and Glencairn as one quadrant of the city separated by the Ring Road. Yet the boundaries commission did not consider that. So here we have local school boards looking at it as an area for development and an area which must be treated as one for determining growth, students, etc. Here we have the municipal government looking at that as a unit for retail development, retail growth and retail planning. The only one that didn't consider it was the boundaries commission.

If it is a part of the act affecting the boundaries commission, then in my view, the act obviously has a serious weakness. Again, I don't think that it should prejudice the people in those particular areas. I have had representations from people in Glencairn and they can't see the logic of the division made. In fairness, the boundaries commission has an artificial boundary. If one can call it, or an economic boundary. If one takes a look at Regina Centre, one of its boundaries is the CN mainline.

It is not that the boundaries commission could not rearrange the map. When I raised this matter with the boundaries commission, the response was, "Well, that would mean a rearrangement of the map." I frankly though that that was what the boundaries commission was supposed to be doing. So, I'm not satisfied with the results in Regina, particularly the Regina North-East riding. Glencairn residents in the past, during election-campaigns, were very upset that in fact they were combined with a rural riding. That was not fair to the residents of Glencairn.

I can't support the boundaries commission report and I do that most reluctantly because I have supported the government throughout on an independent boundaries commission and I have supported the legislation in the past. My concerns are that there are these areas, at least in the city of Regina (I'm speaking only of what I have knowledge) and I really don't think it is fair. It doesn't represent the growth patterns of the city and it doesn't reflect the growth patterns of the school system or the municipal government. I think it is unfair to the residents and for that reason I must oppose the motion.

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the comments of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. I find it interesting that he feels he cannot support the report of the independent boundaries commission. I think that all members, or a large number of members, can look at the work of the independent boundaries commission and say, "Well, in this constituency it would have been better if you would have this; in that constituency it would have been better if you had done that." The hon. member is looking at the city of Regina, at a particular situation in the city of Regina, and saying to the commission, "If you had done that, it would have been a better map."

I think that we can't view the work of the independent boundaries commission on that kind of basis. I think we have to look at their difficulties, their concerns, and their job relative to the total province. I think that the independent boundaries commission took all of the factors they were faced with and came up with the best map they possibly could.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the government will have to look at the legislation before we set the independent boundaries commission to doing its work next time. But I do not think we should be critical of the efforts of the independent boundaries

commission, based on the job they had to do. I would ask all members to support the resolution and I would ask all members to commend the independent boundaries commission on the job they did in putting forward the boundaries in the report we are now asked to support.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 50

Blakeney	Pepper	Allen
Kaeding	Snyder	Romanow
Tchorzewski	Robbins	Baker
Skoberg	McArthur	Gross
Rolfes	MacMurchy	Mostoway
Banda	Vickar	Hammersmith
Thompson	MacAuley	Engel
Feschuk	Byers	Cowley
Matsalla	Shillington	Lusney
Poniatowski	Lingenfelter	Prebble
Johnson	Nelson	Long
White	Solomon	Chapman
Miner	Berntson	Birkbeck
Duncan	Taylor	Swan
Hardy	Pickering	Muirhead
Katzman	Garner	Andrew
McLeod	Ham	

NAYS — 2

Lane	Rousseau

SECOND READINGS

HON. MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 18 — **An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Conflict of Interests Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is item no. 16, Bill No. 18, what I call a conflict of interest bill. In moving second reading of this bill I think I can advise the members of the House that the legislation is mainly a housekeeping bill. Department officials became aware of some minor problems with the act when members were filling out the first disclosure forms required by the act. One of the problems was that there were instances where it was not clear that the act required all of the information requested by the disclosure form. The proposed amendments to subsection 19(1) and (3) make it clear that members must file their statements under oath — something they have done but which statutorily was not there.

The amendment to section 19(1)(d) makes it clear that members need only disclose those debts owed to the member or another person in his family which exceed $5,000

for the member or each member in his family.

I should stop her to say that there was a bit of an interpretation problem on the $5,000 situation. The law, as it is currently written, is open to the interpretation that if you are owed (say by banks or credit union deposits, or whatever) as a family more than $5,000, you have a list of everybody's holdings. It was not intended that way. It was intended that it would apply only to the member and not to the spouse. So we are bringing an amendment to remedy that. We are also proposing a new clause, 19(1)(f) in order to make it clear that a member must list the name of the person holding the interest and the type of interest which is held. This is now what appears on the form and the statute simply makes the law comply with the form.

The proposed amendment to subclause 19(1)(g)(ii) is necessary to include words inadvertently left out when the legislation was originally drafted. The sentence just doesn't end and we need the words to complete the sense of the sentence. If there are substantive amendments to this bill, it would be to the next clauses, 20(a)(i), 20.1(2)(c), and 20.1(2)(d). Here the word ""and" is replaced with the word "or". When the legislation was originally drafted, it was intended that a member would not have to disclose the name of the business in which he held a participation share or which was indebted to him if he met one of two conditions: (a) the total value of the shares or debt was less than a certain sum, $5,000 or $15,000, depending upon the appropriate section; or (b) the number of shares or indebtedness did not exceed 5 per cent of the total shares of indebtedness.

The proposed amendment will mean that members will not be required to disclose if they meet one of the above conditions, whereas the present law reads that you have to meet both of the present conditions. So in effect it is a lessening of obligation on us in that sense.

A new subsection (3) to section 20.1 has been added which provides that a member who was not aware or could not be reasonably expected to be aware of the existence of a government contract entered into by a corporation in which he owns shares, that member would not contravene the act if he fails to disclose it in the disclosure report. But the moment that he does become aware of it, he is obligated by law within 50 days to file the report. In effect it is an oversight in good faith provision and when it is uncovered. It must be reported.

Another amendment to proposed section 20.2(2)(a) makes it clear that members do not have to disclose participation in a government contract through a corporation if the value of the contract or contracts does not exceed $5,000 in any one years, which is the overall standard for revelation generally.

I point out to members that these amendments apply only to disclosure reports required to be filed after January 1, 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these cover the amendments. As I say, they are basically housekeeping and I therefore move second reading of An act to amend The Members of Legislative Assembly Conflict of Interests Act.

MR. LANE: — Just before I ask for leave to adjourn debate, I would like to ask the Attorney General to advise me, either later in debate or by hollering across the floor, whether or not circumstances have come to his attention or the Clerk's attention which would give rise to the amendment of clause 5, amending section 20.1.

That's the one where a member can plead that he was not aware of could not be reasonably expected to have been aware of the existence of the government contract. I can see the need for it but I am asking if there were circumstances that came to the Attorney General or Clark's attention which caused that particular amendment. In the meantime I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. SNYDER moved second reading of Bill No. 19 — **An Act to amend The Trade Union Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before this Assembly represents, I believe, a simple, straightforward amendment to The Trade Union Act to clarify the meaning of section 11(2)(d). I expect it comes as something less than a surprise, in that it deals with an issue surrounding the taking of strike votes, which has received a good deal of public attention and scrutiny over the past year.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, section 11(2)(d) provides that it is an unfair labor practice for a strike to take place unless a majority of employees who are members of the union representing the employees in the appropriate unit, and are eligible to vote, have voted by secret ballot in favor of a strike.

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that last year's work stoppage by Saskatchewan Government Employee's Association members of the provincial public service was declared illegal by Mr. Justice F.W. Johnson of the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench, on the basis of the court's interpretation of the meaning of section 11(2)(d). The court ruled on December 17, 1979, that a majority of the entire union membership was required to vote in favor of the strike action in order to obtain a strike mandate. In the case of the SGEA stoppage of November and December last year, while the majority of those who voted supported the strike, the majority of the entire membership did not express support.

Approximately 60 per cent of the SGEA members covered by the public service agreement voted, of whom 62 per cent favored strike action. The court's interpretation of this vote was that the strike was therefore supported by only 37 per cent of the total membership, which does not constitute a majority. The ruling of the Court of Queen's Bench was subsequently upheld by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal.

The crux of the court judgment was that the exercise or non-exercise of the right to vote does not affect a union member's eligibility, as the term is used in The Trade Union Act. The judgment goes on to say, and I quote from it:

> If the legislature of Saskatchewan had intended that a vote in favor of strike action by members of a union would be determined by a majority of voting members, then it would have said so in clear language.

Mr. Speaker, since 1972, when the present Trade Union Act was passed, it had been our belief that section 11(2)(d) was intended to provide that a simple 50 per cent plus 1 majority of those taking part in a strike vote would determine the outcome of that vote. In this connection, it has been argued that the term of eligibility, as it is used in this section, was intended to mean a union member in good standing who established eligibility by casting his or her vote. However, in terms of the court ruling, it now

appears that the section does not say what we thought it said. Accordingly, a greater effort must be made to express the intent of the legislation in clear language that cannot be misunderstood.

I may say that the act has worked well since 1972 on the basis of our interpretation of the strike vote quorum. It has never been challenged in the courts (I think that's worthy of note) prior to the time of the SGEA strike in 1979. It was simply a non-issue. One compelling reason for this circumstance centres on the fact that it is extremely unusual for a trade union leader to take his or her members out on strike without the assurance of a major degree of support from the membership. To do otherwise, Mr. Speaker, is to court disaster and to invite a good deal of internal difficulty for the union. Accordingly, it has been assumed, for all practical purposes, that the outcome of votes required under section 11(2)(d) always represented the wish of the majority of union members.

Apart from the stipulation that a vote be held, the major concern in 1972 when the present Trade Union Act was drafted was to ensure that all employees who are members of the trade union in the appropriate unit were eligible to vote.

Nevertheless, Mr. Justice Johnson's ruling has plainly cast doubt upon the meaning of 11(2)(d) as it presently exists. It is obvious that the section must be changed, not only to make absolutely certain just what the intent of the legislation is, but also to make it a workable and relevant provision in the context of the collective bargaining process.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, an amended 11(2)(d) is proposed which indicates, as before, that it is an unfair labor practice for a strike to take place unless a vote is taken by secret ballot among the employees who are members of the union representing the employees in the appropriate unit concerned and who are eligible to vote. The main thrust of the amendment is to add to the section the following clause:

. . . and unless the majority of the employees voting, vote in favor of a strike.

I think this makes it unmistakeably certain that the outcome of a strike vote is determined on the basis of a simple 50 per cent majority plus 1 of the union members who actually cast ballots.

Mr. Speaker, any stipulation other than this one would be entirely inappropriate and unworkable. To suggest that a majority of the total union membership, rather than of those who vote, is required to decide the result of a vote flies in the face of all commonly accepted democratic principles and procedures.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that representation in this Assembly would be considerably less than it is today if each member who is sitting in the Assembly were required to have 51 per cent support from all of the eligible voters in his or her constituency. Similarly, few members of parliament or municipal councillors would be entitled to hold office if an absolute majority were needed to validate their election.

Consider the fate, Mr. Speaker, of the money by-laws in the recent civic vote in Regina. If the voter-turnout of 18 per cent of the electorate were deemed to constitute an illegal vote.

If the criterion for a majority of eligible voters were widely applied, I think most social cultural and economic activities would come to a standstill.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, it is neither rational nor equitable to prevent the implementation of a democratically selected decision.

It is also, I think, important to note that the amendment brings section 11(2)(d) of The Trade Union Act into conformity with section 19 of The Construction Industry Labor Relations Act. Under the latter section, a strike vote is determined on the basis of a simple majority of union members voting. I think this is highly significant because the court decision on 11(2)(d) provides simple warning that lack of consistency between the two acts could produce even more confusion of interpretation in the future.

Incidentally too, Mr. Speaker, I should remind hon. members opposite that there was not a single dissenting voice when The Construction Industry Labor Relations Act was passed in May 1979. As a matter of act, no objection was received from outside the Assembly either with respect to section 19. Surely this suggest that the amendment now being considered should receive general support.

Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention that although there have been suggestions in some quarters that the section in question should be removed completely from The Trade Union Act, there is by no means a unanimous position on this even in organized labor circles. A number of union people have indicated to me that the matter is really a non-issue for them because in practice, as I suggested earlier, their union would not even remotely contemplate strike action without the solid majority support of the total union membership. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I'm convinced that no hardship of any kind will accrue to the trade union movement by providing that, before a strike validated, 50 per cent plus 1 of those who actually cast their votes represent the decision-making body. The requirement itself that a democratic strike vote be held under section 11(2)(d) continues on as was the case before, although in practice it's perhaps not necessary to embody this stipulation in legislation because most union constitutions make provision for it. Nevertheless, the government believes that it's a proper and a responsible course of action to include the section in the act to avoid any problems which may potentially occur in rare cases.

Mr. Speaker, it's our belief that the language of section 11(2)(d) has been improved and clarified to make unequivocally sure that the section will operate as it has always operated in practice up to the time of the SGEA strike in 1979. It does not encumber a legitimate union in the exercise of the rights of the union and its members. It guarantees a practical and an appropriate strike quorum. Above all, it maintains the major impetus of The Trade Union Act, i.e. the protection of freedom of employees to organize in labor unions of their choice and the provision of the framework within which effective collective bargaining can take place.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 19, An Act to amend The Trade Union Act be now read a second time.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, it may well be that this piece of legislation will receive general support, as the minister suggest it should. But it is indeed a rather weighty piece of legislation, probably the most weighty this session, and it will generate some considerable debate, I'm sure, from both sides of the House. I say that basically on comments from the Premier and the Minister of Labor at the time of the last SGEA strike. I appreciate that the minister brought this legislation in now, during the fall session, so that it may receive proper review and a full debate in the spring session. With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. COWLEY moved second reading of Bill No. 20 — **An Act to amend the Oil Well Income Tax Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce amendments to The Oil Well Income Tax Act. These amendments . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Rule 51 specifies that no bill shall be read a second time unless it is printed and distributed to the members at least one day previous and has subsequently been marked "printed" on the orders of the day. I believe the bill was distributed at about 12:45 p.m. today. For the member to proceed with second reading, he would require leave. Is the member prepared to ask for leave?

MR. COWLEY: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm prepared to ask for leave.

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have leave? Leave is granted.

MR. COWLEY: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll try again. As I've said, I'm pleased to be able to introduce the amendments to The Oil Well Income Tax Act. These amendments are being made for the following purposes:

1. To remove certain inequities present in the existing tax system.

2. To simplify the administration of the current tax system for both the oil producer and the government.

3. To make the penalties under the act more flexible and tailored to the nature and the severity of the offence.

4. To clarify the scope of the small-owner exemption for mineral owners receiving royalty income.

5. To clarify the treatment of royalties payable on Crown acquired production.

Before I explain in some detail the purpose of these amendments, I'd like to give members some background into the history of The Oil Well Income Tax Act.

Members will recall that in November of 1977, the supreme court ruled that certain provisions of Saskatchewan's Bill 42, The Oil and Gas Conservation Stabilization of Development Act, were ruled unconstitutional. The supreme court ruled that the mineral income tax and royalty surcharge were indirect taxes which under our constitution may only be levied by the federal government. In response to this decision, our government passed Bill 47. The Oil Well Income Tax Act in January of 1978 to protect those revenues jeopardized by the court's decision. The tax was a direct tax in its truest sense, a tax on net income — an income tax which is within the powers of the province. As members may recall, the tax system has successfully protected some $560 million of provincial revenues previously collected under Bill 42, and by the end of the current fiscal year will have collected an additional $240 million net of Crown royalties.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the tax system has been very successful in acquiring for

the province a fair economic rent for its resources, while at the same time providing the oil producer with a sufficient return to encourage record levels of drilling.

An income tax system by its nature is more complex than the traditional Crown royalty system, which is a percentage of the value of production, depending on the producing rate of the well. An income tax allows for the deduction of certain costs to determine the taxable income. This requires the oil producer as well as the government to account for an additional component in computing the province's economic rent. The extra step has increased the accounting burden for both the producer and the government.

In mid-1979 the government set up a working group, comprised of members from the oil producer associations and the government, to look at ways in which the system could be simplified. The working group met several times during 1975 and during this year. They looked at several alternatives to the income tax system but finally recommended the continuance of the existing system, with certain changes. Their recommended changes served two main purposes: (1) to remove inequities present in the existing system; (2) to simplify the account requirements as much as possible. Mr. Speaker, the government has reviewed the recommendations of the working group and has included in the amending bill certain amendments which will satisfy the concerns of the oil producers with respect to the methods of tax collection.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to explain some of the specific amendments being proposed. At present tax applies to a revenue received by a person or company from all oil produced in the province. To avoid double taxation, Crown royalties paid on production from Crown lands are deducted from the income tax otherwise payable. The level of tax on Crown lands before subtracting royalties is approximately the same as the royalty amount. The oil producer on Crown lands is therefore indifferent to the tax system, except for the additional accounting burden.

I propose to amend the act by removing from tax all revenues from Crown production. The proposed amendment is significant for several reasons:

(1) It reduces the administration burden for the producer who produces oil from Crown land. Approximately 65 per cent of the province's production is from Crown lands; therefore a significant number of oil producers will see a benefit from the change.

(2) It removes certain inequities which currently exist between production from Crown and freehold lands. Producers receiving revenue from freehold lands are currently paying proportionately more tax than producers on Crown lands. This inequity will be removed with the proposed amendment by allowing the government to fine tune the system.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will not result in any overall revenue change to the province or the oil producers. The amendment will, however, in part, satisfy the recommendations made to the government by the oil producers.

I also propose to amend the act by replacing the monthly withholding account on account of tax, with a tax instalment system. Under the current system, operators of oil wells are required each month to withhold and pay amounts representing approximately one-twelfth of their yearly taxes. The amendment will make the monthly calculation more compatible with the Crown royalty calculation. This will simplify the oil producer's monthly reporting requirements and will eventually allow the introduction of a monthly billing system. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, along with the

removal of revenues from Crown lands, satisfies the recommendations made by the oil producers to the government.

The remaining amendments are being introduced to improve the administration, and to clarify the meaning, of the existing act. Penalties under the existing tax system have been found to be relatively inflexible and unnecessarily severe in some circumstances. I am proposing to replace the existing penalties with a different set of penalties which are more flexible and more closely tailored to the nature and the severity of the offence to be punished.

The existing act exempts from tax all small mineral owners receiving royalty revenues. The exemption applies for mineral owners with mineral acreages totalling less than 1,280 acres. The exemption, however, is not restrictive enough, as certain oil producers have tried to avoid tax under this exemption. It was not the government's intention, Mr. Speaker, that oil producers should be able to avoid the tax. Only farmers and their beneficiaries, who normally had acquired their mineral rights through homesteading, were intended to be allowed the exemption. I am proposing an amendment which will prevent oil producers from avoiding tax but will at the same time continue the tax exemption for small mineral owners.

The existing act is not clear on the treatment of Crown acquired royalties for tax purposes. I am proposing an amendment which allows royalties paid on Crown-acquired production to be deducted from the tax otherwise payable.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks on the proposed amendments to The Oil Well Income Tax Act, I want to say that I think the industry and the tax collectors on the government side would be pleased to see this bill passed during this session. However, I don't believe there are any insurmountable reasons why it has to. I wanted to have this bill introduced at this session in the event that members opposite wished to take some time to study it because I admit it is a complex piece of legislation. That was the purpose of getting it on the order paper, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading of this bill.

MR. ANDREW: — Just a brief comment, Mr. Speaker, before I beg leave to adjourn debate on this matter. As the hon. member has indicated, it is a very complex piece of legislation. I think it will require some time in which to study it.

I would like to make one point. It appears to deal with the methods of collecting taxes and the minister referred to the increased record levels of drilling in the province of Saskatchewan. With the advent of the national energy program announced a month and one-half ago in Ottawa., I fear we are back to square one, back to the '74-75 situation when Bill 42 came in. Many of the oil people, particularly the people in the exploration field, are leaving the province. It becomes a very serious problem for us both from the standpoint of dealing with the whole matter of oil self-sufficiency and dealing with the economic impact that those people leaving the province will have on Saskatchewan.

I think the problem is one which must be addressed seriously by both levels of government if we are to preserve the industry in the province at such a crucial time in our economic history and in our quest for oil self-sufficiency. I suggest there must be movement by both levels of government, federal and provincial. In that movement I suppose the province is going to give a degree with regard to the take which they have on the royalties or the total take by the province. In turn the federal government is going to be required, if we are to address seriously the question of oil

self-sufficiency to increase the price of oil paid by the people of Ottawa. It seems to me, and I think to many people in the industry, that the only way we are really going to address the question is to keep the energy people in the province and to seriously address the question we are going to face in this decade with regard to oil self-sufficiency.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn debate on this bill.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. COWLEY moved second reading of Bill No. 5 — **An Act to amend the Real Estate Brokers Act**

He said: The main purpose of this bill is to bring time-sharing arrangements under regulation. This is achieved by defining a time-sharing arrangement and by including a time-sharing arrangement in the definition of real estate. The premises that are time-shared are usually located in areas of the world where people go for vacation or recreation. For a sum of money, a person acquires the use of premises for a period of time each year, usually a few weeks during the term of the contract. The terms of the contract may be for 20 or 30 years. In one case I am aware of, it was 40 years.

In some cases, the promoters of time-sharing have acquired premises in several location so that contract holders may, subject to availability, select premises, for example in Spain one year, Hawaii the next and so on. The problem is that persons are paying substantial sums of money in advance for the use of premises over a period which often extends many years into the future. Furthermore, both the premises and the promoters are located outside the jurisdiction of the province and even of the federal government.

This bill will enable the superintendent to disallow the sale in Saskatchewan of time-sharing arrangements unless he is satisfied that adequate provision has been made for the protection of contract holders. Any person wanting to enter into a time-sharing agreement may, of course, do so by going to the jurisdiction where the premises are located over which our province has not jurisdiction.

The act presently regulates the sale of lots or units of land located outside Saskatchewan. This section is being amended to simply refer to real estate located outside of Saskatchewan. The amendments, however, will not prohibit a person owning real estate outside of Saskatchewan from selling it in Saskatchewan, just as he may now sell his own home or farm so long as he is merely engaged in an isolated transaction and not in the business of a real estate broker.

The other amendments to the act, Mr. Speaker, are of a housekeeping nature. I would therefore move second reading of Bill No. 5.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the member who was going to respond to this unfortunately is not in the Chamber. Therefore, I beg leave to adjourn debate so that he can reply to the comments made.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. COWLEY moved second reading of Bill No. 6 — **An Act respecting a Floral Emblem for Saskatchewan.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a very short bill, the purpose of which is to provide a measure of protection to the plant which is the floral emblem of Saskatchewan, and also to recognize it by its proper name, as the Western Red Lily, rather than the Prairie Lily, and I believe, to change the Latin name as well, which is incorrect in the present legislation.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Numerous representations have been made to me by individuals and by groups who are particularly interested in this area. They have asked us for legislation to correct what they believe, and which have proven to be, incorrect things in the present legislation, and also to provide some measure of protection.

Several provinces now have legislation to protect their floral emblems from destruction, because as in Saskatchewan, the plants are becoming endangered species.

This legislation, I believe, should be of assistance to naturalists, educators, and others who are interested in preserving this particular plant which has been chosen, and chosen well, I think as the emblem of Saskatchewan.

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

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. MR. COWLEY moved second reading of Bill No. 14 — **An Act to amend The Business Corporations Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, The Business Corporation Act was passed in 1977. The statute is basically uniform with the Canada Business Corporations Act, and with the Corporations Act of Manitoba . Alberta has recently announced that it will be bringing forward a new corporate law modelled on those of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and the federal acts.

Because The Business Corporations Act is new and extensive, amendments have been required to deal with problems which have arisen, particularly in administration of the legislation. The bill before you now corrects a few minor deficiencies and, in some cases, clarifies existing wording. By doing so, the administration of the act will be facilitated.

All companies in existence before the act came into force must apply for continuation under the new act before December 31, 1980. There are now about 22,500 corporations under the new act, and about 700 still under The Companies Act. These 700 companies have until the end of December to continue under the act. The bill makes clear that any corporation not continued is dissolved on January 1,1981, but also simplifies the procedure for a dissolved company to be revived. The corporation need only apply for continuance, and is revived upon the issuance of a certificate of continuance.

I should like to say in concluding, that the Business Corporations Act appears to be

serving its purpose well and, I personally, as the minister in charge, have had very little difficulty with respect to the administration and the introduction of this act.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is one act where it would be very useful from the point of view of the department, and I believe of the companies that have not yet filed for continuance because some of them may be unable to get in by December 31, if this particular act could be passed at this session. It would be very useful, and so I will be approaching members opposite, after they have had a chance to look at it, and see whether or not we an get this through at this session.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move second reading of this bill.

MR. LANE: — I'm sympathetic to the wishes of the minister; I would like time to consider it further. I'm a little concerned about the provision on the fact that a company has not continued under the existing act. Of course the assets of the company and the company revert to the Crown, and that was a matter of concern when the original bill was raised; we thought that was a rather Draconian measure and that it should be dealt with in another manner, because the normal reason for non-continuance is inadvertence. I'm glad to see it dealt with, although I'm a little concerned that when it was raised at the outset, perhaps the oppositions' comments (on a basically non-political bill) should have been given a little more weight. I'd like a little more time to consider it, but I'm sympathetic to the minister's desire to get it through this session. If there are no matters of concern to be dealt with, we will let it go through this session.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. COWLEY moved second reading of Bill No. 15 — **An Act to amend The Business Names Registration Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend the requirements for registration of a business name to include not only a partnership, but a joint venture and a syndicate. The bill also provides the registrar with additional discretionary powers in refusing registration. It has been argued that he may refuse to register a business name only if the name is objectionable. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that he may refuse registration where the name, in itself, is not objectionable, but the registration would be objectionable because the name, although not registered under the act, is already in use.

A further amendment clarifies the admissibility of a document certified to be a true copy by the registrar. The court has questioned the admissibility of the contents of a document that has been certified by the registrar to be a true copy of a document filed with him.

Similar amendments are being made to The Business Corporations Act and to The Non-Profit Corporations Act, in an attempt to remove any doubt on this question.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Business Names Registration Act.

MR. LANE: — A couple of comments. I have concerns about the provision for joint ventures and names, and I would hope that the minister would take up with his official that there should be a requirement on joint ventures that the name used must somehow

represent the other corporations participating in the joint venture, because sometimes a name is so far divorced that the public does not see the connection. And that can lead to inadvertently or deliberately keeping a joint venture away from the public's right to know, or the public's ability to know through searching the documents. So that's a requirement I would suggest the minister raise with his officials. We do it in The Companies Act, and of course in that particular act there must be a reason for the name and you must show the devolution of the name. So I suggest that the same apply to joint ventures, though perhaps we should go a little further and say that a name must be tied with those participating in the joint venture.

Secondly, would the Provincial Secretary take note of this an supply me with the amount of the proposed fee that is going to be prescribed for searches? Then will the minister advise the House whether or not the companies office will allow those using the facilities on a regular basis to set up an accounting system to pay by cheque, as we do at land titles? We pay X number of dollars and then just submit the documents, then we're notified when the amount of money is down and more money is required. That has an advantage. It's convenient for those using the facilities but it gives the companies branch, or land titles, the use of funds for a very short period of time and that should be to their economic advantage. I would hope the minister would raise that particular area with is officials, and pending that, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 10 — **An Act to amend The Universities Commission Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this bill containing an amendment to The Universities Commission Act. I should point out, first of all, that this bill is very much of a routine nature and involves only a change in the fiscal year of the Saskatchewan Universities Commission.

As hon. members will know, the Saskatchewan Universities Commission was established in 1974. The purposes of the commission are to facilitate planning at the university level, a sector of the post-secondary education system. In doing the job of planning and advising the government with respect to plans, the universities commission, on an annual basis, reviews the financial and other needs of the universities, provides an analysis of those needs and provides a report on the implications of various financing options to the government, in terms of the financial provisions made by the government to the universities in Saskatchewan, namely the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina.

When the universities commission was originally established, the fiscal year for the universities commission was the same as that for the universities, running from July 1 of one year to June 30 of the year following. This was a convenient arrangement at that time, since both the universities commission and the universities were operating on the same basis in terms of fiscal arrangements. However, beginning in the government fiscal year of 1978-79, a change was made in the funding arrangements for the universities commission itself and funding for the commission's administrative expenses was established as a separate vote, outside of that for the universities. That provided the members of this legislature with a more clear division of the moneys allocated for the university sector in the province, and identified more clearly the exact amount of money that was being allocated for the universities commission itself.

Since the principal reason for tying the commission's fiscal year to that of the universities ceased to exist, I am now placing this amendment before the hon. members. It provides, in my view, a better co-ordination of the commission's fiscal year with that of the government, thereby simplifying the financial arrangements between the government and the universities commission. As I say, it's strictly a technical change related to that fiscal year date. The fiscal year for the universities commission will now become the same as the government fiscal year.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Universities Commission Act.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if it would be proper if the minister could answer one question before we voted on it?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the proper time to intervene with a question is before I rise, but I'll put myself in the hands of the House. Will the House entertain a question to the minister? Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: — The only question I would have is, what is the change in the dates — from when to when?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — The dates currently have been July 1 to June 30 of any given year, which is the university's fiscal year. The change will now make it April 1 to March 31, which is the fiscal year of the government. That is the only change that is being made.

MR. TAYLOR: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would think, in view of the explanation by the minister, that since it would bring the operation of the university more in line with the budget of the government, the government's fiscal year, we would support this bill.

MR. KATZMAN: — When you're replying during committee of the whole, could you explain one matter? With this movement of the year from the present July date, obviously they will not know what the amount of funds is going to be prior to their doing the budget. Right now, in doing the budget in July, they know nine months, approximately, of funds that are committed to the universities by this government and for three months they do not know. How will that affect your budgeting? My understanding is that you allocate the funds at the beginning of our fiscal year of April 1 but that the money really doesn't go to the universities, school boards and so forth for two or three months . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just the commissions? That's fine.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. MR. McARTHUR moved second reading of Bill No. 9 — **An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce Bill No. 9, An Act to amend the Department of Continuing Act. These amendments, again, are not

substantial. They are largely housekeeping.

I do take pleasure, as I have indicated, in introducing this bill because I think that since the establishment of the Department of Continuing Education by this administration, we have many important things happening in terms of the whole idea and concept of a continuing broad education beyond the normal school system. I only need mention a few of the developments which have taken place, one of the most notable being the community colleges. Certainly we have a much-improved system of vocational and technical training developing under the general auspices and programs of the Department of Continuing Education. Many programs are now developing to meet the needs of native people and many other things are being done which have, I believe, proved the good sense and good judgment of this government in establishing the Department of Continuing Education.

I do not, through this bill, intend to make any substantial changes in something which is working. However, I wanted to just tidy up a few things, which I will mention now.

The first two amendments contained in sections 3 and 4 of the bill are really entirely of a housekeeping nature. We provide in these sections something which was overlooked in the original bill and that is definitions for the terms "department" and "minister." Bills normally have these definitions. I cannot tell the members why they were overlooked when this bill was originally brought in, but we identified this oversight and having this bill here at the present time decided to make those technical changes.

The next change I wanted to mention to the members is the amendment described in section 5 of the bill, which is a section dealing with the grant-making powers of the minister under The Department of Continuing Education Act.

As members will perhaps recall, we have been trying to standardize our provision with respect to grants. There are really two ways in which grants can be authorized, one through a minister's order and the other through an order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

We have been trying, in all of the departments of government, to arrive at a standard procedure whereby after the appropriations are approved by this legislature, and of course by treasury board, grants of up to $10,000 may be authorized at that point by the minister. Grants in excess of $10,000 require authorization of the Lieutenant Governor in Council or in cabinet.

This section simply brings that practice into play in the Department of Continuing Education, so that we are now consistent with what is developing in most other departments.

I wanted to mention one other items, Mr. Speaker. It refers to the revised wording of section 10 of The Department of Continuing Education Act. As hon. members are aware (and I mentioned it in last year's budget debate), we have been working in the Department of Continuing Education on a program which is designed to bring a new approach to training and to linking training to work and employment for native people in our province. There has been a great deal of work taking place on this over the past summer and fall. Consultations have proceeded very well with the parties who will be involved in this training program, including the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians, unions, employers, the Department of Continuing Education itself, as well as other interested parties.

This program, which is being referred to as the native career development program is, as I have said, a very innovative and a very challenging approach to meeting the combined training and employment needs of native people. We are linking training with employment through a training-on-the-job program that will have an adequate provision for both formal and informal training to supplement the work experience, as well as providing for counselling, recruiting, and other activities involving, as I said, the native people themselves as well as employers and unions.

As part of what is needed here, the Department of Continuing Education will make payments in the form of allowances to participants in this program who are involved in training programs, as well as the form of wage subsidies which will be paid to employers participating in the programs. I will be saying more about this particular program at the time we debate the budget for the coming year. I will simply point out to the hon. members that the revised wording for section 10 of The Department of Continuing Education Act simply clearly spells out the department's authority to make such payments and to invest that authority in the person of the minister. That is a procedural requirement that is necessary as part of the operation of this program.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, in address this bill, I certainly feel that the need for native education is one of the paramount needs of our education system. The need is for adult education that fits the mode of life of the native person. I think maybe we are looking at something along the right path here in this native career development program. However, in all fairness, before I would give consent to this I would like to discuss it with interested parties. I see there are two or three mentions that the minister has made of the power to issue grants, which may well be justified. I think in taking a look at this with the objective of designing the best possible type of system for native education, and even for non-natives, in continuing education, I would like to do a little more study on this. Therefore I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. McARTHUR moved second reading of Bill No. 12 — **An Act to amend The Student Assistance and Student Aid Fund Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Student assistance and Student Aid Fund Act. The student assistance program is a very, very important part of this government's commitment to the needs of students in terms of post-secondary education in our province. We know, that with rapidly rising inflation rates and rapidly rising costs. it is extremely important for students to have access to a good and effective student assistance program. This government and I are committed to finding ways to make that program work as effectively and as efficiently as possible in order to meet the financial needs of students.

I should point out that I think we on this side of the House can look upon the student assistance program with some pride. I believe it was in 1949 that the first Saskatchewan student aid fund was established by the provincial government with an initial investment of $1 million to start the fund operating. I believe that was another new innovation in post-secondary education, indeed in government programming, by

a CCF government in this province. I believe that that being the case, it is with some degree of justifiable pride that I can speak to this bill.

Our program has been operating since that time and has undergone some changes. In 1964, I believe it was, the federal government, recognizing the lead Saskatchewan had taken, and recognizing that a similar kind of approach was needed on a national basis if there were to be equality of opportunity for post-secondary students, introduced an interest-free loan program that made interest-free loans available to students studying in post-secondary institution. That program has been administered by the provincial government, now by the Department of Continuing Education, but when the administration came to power in 1971, we recognized that there was an important need to move a step further with this program. As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, we introduced a student bursaries program that became an additional form of financial assistance that was non-repayable and provided additional help above and beyond the provision that were made under the federal program. The student bursaries program now provides bursaries of up to $1,800 per year in addition to the $1,800 per years interest-free loan made available by the federal government.

We are operating these programs because we believe that student assistance should be provided on a national basis. We are operating these programs jointly, and indeed they are administered as one program, but I emphasize to you, the bursaries which are non-repayable are paid for totally by this government and approved by this legislature. I believe we have a good student assistance plan, Mr. Speaker. I do believe however, that there are changes that are going to be needed and I have been one who has been advocating at the national level that we should be undertaking some changes in the program as it currently exists. I won't go into the details of some of the changes I think are needed at this time, but I will say to this legislature that a little over a year ago I was successful in convincing my provincial counterparts and the federal minister, the Secretary of State, that we should undertake a review of the student assistance program, and a national task force was established to review that program.

That task force will be reporting soon, Mr. Speaker, and it is my firm belief that it is time the federal government gave serious consideration to increasing its commitment to the student assistance program. I should point out to this Assembly that our commitment through the bursaries program has been growing very, very rapidly. We have been picking up, if you like, the excessive costs that are growing, over and above the provisions made in the loan's program, at a very rapid rate. In 1971-72, our allocation was approximately $627,000; by 1976-77 it had grown to about $2 million; by '79-80 to about $2.5 million; and for 1980-81 we are projecting a 27 per cent increase, up to about $3.7 million. I believe there are going to be important changes, and I am looking forward to the results of the task force which is reviewing this program.

What I am bringing forward here now, however, is something I though we should move on even though the report of the task force isn't in. I think the progress on the task force has been a bit slower than I had anticipated; I hope we are going to be able to move quickly when that report is in to develop a new national program, and we in this government stand committed to work with the other governments and the federal government to do that. But, recognizing the slowness with which that task force is proceedings, I have decided to bring forward to the members of this Assembly this proposed amendment.

What this amendment does is provide for additional student participation in the scholarship, bursaries and loans committee that operates s part of the student

assistance program. This committee, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for reviewing the program, for making recommendations on the development and administration of the various scholarships, bursaries, loans, and other forms of assistance for students for which funds are provided by the Government of Saskatchewan. This committee was active in helping us to put forward our brief — with participation on that committee from the universities, technical institutes and from the students, as well as from the government and the public — to the task force. Students have indicated that they feel that because of the growing technical institute attendance in our vocational technical institutes, we could do with additional technical institute students. As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, the current act, which makes provision for only one student from the technical institutes, is now being modified so we will have a representative from each of the technical institutes. That will broaden the base of participation of this very important body of students in our program. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that indicates the commitment we have to participation by students and by users of our programs in the administration and functioning of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an important change. There will hopefully be more changes coming in the national program. I think it is a step in the right direction to give students a greater role in the program.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this bill.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the minister's remarks on The Student Assistance and Student Aid Fund Act. The minister well know that this is a concern I have. I feel that many of our Saskatchewan students are being short-changed on this student assistance program. One of the things which concerns me the most is the fact that the assets of the parent are taken into consideration. Perhaps in the federal task force, which is coming down, that problem may be addressed. We will wait and see when the task force comes down. The idea of having students participate in this is a novel one. I must say, I noticed you mentioned the two technical institutes. I assume they are Kelsey and STI?

AN HON. MEMBER: — And Wascana.

MR. TAYLOR: — And Wascana. I was wondering if Wascana was being included. Again, I would like to have some more discussion regarding this. I suppose we are somewhat hamstrung until the task force comes down to see what changes there would be. It is one thing to allow participation in the administration of this, but again I must stress that if the funds are not available to the students who need them because of some encumbrances which exist today, I think that is the problem we should be addressing. However, I will have more to say on this later. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. McARTHUR moved second reading of Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend The Community Colleges Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill respecting amendments to The Community Colleges Act, I would like to make a few brief comments.

I think, as many of the hon. members of this Assembly are well aware, when the community college system in experiment in Saskatchewan was established in 1973, it was widely

recognized as a unique and innovation experiment in bringing education to all people of all ages and in all locations in our province. I would say it has been a tremendous success. Through this responsive and flexible system we have of 15 regionally-operated community colleges, we are providing more than 90,000 Saskatchewan residents each year with interesting and valuable educational programs — learning experiences which I say, Mr. Speaker, they would otherwise not have received.

The intent of the community college system is to maximize opportunities for continuing education through a decentralized program of formal learning opportunities and through the organization of programs at the community and at the regional level to meet informal learning needs.

I wish to underscore at the outset that the amendments to The Community Colleges Act, contained in Bill 13 in no way suggest any change to that fundamental concept. Rather, these amendments, for the most part, result in a need for updating the act to reflect some of the realities of the community college system and to recognize some of the changes which are taking place and some of the things which those changes suggest.

Not surprisingly, our community college system has developed in ways which could not have been fully anticipated in the early 1970s. So, Mr. Speaker, we place before you these amendments, not major amendments, but nevertheless significant amendments to ensure that our excellent system of community colleges continues to respond to the informal learning needs of Saskatchewan people.

Amendments contained in section 3 of the bill before you are rally changes very much of a routine or housekeeping nature. The definition of the terms “instructors association” and “students association” are deleted from the definition section of the act since these terms no longer appear in any other section of the amended act. In the same section, the definition of the term “minister” has been amended to make it consistent with similar definitions in other provincial statutes.

The amendment contained in section 4 of the bill is a wording change which carries with it a positive statement concerning the role of community colleges in Saskatchewan.

Section 5 of the bill before this Assembly speaks to the matter of composition of the community college boards. In the previous act provision was made for a board whose membership included the college principal. The effect of the revised wording is to no longer make provision for membership on the board of the college principal. This reflects the growing maturity of the system, and the view that the operations of the college through the board can now be handled by lay people in keeping wit the basic nature of the program.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this, the changes contained in section 7 and section 10 of the bill are merely adjustments or subsequent sections of the act reflecting the fact of this change in the board membership. The addition of section 6(1) to The Community Colleges Act provides college staff with a degree of personal immunity from liability such as is currently afforded to school teachers and instructors in technical institutes, vocational centres, and in the school system in the province. While the college as a corporate entity remains responsible, just as a school board does, for ensuring that adequate precautions be taken to safeguard its students from personal injury, and to ensure that facilities loaned or leased to the college are not wilfully damaged, the point of this amendment (and I think it is an important one from the point of view of instructor

and teacher rights and protection) is to provide the individual instructor (just as the case with teachers) with a degree of personal immunity from liability for actions performed in the course of his instructional duties, or other duties associated with instruction. The hon. member will be well familiar with the provisions that are made for school teachers in this regard, and we wish to now do the same with respect to community-college instructional staff.

Section 8 of the bill addresses the matter of the term of office of a member of the board. This section defines the length of a trustee's term as being three years, with a provision that no board member may serve for more than two consecutive terms. This, I think, is a useful amendment in that it sets a basis for rotating the membership of the board, as well as a basis for some continuity on board membership, and clearly establishes the terms under which those appointments take place. In addition, this section defines the circumstances under which a trustee could possibly lose office. These provisions facilitate the process of orderly rotation of board membership, and are, I think, consistent with the fundamental principles that the board of a community college should be representative of the residents of the region in which it serves, and that there should be as much provision for a variety of kinds of participation as possible.

Section 9 of the amending bill contains a slight change in the wording of clause 13(a) of The Community Colleges Act to reflect the fact that community college boards control the disposition of certain funds, in addition to those which are voted by this Assembly. These funds include revenues from tuition fees and other relatively minor funds.

As hon. members will have gathered, the amendments to The Community College Act as proposed in Bill 13 before this Assembly are designed to ensure and enhance the operation of a system which is already functioning well, and so is not being subject to major change but is nevertheless being updated in recognition of the growing maturity of the community colleges, and of their slightly changing needs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend The Community Colleges Act.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I can se there are some substantive changes and, we would hope, improvements. But I would like to study these further so I'll beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 3 — **An Act to amend The Trustee Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed to The Trustee Act accomplish two desired effects to serve better the trustees. First, the trustee will be permitted to invest any trust moneys in deposit receipts, or like instruments issued by a credit union incorporated under the laws of Saskatchewan, or by the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., which investments are not presently permitted by this said trustee act.

Secondly, a trustee will be permitted, pending the investment of trust money, to deposit trust money in a credit union incorporated under the laws of Saskatchewan or in the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., which deposit presently is permitted

only subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Credit unions are now a major component in the financial sector of this province and, I believe, have the confidence of the public similar to that of a chartered bank. The credit union mutual aid fund, established under The Credit Union Act protects the deposits of members in a credit union. The Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Ltd, or Credit Union Central, as it is more commonly known, is owned by credit unions and the co-ops. The assets and financial resources of the Saskatchewan Co-op Credit Society Ltd. are very substantial, and in our judgment provide the desired security for the purposes of a trustee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 3.

MR. LANE: — Basically, we have no objection to the bill, except clause (f), which reads:

> any other body corporate that is empowered to accept moneys for deposit and that has been approved for that purpose by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

My objection being that The Trustee Act is established to specifically list those secure businesses, trust companies or banks. To open it up beyond that to that approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council causes me some concern. Perhaps the Attorney General an advise me in the next day or so as to what he has in mind in that regard. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 4 — **An Act to amend The Police Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment was originally proposed by a number of the cities in Saskatchewan. I think primarily prince Albert and Regina. It has been subsequently endorsed by the entire Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association. It is a fairly major amendment, but straightforward. It proposes to amend subsection 27(3) of the act to permit city councils to increase the size of their boards of police commissioners. Councils will have the right to decide whether or not to increase the membership beyond the three members, as currently set out by law. In other words, it is not mandatory for the councils to increase their boards. They will have the freedom to increase membership from three to five.

No matter how large the boards are, the mayor and at least one member of council must be included. In the case of a board of more than three members, the mayor and two members of the council must be on the board.

The amendment to subsection 27(9) sets out the number of members required for a quorum and the procedure in the event of a tie-vote.

I move second reading of this bill.

MR. LANE: — We are not quite ready for the question. I think it is appropriate to advise the Assembly, although the request came from Regina-Prince Albert for this extension, that to date the Attorney General has very vigorously opposed the increase in the number on the police commissions in the cities. They have been urging five members for some considerable period of time. It was the Attorney General who, in fact, insisted on three. There is a conversion to their way of thinking, for which I commend the

Attorney General. In his remarks he didn't give enough time for an explanation for a change in his thinking. As I say the municipal governments had requested it for some considerable period of time. Frankly I think it is long overdue.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:18 p.m.