

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 25, 1981

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SOLOMON: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 21 senior citizens from the constituency of Regina North-West, the Pasqua Pioneers, who are in the Speaker's gallery. I'm very pleased to see them this afternoon, and I hope they enjoy the proceedings. I know that they will find the proceedings in the Assembly today not only interesting but also entertaining. I would just like to inform the members that I've met with the Pasqua Pioneers at the Pasqua Neighbourhood Recreation Centre, and I look forward to meeting with them again in the future. The Pioneers are led this afternoon by Mr. Harry Bell, their president. I would like to ask all members to join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce through you to this House a group of 37 grade 7 students from the Watrous Elementary School. They are in the west gallery, and are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Vern Rudneski, as well as Mr. Bill Lazaroff and the bus driver, Steve Fuxa, and parents, Alice Burke and Lesley Airey. I would like to extend to the students and the chaperones our greetings and welcome to the Legislative Assembly, and hope that they have an enjoyable stay. They have a full day which includes a lot of visitations, as well as the Regina Pats-Calgary hockey game this evening. So I am sure that they will enjoy that, and I invite the members to extend our greetings to the students now.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Minister of Finance in welcoming the students and teachers and bus driver from Watrous Elementary School. I have a special reason for wanting to do that. I want to say to the students that I think you are getting a very good education at Watrous. I'm a little bit biased on that because I, too, was educated at Watrous School, and I do want to join with the Minister of Finance in welcoming you here to the legislature and to Regina, and I hope you have a most enjoyable visit.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure today in introducing to you and through you to the other members of the legislature, a group of 55 students from my home town of Moosomin who are seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their school teacher, Mr. Dan Dayday, and Mr. Bill James. I want, on behalf of the Assembly, to wish the students a very enjoyable visit to the legislature and to our capital city. I hope you find it very educational. I will be meeting with this group of

students later on this afternoon in the second floor rotunda for pictures, and later in room 267 for some refreshments and, I hope, a question and answer period. I would just ask at this time, Mr. Speaker, that members of the Assembly join with me in wishing the students an excellent stay here today, and a safe trip home. Thank you very much.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. WHITE: — Mr. Speaker, permit me to introduce to you, and to members of the House, 14 members of the Sunrise singing group. They are university students from the University of Indiana. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery and are accompanied by Mr. Mickey Porter of Regina. They came to the city on Friday and they'll be leaving on Saturday. They are performing tonight at the sponsor of their visit here, Discovery Baptist Church, and tomorrow evening they'll be performing in the education auditorium at the University of Regina. I'll be meeting with them after question period, for a discussion in the members' dining room.

For their information, I would like to point out that during the question period which follows, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, will be questioning members of the Saskatchewan government's cabinet, members of the New Democratic Party, on matters they consider of substantial and immediate interest. Our parliamentary system, as you are aware, is somewhat different from your congressional system.

I hope all members will join me in welcoming them here today. We sincerely hope they have a pleasant stay in Saskatchewan. Their visit, I think, is very important. It promotes good relations between our countries. I hope you have a safe journey after you leave our province. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Environmental Concerns re Western Power Grid and Thermal Development

MR. ANDREW: — My question is to the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Mr. Minister, it would appear that SPC is steam rolling full speed ahead in the development of the lignite coal-fired generating station in the Gravelbourg area. They are doing this in spite of the facts that quite a number of farmers are going to be displaced from their farmsteads, that up to 6,000 acres of good, fertile Saskatchewan land is going to be displaced, and that you are opting for thermal electric power rather than hydro power.

My question to the minister is this: can the minister advise the Assembly how you justify pouring ahead with this action in the Gravelbourg area, when you are supposedly throwing the blocks to stop proceeding with the western power grid for Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta because, in the words of the Premier, you have to check the environmental concerns of the power grid?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Yes, I certainly can explain to the hon. member. The hon. member may be aware that Sask Power Corporation is currently involved in looking at a number of options with regard to electrical supplies for the 1980s and into the 1990s.

We have identified a number of potential projects, one of which is in the Gravelbourg area. There are others. One is in the Lake Diefenbaker area; others are on the Saskatchewan River. There is also the western power grid alternative which is being examined with the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba.

What is currently happening in the Gravelbourg area is this: we are undertaking to have discussions in that area and to gather data with regard to the possible environmental and community impact of a development in that area. That is a very, very different thing from what the hon. member claims we are doing which is steaming ahead with the development.

What is necessary, if we are to have full information on environmental and community impacts, is that we be able to do studies, take base-line data and gather other information. That is what is happening with respect to the Gravelbourg area at the present time. We have requested permission to enter certain lands, and we are explaining the project, so that people can better understand the project and so that we can gain the required data. There is absolutely no decision, at the present time, to proceed with Gravelbourg.

I might say, with respect to the western power grid, that the hon. member makes an allegation that is completely without foundation. I should point out to the hon. member that I have, since becoming minister, attended three or four full-day meetings to carry on discussions about the western power grid. It is a very complicated proposal and there are many, many unanswered questions about the western power grid, including the impact on the environment, and a number of other economic and supply aspects. Those discussions are proceeding apace and will continue to proceed apace.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The farmers in the Gravelbourg area are the people who are concerned with regard to your credibility as to the environment concerns. My point is this, Mr. Minister, you have had the report of the western power grid for some two years. You have contributed \$350,000 to that power grid. The Manitoba and Alberta governments are prepared to proceed full speed ahead with it. The grid makes sense economically and environmentally, and is a use of hydro power rather than fossil fuels. Can the minister advise us of your position with regard to the western power grid, and when we might have an answer, and when the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta might have an answer from your government as to your position on the western power grid?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it was last week that I attended a meeting (and I'm sorry that the hon. member is misconstruing the discussions that have taken place, and I feel I must clarify it) with the other two ministers from Alberta and Manitoba.

It was indeed the province of Alberta (and I say, quite rightly and justifiably so) that came through with a totally new proposition to consider with respect to the pricing of power. The hon. member would quite well understand that with regard to having an agreement — the agreement on price is about the most fundamental thing that one could discuss — the province of Alberta (quite rightly because I think the different concepts of pricing and the different approaches to pricing need to be explored) came through with a totally new proposition.

In addition to that, Manitoba has some new propositions that they have brought forward to the table, with respect to the possibilities of supplying energy, and the

contracts under which energy would be supplied.

Those kinds of matters dealing with a project that involves up to \$2 billion have to have time to be worked through, and I believe that everyone involved in the negotiations believes that time is necessary. Certainly, they would not be stating that they are ready to sign a deal, or they would not be bringing forward new propositions at this time.

I will say to the hon. members that neither am I ready to sign a deal because we have many, many questions yet to be determined, and as the minister who chairs the board of directors of Sask Power, I am going to have to feel absolutely confident about the kinds of proposals I take forward before I take them forward. In order to feel confident, I have to know what the propositions are, and we have not yet reached that point.

MR. ANDREW: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It would seem to me that the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba are, according to the press statement, pushing full speed ahead to have this thing proceed.

As I understand it, officials in SPC were some time ago in favour of this program, and it has been held up by the political people within SPC, and that means the cabinet. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is basically this: why is it that during the reign of Ed Schreyer in Manitoba, the Government of Saskatchewan was full speed ahead for the development of the western power grid? Since that time, is it not the reason that you are now holding up on it because of that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to this very . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Perhaps we can just get things back under control and allow the minister to continue.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — With respect to the suggestion that the hon. member made that the political element, or whatever term he used, is holding up this deal, I am the only politician involved with SPC. I am chairman of the board of directors for the Sask Power Corporation.

I will tell the hon. member this: we received the final sets of recommendations and reports on what could be up to a \$2 billion project from consultants in January — mid to late January. That report made certain recommendations about how this proposition might proceed, including propositions about pricing, energy supplies, and routing a very major transmission line; that in itself will cost upwards of \$1 billion. All of those things have been the subject of discussion and evaluation.

One of the propositions that the report made was that the pricing be based on a concept of the cost of power produced by the hydro development that is involved here at Limestone, plus the alternate cost of producing power in Saskatchewan, and splitting the difference. That proposition was discussed as a pricing arrangement, and both Alberta and I suggested that we needed to look at alternate arrangements.

At the last meeting, Alberta came forward with a different proposition than the C plus B over 2 proposition, not I. Now, I'm glad they came forward, because I think their proposition is a good one, but I want to tell the hon. member if he or anyone he is speaking to is suggesting that it was I who brought forward the propositions which

require further review (which they do require) and brought forward all of those, he is absolutely wrong. We are continuing to discuss a very, very important hydro-electric proposition. If the hon. member is attempting to scuttle that through some sort of political innuendo, I say he is doing the people of Saskatchewan a very major disservice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: — Is it not a fact, Mr. Minister, the case that the Government of Saskatchewan is holding up the approval on the western power grid because to do otherwise would nail the final nail in the coffin of the NDP in Manitoba in the forthcoming election?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I didn't know that the NDP was even approaching a coffin in Manitoba. My understanding is that the only coffin that has its door open in Manitoba is one that the Conservative Party is about to lie down in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I want to say to the hon. member that I have never talked to anyone in the NDP in Manitoba about this proposition. I have never talked to them in any way, shape, or form about the political importance of this proposition, because I am approaching this project from the point of view of a very important alternative which Saskatchewan could pursue in terms of the supply of power. It is a multimillion dollar undertaking. It is necessary in undertaking this kind of deal that we have an agreement. An agreement must contain a lot of things — agreements on pricing, agreements on routing the line, agreements on supply, all of those sorts of things. Until we have an agreement, which we don't have at the present time (not because of my fault; certainly all three of us are pursuing those matters), an agreement cannot be signed. It is as simple as that. We will be proceeding with these negotiations according to a pace which allows us to deal with those questions.

Gravelbourg Power Plant

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). Would the minister not now agree that it would in fact be more feasible and economical to join the interprovincial grid system than to go ahead with the proposed plant t Gravelbourg?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, we do not have all of the data with respect to the western provincial grid and the full economic and financial impact for Saskatchewan. This is evidenced by the very fact, as I said, that a whole new complicated pricing arrangement is now on the table for further discussion and negotiation.

We do not have the data in with respect to the Gravelbourg project because, as I indicated to the member, we are only in the process of reviewing the environmental and the community impact. Therefore, there is simply no way of answering your question. That points out exactly why one cannot make a decision on one project or another right now. We still have many questions which need to be answered. Until those questions are answered, I can't tell you which project would be the best one, or whether indeed

another project on the Saskatchewan River would be a better one.

New Development in Lumsden

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Environment. As an aside, it is interesting that you proceeded up in the North draining lakes. Anyway, your officials have indicated to the town of Lumsden that it would lose its grants, it could lose flood assistance, and insurance coverage would be affected unless new development in the town be basically raised four to eight feet above existing developments. Put the town on stilts is what your officials have in fact told them, and if there is a vacant lot and a new house is built, it will have to be four to eight feet higher than its neighbouring house and will cause severe drainage problems. Would the minister be prepared to withdraw the statements made to the town of Lumsden by his officials, and be prepared to look at more reasonable alternatives to protect the town from flooding in the future?

HON. MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, there is a federal-provincial agreement of which I know the hon. member has heard. It has to do with the Qu'Appelle Valley. It has to do with the Souris River Valley. It has to do with flood and drainage control. It has to do with building on flood plains.

Now, there isn't anyone in this House who is unfamiliar with the problems that the town of Lumsden has experienced over the years with respect to flooding. There is no question about the fact that I, along with my officials, met with some of the council members (and other interested persons) and discussed with them the implications of the agreement which is now held between the province of Saskatchewan and the federal government with respect to attempting to deal with that kind of a problem — the flooding of certain villages, towns, and farmlands in these particular drainage basins.

There is the fact that CMHC (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation) has indicated that it will not provide funding for houses that are being built in Lumsden on the flood plain. Regardless of whether or not the province wishes to do anything about it, CMHC is taking that particular stand, and the people of Lumsden were so advised.

I suggest to the hon. member, if he wants to really acquaint himself with the program, that he make some contact with my office or officials, and we'll try to inform him of the details of that particular agreement.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the minister. I have spent some time with town officials and officials in surrounding municipalities who are not only seriously concerned, but somewhat incredulous at the extremely impractical proposals submitted by the Department of the Environment.

Now, in that agreement, it was made clear to the townspeople of Lumsden that they would not have any right of appeal from the provisions of the federal-provincial agreement. And basically, they had no input into that agreement.

There is an alternative. I would like to ask the minister a question. At the meeting last night (and I'll have further questions about that), officials of the department indicated that the cost of a second dike, inside the existing one, would be in the range of only \$1.5 million. This is considerably cheaper than the cost you are going to put the townspeople of Lumsden to, to build these dikes and 8 and 12 foot higher homes on banks. Would the minister be prepared to commit to the townspeople of Lumsden

today, that he will cease any further action on the proposals being submitted, sit down with the townspeople, and reconsider the proposals made, and reconsider, in particular, the statements made by officials last night that there is a much more practical and cheaper way of proceeding?

HON. MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, certainly we're prepared to discuss with the people of Lumsden (either by way of their council or otherwise) along the line about which the hon. member speaks.

I indicate to you that there is a program for which this legislature will approve some funds for the purchasing of land which is prone to flooding, in order to take it out of the kind of proposition which the people of Lumsden are making to us.

I suggest to you that the people of Lumsden can go ahead and build in those areas, if they want to. But, the fact is that there is no insurance. If they have flooding problems, and if their houses disappear in the flood, then certainly they are not going to be able to come back to the provincial or federal government to seek assistance with respect to the damages that have occurred, or, by way of insurance, to seek insurance coverage for the kinds of problems which they are likely to face.

All we did was point out these kinds of problems. Now, I appreciate the dilemma that the town of Lumsden finds itself in. But, I suggest that we can have negotiations and discussions about how we might find alternative ways. But, there is an agreement at this particular time, whereby CMHC will not provide funding assistance for anyone who wants to make application to build on a flood plain in the Lumsden area. That's a federal issue. I suggest to you that we already are dealing with the purchasing of flood-prone lands in the Qu'Appelle and Souris River basins. We are trying to take the building of houses away from the damage which has occurred and that which will likely occur in the future. We think these are progressive steps. I know it creates some problems for the people of Lumsden; it has created some problems for the farmers in the Qu'Appelle Valley, where we have purchased lands and taken them out of production and out of the flood-prone area. I suggest that is the situation in Lumsden, and while we'll meet with the people, I see no real alternative to the proposition which is now made.

Storage of 1980 Calendars

MR. GARNER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the minister responsible for SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Are you aware (and if you are not aware I would like to bring to your attention), that there is a stack of 1980 SGI calendars at Regina Cartage and Storage, 2226 Dewdney Avenue? The stack is 4 feet wide and 20 feet high. First of all, are you aware of it? And, why are you paying storage for 1980 calendars in 1981?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I am not aware of it, Mr. Speaker, but if SGI has about 9,000 calendars of 1980 vintage, they must have had in mind the only 9,000 Conservatives who were usually about a year behind events in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — That's fine, that's fine. Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Premier, since you seem to know quite a bit about the 1980 calendars, could you also tell this Assembly why they have 31 days in the month of April for 1980? Is this maybe one of the reasons why SGI has been losing money over the past few years?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I can't answer the question, but I do want to tell the hon. member that we're not yet in April, we're in March and, therefore, he ought not to be looking at this April calendar of 1980 to figure out whether it's 30 or 31 days. I can't answer that. I'll take notice and try to provide further details for the hon. member.

Chemical Safety Information

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Earlier this month the minister indicated that he had been informed by the federal Minister of Health that information which Saskatchewan had requested on the chemicals, whose safety is suspect because they are implicated in the IBT (Industrial Biotest Laboratories) affair, would not be provided to the province. The refusal to provide this information is particularly alarming as a result of the fact that of the 800 tests that have now been done on IBT, 470 of them have been found to be invalid, upon re-examination. My question is: what action is he contemplating taking with respect to obtaining information on the safety of these chemicals? And, also what action is he planning to take with respect to alerting the Saskatchewan public about possible dangers associated with using these chemicals?

HON. MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health and Social Services in the federal government has responded to our inquiry with respect to more evidence of the constitution of those chemicals which have not been approved or which have been fraudulently tested by the IBT in the United States. She has indicated that the act which governs the trade practices, states that she is not allowed to provide the detailed information to us. This gives us some concern because of the fact that in the province of Saskatchewan we are required to issue certain permits for the use of various chemicals, some of which are being used for various activities in this province.

With respect to what we will do, we will continue to pursue with the hon. minister the reasons why we should not have that information. We are attempting to review our own legislation as to what authority we have to receive the legislation. We are also asking the Attorney General's department to review the federal legislation as to whether or not the interpretation which the federal government puts on that particular piece of legislation is, in fact, what the hon. minister says it to be. Without being able to go any further than that, I don't know at this time what our position will be. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to pursue it, in light of the fact that it is important to us.

MR. PREBBLE: — Supplementary question to the Minister of Health. Surely, the public of Saskatchewan needs to be further alerted. It is now being found in re-examining this test data that 94 per cent of tests for cancer have been found to be invalid, 75 per cent of the tests for birth defects have been found to be invalid and a large number of other important tests have been found to be invalid. Would the Minister of Health share my view that the time has now come for the Department of Health to alert the public in Saskatchewan as to the possible hazards associated with using these chemicals by requiring that lists of all 89 of these chemicals, and the products in which these chemicals are contained, be posted in every retail store in the province selling these chemicals, so that the public might be aware that they have not been properly tested and that they are on the IBT (Industrial Biotest Laboratories) list.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the member also that I have pursued and I am still pursuing the federal Minister of Health and Welfare to see if we

can get that information. Recently there was a meeting here in Regina with the federal deputy minister of health, the deputy minister of environment, the deputy minister of agriculture and the deputy minister of health, to get this straightened out. I know they are still pursuing that particular avenue.

I want to tell the hon. member that I have some reluctance in doing what he is asking me to do, and that is to request all retail outlets to post 89 chemicals. I think this would be somewhat unfair to the public, in that we don't know what percentage of those chemicals are toxic. If I knew that 75 of the 89 were toxic, or the vast majority of them were toxic, maybe there would be some validity in his suggestion. But maybe there are only 10 per cent which are toxic. I am concerned, as Minister of Health. I do want to indicate to the member that we are pursuing it. If we don't have some success with the federal Minister of Health and Welfare, I may well have to look at what the member is recommending.

MR. PREBBLE: — My final supplementary is to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Speaker, five of these chemicals that were on the list have already been banned since they were posted. In addition, we found that a number of other laboratories in the United States have also been found to be guilty of fraudulent testing. In light of the fact that the federal government refuses to hold a royal commission into the safety of agricultural chemicals, will the Minister of the Environment conduct such a royal commission in Saskatchewan, including an examination of alternative policies which would assist in reducing the applications of chemicals in the province and assist in promoting alternative approaches to pest and weed control?

HON. MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, while we would very much like to undertake the kind of suggestion which the hon. member makes about a royal commission or other kind of hearing with respect to the matter of chemicals being used in Saskatchewan, I think it is not properly the role of the province to do so. The federal government has the jurisdiction and the authority to register chemicals for use in Canada and in the provinces.

I think it rightfully falls upon the federal jurisdiction to initiate any actions related to the assessment of the approvals which they give to chemicals, or the registration which they give to chemicals. We would, as I said, favour that kind of idea, but I suggest to the hon. member that our first objective will be attempting to pursue the federal government, and to pressure the federal government to reveal the kind of information which could be useful to us in informing the public with regard to the seriousness or the toxicity of various chemicals being used in our province.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Report of Winnipeg Meeting on Constitution

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, just a brief ministerial statement regarding the meeting yesterday in Winnipeg. I'm pleased to report to you today, and to the members of the House, on yesterday's meeting in Winnipeg involving ministers and officials from the eight provinces opposing the federal constitutional proposals. The meeting dealt with three matters:

1. An alternative patriation plan with a different amending formula from the one proposed by the Prime Minister;

2. Joint representations from the eight opposing provinces to the British government and parliament;
3. Co-ordination of other strategies designed to block the federal initiative as it currently stands.

You will understand that I am not in a position to reveal specific details of our discussions, or to indicate in detail Saskatchewan's position, because I will have to report first to the Premier and to my cabinet colleagues. I do want to say, however, that I was encouraged by the progress made at yesterday's meeting and I am optimistic that the final details of an alternative patriation plan can be worked out very soon.

I was particularly encouraged by our discussions on the amending formula. The proposal that emerged from our meeting yesterday represents a very significant improvement, in our judgment, on the so-called Vancouver consensus formula, and goes a long way toward meeting the concerns that Saskatchewan has expressed concerning the risks of opting out as stated in the Vancouver formula.

I will be reporting to Premier Blakeney and my cabinet colleagues at the earliest opportunity. The eight premiers will be getting together very soon, either by telephone or in person to consider their ministers' reports in detail, and to make their decisions. It is my hope that the provinces will be able to reach final agreement on an alternative patriation plan, and that on that basis we might yet see a resumption of bargaining between the federal government and the provinces. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, the press reports as they pertain to the Attorney General's participation in yesterday's conference have a distinctly different result. We take the view that Saskatchewan's proposal was basically rejected out of hand. And let me say that Saskatchewan's refusal to fight from the outset for an opting out provision will be much regretted by the people of this province. The only province to not state definitely if it would support the new formula was the province of Saskatchewan and the Deputy Premier opposite. I much regret that his statement today did not state unequivocally that the government would support the proposals of the other seven provinces.

It's interesting to note as well, at the conference yesterday, that Saskatchewan indicated that it has not ruled out the possibility of joining in the court action. I much regret in the statement today that the Attorney General did not make reference to that and one can only come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General is saying one thing in one province and another thing here at home.

It's interesting to note, as well, that the Attorney General has just arrived back from London, England, after a highly publicized trip, one in which he tried to leave the impression that he was having some effect. And yet the eight provinces yesterday rejected out of hand having the Attorney General co-ordinate further trips to London and, in fact, delegated that responsibility to the province of Alberta.

When, Mr. Speaker, one takes a look at what is left out of this statement, the fact that he refuses to commit to the proposal of the other seven provinces, it is fact that he was not recognized for his . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member is obligated to speak only to the statement.

He does not have the opportunity to speak to what is left out of the statement, and he must do it in a manner which is not regarded as debate.

MR. LANE: — It's unfortunate that the Attorney General did not address himself to Saskatchewan's position at this particular meeting yesterday. One can only suggest that it looks as though the Attorney General was about as welcome as a skunk at a garden party yesterday afternoon and that Saskatchewan, again, was too late; delayed and stalled too long. The statement today only proves once and for all that Saskatchewan's representation yesterday, to the regret of the people of this province, was of little force and effect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, I have little more to say about it than was said earlier, but statements made by this caucus with respect to our constitutional problems some weeks ago were termed too little, too late and I think it's epitomized by recent visits of the Attorney General to Winnipeg. We predict, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I am unable to determine, at this time, why the member for Swift Current is on his feet.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to speak on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: — There is no opportunity for the member for Swift Current to speak on this issue unless the House agrees unanimously that he should speak on this issue. Agreed.

MR. HAM: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Trudeau and company will continue to push their present package of constitutional change to the end, to the detriment of Canada and, in particular, of western Canada. The only viable and realistic course open to those in western Canada is the option put forward this caucus.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. LANE: — I would like to raise a matter of privilege. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the standing committee on Crown corporations, I did question the minister responsible for Sask Tel and did ask him for an agreement between Sask Tel and Chartwood Developments, the developer of the Cornwall Centre. At that time the minister indicated he would not give that agreement to the public, because it was not in the public interest, and secondly, and I'm quoting from Crown corporations yesterday:

I don't think that Chartwood would want us banting around the business that it is doing with the government.

He goes on further on page 102 of Crown corporations verbatim yesterday:

Again, I say I don't want to discuss the financial arrangements because it's part of the agreement, and I don't think the Chartwood people would be very happy with us if we divulged any of this information.

It has come to my attention today, Mr. Speaker, so this is my first opportunity to raise the matter. A press reporter allegedly contacted Chartwood Developments and asked if

they could release the very agreement that was refused yesterday by the minister. They indicate that if the province wants the information released, they can release it. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the committee was misled by the minister yesterday in this statement that Chartwood would not want the documents released and his primary reason was that it was a private agreement which should not be released. It now turns out that the developer is prepared to have the agreement released. We have been, I suggest, misled. The Assembly has been misled. I ask Mr. Speaker, to rule on the question of privilege and, secondly, as a term of clearing the privilege, that the minister be ordered to release the agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: — The member has not advised me prior to this time of this matter of privilege, and normally the Speaker is advised in advance of the matter of privilege arising, unless the matter of privilege has arisen since the beginning of the sitting.

I want to refer the members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, citation 19. There are three sections that may lend some light to the decision with regard to this alleged point of privilege:

- (1) A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.
- (2) The failure of a Minister of the Crown to answer a question may not be raised as a question of privilege.
- (3) Statements made outside the House by a Member may not be used as the base for a question of privilege.

And I refer members to the section on committees, citation 76 on page 24 of Beauchesne:

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

I was not present in the committee, and I feel that the committee must deal with this matter. If they feel there is a matter of privilege, they will report it to the House, and at that time I'll take the opportunity to deal with it, if in fact it's reported to the House.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, rule 39, just for the Attorney General's benefit, reads:

A motion may, in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the Assembly without notice having been given under Rule 38.

Mr. Speaker, to explain the motion which I would like to have leave to move, I have here a copy of a Department of External Affairs advertisement in which it is recruiting people to serve in diplomatic missions throughout the world. It very clearly states that only residents of Quebec and Ontario would qualify for these positions.

I have another item here . . . I'm explaining rule 39 for the benefit of the Attorney General; almost everyone in the House understands it. The other item I would like to bring to light in the House for the Attorney General, who has been away for some time

on rather dubious missions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I wonder if we could have order in the House. I want to caution the Leader of the Opposition (and he has not abridged this yet) to give the explanation in the briefest possible terms, and then read the motion. In that way we'll get at it.

MR. BERNTSON: — You have my absolute assurance, Mr. Speaker. The other point I would like to bring up is this. In March of this year it was brought to light in the House of Commons that positions of air controller for the airport in Montreal were held only for residents of Quebec. I would like to have leave (and it's not my intention to debate this at length) to move:

That this Assembly register its abhorrence and total dissatisfaction with the federal government as it relates to recruiting practices of various departments of the federal government, which exclude residents of our province, among others, from seeking those positions — an act which clearly relegates citizens of all provinces except Ontario and Quebec to the status of second-class citizens.

MR. SPEAKER: — You have heard the motion raised by the member for Souris-Cannington, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, under rule 39. The motion will require the unanimous consent of the House, so that means all other business of the House will be set aside until such time as this matter is dealt with. Does the Assembly give unanimous consent? No. Okay, second readings.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Local Improvements Act

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — The Local Improvements Act is an important piece of legislation affecting urban municipalities. Urban municipalities are empowered to carry out a variety of capital works as part of the provision of services to their taxpayers and to their residents.

The Local Improvements Act provides a mechanism under which urban municipalities may recover the cost of providing certain of these capital works from the abutting properties that receive direct benefits. Examples of such capital works would be water distribution mains, sewage collection mains, storm sewers, street paving and sidewalks.

This cost recovery mechanism is an important part of the overall municipal financial structure. The recovery of the costs involved in the installation of such improvements to property from those directly receiving benefits from these improvements provide a very equitable manner of allocating the costs of providing such services.

Mr. Speaker, turning specifically to the amendment before us, I would point out that the existing provisions of The Local Improvements Act do not contemplate general replacement or reconstruction of an existing work installed at local improvements prior to the previously estimated lifetime of the existing work expiring. This problem, Mr. Speaker, was brought to my attention just about a year ago by the city of Saskatoon which had a problem, and asked us, as a government, to bring forward an amendment to The Local Improvements Act to bring about a correction to the problem. With the

exception of pavement recapping, the replacement or reconstruction of such works that I have already mentioned was previously borne by the municipality at large, notwithstanding the additional benefit that may accrue to the property owner.

The purpose of the amendment before us is to allow urban municipalities to replace or reconstruct previously installed local improvement works, whose lifetime may yet expire, with another local improvement.

Mr. Speaker, to ensure fair and equitable consideration of both the municipality and the property owner, provision is made which prevents the property from being doubly charged for the same provision of services.

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions, the municipality will be responsible for that portion of costs of the project which relate to the yet unexpired lifetime of the original improvement. The property owner will be responsible only for that portion of the cost of that replacement or reconstruction which exceeds the lifetime of the original work. An example, Mr. Speaker, would be: municipality A constructs a local improvement in 1975 having an estimated lifetime of 10 years. That local improvement is replaced in 1981 with a similar work that has an estimated lifetime of 10 years. Since the property only benefits from the two works for a total period of 16 years, this is all that may be charged for them. Under the provisions proposed, the property pays for the initial 10 years of the service and the additional six years of service provided by the replacement. The municipality must pay for the first four year period of the replacement, as the property has been charged for that period under the first work.

These amendments will provide an improvement, and a more equitable method of recovery of the costs of providing such services. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, this anomaly in the act was brought to our attention by the city of Saskatoon, and so as to prevent double charging, we are making this amendment. I might inform the hon. critic for urban affairs and the opposition that this amendment has been checked with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), the organization that has its membership from all urban municipalities. They support the amendment and the proposition put forward by the city of Saskatoon to correct this anomaly. Mr. Speaker, I therefore, move second reading of this bill.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, in listening to this bill being presented, I can't foresee anything so far, except anytime anybody mentions paving being done. I must take a good look into it, because what I have had to do with paving goes back to environment. There has been a bad record with this government when it comes to paving, especially at Federal Pioneer. Mr. Speaker, I will look into it. As I say, I don't see anything wrong so far. He says they have discussed this matter with SUMA. I am also going to make sure before this bill goes through that I discuss it with the people who are involved in the municipal and urban affairs. I want to discuss it with people involved on councils. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 43 — An Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources Act.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, the amendments set out in this bill are of a purely housekeeping nature. There are two amendments to the bill. The first one, in regard to section 3, removes the references to the old Fur Act and the old Game Act, which have

both been replaced by the new Wildlife Act.

The second amendment, Mr. Speaker, is in regard to section 4 and allows for a portion of the fees collected for hunting licences to be placed in a wildlife development fund. This section is simply an improvement of the wording in regard to the portion of hunting licences that should go to the wildlife development fund. As I said earlier, this bill is of a housekeeping nature. It give me pleasure to move second reading of Bill No. 43.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the minister that the bill is largely of a housekeeping nature. Our critic did have a couple of concerns, but I am sure he would be prepared to raise them in committee. We'll be letting the bill go at this time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 45 — An Act to amend The Registered Nurses Act, 1978.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to explain the purpose of the proposed amendments to The Registered Nurses Act, 1978. The amendments do not change any of the existing provisions of the act; rather, they are intended to facilitate and regulate a new type of activity by the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association.

Mr. Speaker, the nursing profession in Canada has established a foundation known as the Canadian Nurses' Foundation. This foundation receives donations from various sources, holds the moneys in trust and makes disbursements for a variety of professional development activities in the nursing field, including post-graduate training and research. Officials of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association believe there has been only limited use of this national fund by Saskatchewan nurses. They have concluded that it would be preferable for them to establish a Saskatchewan foundation to which donations could be made by organizations and individuals in the province. This foundation would then give assistance of various kinds to nurses in the province by way of bursaries, scholarships, research grants, and funds for the general development of the nursing profession in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments to The Registered Nurses Act, 1978 authorize the establishment of the Saskatchewan Nurses' Foundation and confer upon the foundation the authority to carry out a variety of professional development activities using moneys from a Saskatchewan nurses' foundation fund. The foundation will be established as a corporate body, with authority to own property, make investments, and make by-laws for its corporate purposes.

I should mention that foundations of this type usually become registered as charitable organizations under the Income Tax Act, and that contributions are, hence, tax deductible.

The foundation's members will consist of those individuals who are members of the council of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association. However, the activities of the foundation will be separate from those of the association itself. That is, the foundation will administer a fund established in a bank account set up specifically for that purpose.

All administrative costs associated with the foundation must be taken from the fund, and the moneys in the fund cannot be used for any purposes other than those stated in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I should also emphasize that the fund will consist entirely of private donations, plus any income earned from the investment of those donations. It will not be supported by grants or other financial contributions from the provincial government. Accordingly, it will not be subject to strict government scrutiny for control. Nevertheless, the amendments do include a number of provisions to ensure that the foundation administers the fund equitably and in accordance with accepted financial practices.

The accounts of the foundation are required to be audited annually by a chartered accountant. In addition, the foundation is required to submit an annual report on its activities, together with the auditor's report, to the members of the association.

Furthermore, all by-laws and amendments to by-laws, passed by the foundation, must be filed with the Minister of Health and must subsequently be tabled in the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the desire of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association to become more actively and extensively involved in the development of the nursing profession in this province. The proposed amendments have been prepared with the participation of the association, which is in full agreement with them.

I think that the amendment will be of great value to the association in fulfilling its goals, while at the same time ensuring adequate controls on the use and administration of funds by the foundation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move second reading of Bill No. 45 — An Act to amend The Registered Nurses Act, 1978.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this legislation was brought forth, after some consultation with the members of the affected profession. I think the foundation legislation has commendable objectives. We will certainly be supporting the principle of the bill. I have a couple of minor concerns that I will deal with at the committee stage. We will be supporting the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Koskie that Bill No. 34 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code** be now read a second time.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, as I said in my remarks the other day when the bill was introduced in second reading, there were some considerations that I wanted to bring forth to expand the human rights code in this province. Upon checking with legal counsel, I understand that the avenue through which I would have to bring those in

would be either by amendments in committee of the whole, or else by introducing a private member's bill directed toward this. In view of that, I would be willing to allow this bill to proceed to committee of the whole for further discussion there.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Long that Bill No. 32 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Snyder that Bill No. 40 — **An Act respecting the Establishment of the Wakamow Valley Authority** be now read a second time.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, I'm ready to let this bill go through. I just have a few questions and I've agreed that they be asked in committee of the whole.

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for urban affairs, I would like to add a few words of support and comment on Bill No. 40. As many of the members may be aware, our department was involved to a considerable extent helping with the legislation, and helping to develop the concept of the Wakamow Valley.

To begin, I want to congratulate the city of Moose Jaw and the surrounding municipalities on the tremendous effort they have put forward toward the Wakamow project and the high degree of leadership that they have shown. This is clear evidence of the strength and vitality of municipal government in this province. The plan is an exciting one, and the facilities proposed will be of real benefit to the residents of the city of Moose Jaw and area in the years to come. The province, through urban affairs, has provided the city of Moose Jaw with a grant of over \$60,000 to assist the proposed Wakamow Valley master plan. Funds are also included in the 1981-82 budget to cover the province's share of the annual operating budget for the Wakamow Valley Authority, and to provide some capital start-up assistance.

Mr. Speaker, urban park projects such as Wakamow are evidence of this government's desire to work co-operatively with local level government to enhance the quality of life in our urban communities. Many of our urban centres are fortunate in having areas of significant natural beauty within their corporate limits. When municipalities see the need for additional urban park space, our government is prepared to consider working jointly with them to provide long-term plans and policies to protect, enhance and sensitively develop the gift of nature which these communities possess. Not only do such projects greatly enhance the quality of life within our major urban centres, but they also contribute to energy conservation by providing recreational needs and leisure facilities close to home.

As my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Labour, has demonstrated and argued in the case of Wakamow, the government's commitment to urban parks extends beyond providing financial assistance and study. We are also prepared to consider providing continued operating assistance on a partnership basis with urban municipalities and with other partners, where local circumstances dictate. However, I want to stress that the nature

and extent of such operating assistance will be an item to be negotiated, in each case, between the city or the community and the province. The reason is simply that each local circumstance has its own peculiarities and uniqueness. In the case of Wakamow, as with Wascana, a separate authority with its own legislation was considered desirable by all parties. In other cases, a different organization may be considered to be more appropriate.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the members of this House that as a result of a request from the city of Prince Albert, the province will be working with Prince Albert, the R.M. of Buckland and the R.M. of P.A., and the Wahpeton Indian Band during '81-82 to set out a long-term vision for land use of a forested area within the immediate area close to the city of Prince Albert and near the river bank area (with which some of the members will be familiar). There is the so-called Nisbet Forest which is under the ownership of the province; the city has some 1,500 acres. This project will be known as the Little Red River Land Management Study and will address the future of all the land use in that area. As with Wakamow, the province will provide 50 per cent of the cost of the study, to a maximum of \$50,000. We will participate in the study and the management of the study that is proposed. The remaining 50 per cent of the cost will be shared by the other local partners. In line with my earlier statement, the nature and extent of any ongoing assistance for the Little Red River project, including the need for an authority, will be determined jointly by the partners, once the study has thoroughly assessed the area's future needs.

Mr. Speaker, as in Wascana, in Meewasin Valley and Wakamow, now we see Prince Albert as an area to develop and undoubtedly there will be future requests.

In closing, I want to congratulate the city of Moose Jaw and the R.M. of Baidon on a job well done, and for the support and co-operation that my department has received, and for the encouragement, and perhaps to a degree one can say the prodding that we have had from the Minister of Labour, and the other member for Moose Jaw, Mr. Skoberg. They've done a tremendous job of working with the community. I think in years ahead future generations will look to this day when this bill is being passed, and say that here was a time and a day when this legislature joined together to do a tremendous thing for a community, to improve its quality of life. I wholeheartedly support the bill.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity in closing debate on second reading to express my gratitude to the members opposite for the manner in which they've expedited the movement of this bill, for reasons that I think are understood on both sides of the House. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to move that this bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and by leave of the Assembly referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 40 — An Act respecting the Establishment of the Wakamow Valley Authority

Section 1

MR. SKOBERG: — Yes, I would like to just make a comment or two on section 1, Mr. Chairman. I think it's rather interesting to recognize where the name "Wakamow" came from. I know that question has been asked in various areas. It actually means "the turn"

in Plains Cree, and refers to the historic location where the Moose Jaw River makes an abrupt turn from north to east; and actually, it was suggested by the Federated Indian Cultural College. We made every effort to canvass all of the organizations and had a contest for the naming of the authority. The name "Wakamow" meaning "turn in the creek" was the name that did come about.

I might also say that it may be of interest to some members of the legislature that the residence I have in Moose Jaw (and I say this really for the benefit of the hon. member for Arm River) is in the management area. So he'll note as he goes through the bill that everything that applies to anything that's restricted in so far as development is concerned, likewise applies to my residence in Moose Jaw.

The fact is that the authority, through its terms of reference and the structure that it will have, is really vested with the whole idea of trying to minimize future flood damage. All of us are well aware of the fact of what has happened in Moose Jaw over the years. We know that there has been some serious damage to the residential areas of the valley that now will be falling within the Wakamow authority. So the purpose really was to minimize the flood damage that may occur in the future. Let's hope that there is some water coming down that valley this year.

Of course the authority aims to provide more recreational opportunities in the valley itself, and to integrate the present wild animal park which has been so highly funded by government over the years with the Wakamow Valley Authority, and, naturally, to recognize and enhance the heritage aspects of the valley. The question has been asked, over time, what some of the objectives might be.

We also hope that we will be able to retain a good part of the natural habitat in the valley itself, and ensure that the components of the plan can be implemented by local voluntary organizations. My colleague, the Minister of Labour, the member for Moose Jaw South has indicated in his opening remarks that there was tremendous co-operation with the local organizations in Moose Jaw in the development of this authority.

I might say that the co-operation that has already been alluded to by my colleague has been very evident. There has naturally been some concern, and I'm sure that the hon. member for Arm River will be asking some questions to clarify some of the points he will have. But the advisory working committee that was structured showed a real ability to put together a plan of action and a plan that will be accepted by all people of Moose Jaw and the surrounding area; it was something that was very pleasant to work on. The committee that was structured worked many hours. The real working committee that was comprised of officials from the city of Moose Jaw, and members of the department (the Hon. Walter Smishek's department) did do a tremendous job of putting together some of the legislation that needed to be put in place to provide the authority that you have before you today.

With that, Mr. Chairman, on item 1 I would just like to say again that I too appreciate the co-operation that has been very evident, particularly from the member for Arm River, in trying to bring this about so that Moose Jaw city itself will benefit from some of the financial contributions that are available with the quick passage of this particular piece of legislation.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I would like to refer to a letter of June 24 in this package that I received from you, where they sent out a questionnaire. I wonder if you could tell me

who these questionnaires were sent to? I understand there were 50 of them sent out. Were they groups of people, or individuals? Do you know this, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — The questionnaires the member is referring to were sent out prior to a public meeting that was held in the city of Moose Jaw, and as I recall it, they were sent to all of the residents of the Churchill and River parks. Perhaps the hon. member for Moose Jaw North can correct me, but I believe the questionnaire was sent to all of the three subdivisions — all of the people who hold land in those registered subdivisions, River Park, Wellesley Park and Churchill Park. My understanding was that they were all provided with the questionnaires, and that was the circulation of the questionnaire that you draw attention to.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — From what I can gather here, there were 50 questionnaires that came back in. But there were more sent out then than you're saying. How many questionnaires were sent out then?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — The distribution took place as a result of an insertion in the *Moose Jaw Shopper* and of course the distribution was quite large. I think the particular distribution was to those people in the immediate area, but obviously, there was a wider distribution than just that general area. I think the member for Moose Jaw North will fill me in on this if I'm not entirely correct, but I think it was distributed widely throughout the city of Moose Jaw, with special emphasis on the park area that was directly affected.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, I am quite satisfied that it was circulated enough and that the people are satisfied. I want to ask some questions about the questionnaire. One question was, "Do not live in the park?" (?) There were 27 people who totally agreed; 7 people suggested some changes. There is a lot of material here and no one totally rejected the concept. But almost every respondent wanted a few changes. Could you outline some of these changes? I just don't understand it, Mr. Minister. Could you explain it?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Chairman, I can't indicate with any precision the individual changes that were suggested. The questionnaires were evaluated after they were brought in and an attempt was made to take into consideration those suggested changes. I can't tell you with precision how, in each instance, they were acted upon. I think in many instances they were of a very general nature. As you indicated, no one rejected out of hand the suggestion of Wakamow or the general thrust of the proposition, but, in some instances, rather minute changes were suggested. On other occasions, matters which the policy committee and the working committee took into consideration when the legislation was being drafted were addressed.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Another item I would like to refer to, Mr. Minister, is the public meeting. There are no results here about the public meeting. There is just a letter given to me in the package, advertising the public meeting. I wonder if you could tell me approximately how many people came and what happened? There is nothing in the package to say what happened at the meeting. Perhaps you could enlighten me on that.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — I wouldn't want to be held to the exact figure, but to my recollection it was held in the Sportsman's Centre. I think there were 100 or 125 people in attendance; that would be a ball-park figure.

A good thorough discussion was held with respect to the extent of the program at the

time. The questions which were contained in the questionnaire were discussed in chronological order and an opportunity was given to all parties to make their representations once again to the officials from the city of Moose Jaw. Also in attendance at the time was Mr. Holtzman, who was directly responsible for the drafting of the legislation, as well as people from the Department of Municipal Affairs, the city commissioner, the mayor of Moose Jaw, me and the member for Moose Jaw North.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Were there any people at this meeting who had any objections, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — I believe the objections that might be heard at that time and today related not to the general thrust of Wakamow, nor to the intention to develop that particular park area.

The general concern which has been registered, of course, has been one that's long-standing. That's a controlled zone at this stage, because it falls within the flood plain as designated previously. Accordingly, there are restrictions placed upon that particular area by a zoning by-law of the city of Moose Jaw. For a period of time there has been some concern, and some discontent has been registered. I believe this manifested itself at the meeting. Frustration and concern were registered by some residents, not because of the development of Wakamow, but more particularly because they feel somewhat inhibited in being restricted from building because of their being situated in the flood plain and with restrictions that have been placed upon them by the zoning by-law. I think, having said that, there was concern expressed, not arising particularly out of the legislation under discussion today, but more particularly because they are located in that geographic area that has been subject to flooding, I believe, in 1948, 1969 and more recently, in 1974. On each occasion there has been considerable damage, and a considerable amount was paid out in flood damages from the Department of Municipal Affairs.

I think the concern that was registered is related more to what came before Wakamow than the terms and conditions that are described in the legislation under discussion.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — There is a letter here, Mr. Minister, — it says Moose Jaw and District Labour Council, from a Mr. Percy Hill, chairman of the board. He's bringing a lot in here and I'm not just sure I understand what this project has to do with the water quality. Does it have something to do with cleaning up the valley? The labour council put their blessings on the project, but he says so much through the letter about the pollution through the valley, and how it affects the water quality. I just don't understand what he means. Perhaps you can enlighten me.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — I'm not entirely sure about the letter to which the hon. member draws attention, except to say that the Moose Jaw and District Labour Council has had a long and abiding interest in the development of that valley, and Mr. Hill has been part of, I believe, the planning commission or planning board, in connection with the city of Moose Jaw. Accordingly, Mr. Hill, himself, has had an overriding interest in city planning matters. Additionally, my understanding is that the reference may have been to some of the clean-up that is taking place, for example, some of the dredging and removal of mercury-contaminated soil from the river basin. I'm only speculating, but I presume that that may be part of what Mr. Hill described in his letter.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I don't want to hold this up too long, but just to get it on the record, perhaps I'll just read a part of this letter:

The Moose Jaw and District Labour Council has, for many years, called for the clean-up of, and the proper utilization of, the Moose Jaw River Valley. Our last significant effort focused much attention and controversy on the river. It was clearly proven that the diesel fuel has not been eliminated in the underground waters. No mention is made of the buried waste in the area, which contains you-name-it-and-we-dump-it materials. And there are some indicators that point out the existence the river is badly polluted and that there is general deterioration of the valley.

Suddenly, it became politically expedient to use the river clean-up issue in election campaigns. We welcome the renewed interest but were somewhat disappointed with the lack of real progress.

The Wakamow proposal does provide a plan of action and our council supports this plan in principle. We have, however, some serious concerns and opinions on necessary changes.

Water quality is of prime importance. We are appalled that water quality was left out of the consultant's terms of reference. There will be no attempt made here to prove pollution exists since we have been down that road before. Further proof is absolutely unnecessary. However, it is alarming to see a plan of action ignore the pollution issue. The mercury situation is a very direct example of this problem. There exists a situation where 100 per cent clean-up in public awareness is the only solution. Instead, we see committees formed, leaving out members of the public at large and making no provision for public awareness.

Solutions were proposed to tell the public that the mercury can be contained on sight, but nothing is said about the fact that the diesel fuel has not been eliminated in the underground waters. No mention is made of the buried waste in the area, which contains you-name-it-and-we-dump it materials. And there are some indicators that point out the existence of the attitude of giving lip service to an important issue. An irony of this approach is a proposal like the Wakamow which would be referred to consultants without instructions for even contacting the Department of the Environment about water quality and water quantity. Water quality and quantity have been long-standing concerns of ours. Others had a lot to say about it at the Wakamow public meetings as well. Our public is convinced that water quality and quantity are problems that can and must be solved. Surprisingly, years ago the CPR found it possible to hold several bodies of water for year-round use. Yet nothing is done when public environmental need is great.

Concern must be expressed over the way private property is being acquired. Our council agrees that this is desirable, and that this must be done. Methods such as rezoning, interim controls, and appraiser purchases are being used by administrators. The guarantees of justice are not so clearly defined. In fact, what happens is that the elected bodies legislate laws and regulations and provide funds and they leave it in the hands of the administrators with little or no monitoring of the situation. We see home-owners very unjustly treated, a sour taste in the mouths of many, and furious contradiction evident by realtors purchasing valley property. Suspensions ran rampant and people did not expect a fair deal. Complete scrutiny must take

place regarding all private property so that acquisition is done in good faith. Anything less is not acceptable.

The provincial government is putting funds into this project. Therefore, the province should expand the area under its jurisdiction, for example, by including Kingsway Park and the provincial park. The two mill per year municipality funding is earmarked for the Wakamow project by the parks and recreation department. These funds could find their way into overall department spending. Possibilities such as this must be carefully guarded against. Jurisdiction questions such as these must be clearly defined, ensuring public acceptance and long-term stability for Wakamow.

The various uses proposed for Wakamow are interesting, but must not be permitted to divert attention from the overall concept, which is to develop the valley for public recreation use. Private enterprise facilities must exist outside the Wakamow and not be permitted within, because of the obvious contradiction within the overall public concept. Natural areas require much more consideration. The manicured look must be questioned because of the high costs of maintenance. Also, there is much more valuable beauty in the natural state when displayed properly.

The aspects mentioned previously about water significantly alter the uses and attractiveness of Wakamow. The Moose Jaw and District Labour Council appreciates the opportunity to express views on the Wakamow Valley development proposal. The future and monetary returns to the citizens of this area are tempting to contemplate — but who knows? — they may be pleasantly significant. We sincerely desire to see the best overall facility evolved.

Now, I'm sure that you must have satisfied the people and all these desires or you sure would have heard from these people again. Would you just explain some of the things I've outlined in here? That's all I'm asking here.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Well, I think essentially the letter from Mr. Hill articulates quite well the concerns that many of us have expressed over the last number of years. He draws attention, especially, to the deterioration of the valley and the neglect that has taken place over a great many years — as a result of a number of floodings and the erosion which took place, and the silt and other debris that are carried downstream each time there is a high water flood which takes place in that general area. I think he draws attention to some of the concerns which have been expressed over a period of time (since the city's zoning by-law came into effect) and he expresses some concern also that Wakamow will treat the landowners fairly in the acquisition of their property. I think you will find described in the legislation under discussion the precise guarantee that resident landowners will not be subject to expropriation, that the landowner or his or her spouse will in effect be given the absolute assurance that there will be no possibility of their being expropriated during their lifetimes. It provides also that there will be a provision for first right of refusal to be offered to Wakamow, which should provide at least a willing buyer in circumstances where some of the property being in the flood-prone area may not be too attractive on the commercial market.

I think essentially the clean-up which is taking place with respect to the mercury contamination that has resulted from many years of neglect, and has been contributed to by CP Rail in the cleaning of their cars over many, many years, is another example of

work which has been done previously in terms of the Qu'Appelle implementation study. There have already been some steps in terms of progress in making ready for the legislation, which in turn provides yet another step forward in terms of the Wakamow authority's being placed in the position where it may develop this resource for the city of Moose Jaw and surrounding area. I don't know whether I have touched, in any precise detail, on matters of general concern. Perhaps the member might be more precise in the questions of concern that remain.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I just wanted to get that on the record. I don't want to hold it up, because we have had private conversations about it with several people in the Moose Jaw area, including you and the other member for Moose Jaw.

When the Hon. Minister of Urban Affairs gave his statement, there was just one thing that he didn't mention, Mr. Minister. He was talking about the unanimous support from the city of Moose Jaw, which I definitely agree with. There was unanimous support. He thanked the R.M. of Baildon No. 131 for their unanimous support, but he neglected to say anything about the R.M. of Moose Jaw, which I understand has not given unanimous support or has opted out. To get it on the record, I would like to have your interpretation of why the R.M. of Moose Jaw did not participate?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — The hon. member may know that initially discussions that took place involved the R.M. of Baildon, the R.M. of Moose Jaw, the city of Moose Jaw, and the province. I think there was a genuine interest shown by the representatives from the R.M. of Moose Jaw. It should be said, first of all, for the record, that no property, no land which is in the Wakamow authority is part of the R.M. of Moose Jaw or the R.M. of Baildon. But because of their close proximity to the Wakamow Valley and the fact that they abut the Wakamow Valley, it was considered wise to have their involvement. The financial involvement, as you know, is very limited. The financial requirement is \$1,500 a year for membership by Baildon.

I expect we had to express some disappointment because the R.M. of Moose Jaw chose to attach conditions to joining Wakamow. The condition was that it would be given the opportunity, upon reasonably short notice, to opt out. We thought it was unwise; at least the policy committee determined that that should not be part of the provision, particularly in light of the fact that Baildon municipality did not attach that condition to its membership.

We left the door open and indicated to the R.M. of Moose Jaw that we would welcome, at any time, its inclusion, and an amendment to the act would provide its re-entry. I think, quite frankly, that they have had some second thoughts. I am not speaking for the R.M. of Moose Jaw, but in private conversation they have still indicated a continuing interest in support for the program. It was basically because of their reluctance to become a part of Wakamow without being granted in legislation the opportunity to opt out by their own leave, that the policy committee made up of the R.M. of Baildon, the city of Moose Jaw and the province, decided not to include that in the legislation. Obviously we will welcome their participation at a later date.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I just have one more remark, Mr. Minister. As I said in second reading when we went through this before and you made your comments, I would definitely agree and the caucus would agree to let this bill go through, all things being equal, because we know there is an urgent matter involved. I would like to thank you for the co-operation of someone from the city of Moose Jaw getting this package to me. As

far as I can see in all the correspondence which has been involved in this, all things are equal, so I have no qualms about this bill going through.

The member for Kindersley has a few remarks he wants to make in closing. May I assure you, Mr. Minister, that after what happened in the past (especially in Saskatoon) if all things hadn't been equal and if we hadn't had this response, we would not have been able to support this bill. I talked to the city of Moose Jaw, of course, and I talked to the reeve of the R.M. of Baidon, and they were in full agreement. The only comment I want to make is that the reeve of the R.M. of Moose Jaw, No. 161, said there is no way they would oppose this. They hope to join sometime, and their only concern is that they wish they had the option of getting in or opting out. That is all I have to say on this bill; the member for Kindersley has a few remarks to make.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Minister, the only comments I have on Wakamow is that I wish you well on Wakamow. The caucus of the official opposition will be supporting you on this question. The only question I would throw out to you is basically this: the last development of this type in the province of Saskatchewan, as you know, was the Meewasin Valley Authority in Saskatoon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Perhaps it was supported, Mr. Minister, but the bill you have brought forth takes care of some of the major concerns advanced in the opposition to the Meewasin Valley Authority. I commend you for that.

I do say this: what I saw happening in the Meewasin Valley Authority in Saskatoon (I think you have been able to avoid it happening by the legislation) was the entrenchment of political sides into the project. From my talk with the mayor and from discussions the hon. member for Arm River has had with the various R.M.s and the farmers, I think you have been able to do this. I hope the fate of Wakamow will not be the same as that of Meewasin. It is fraught with problems and those problems continue to this day. One R.M. wants out of the authority because it feels it is being unfairly treated.

To a certain degree, I think the concerns were raised because of the manner in which the whole program was approached. I hope you keep this program open; listen and respond favourably to concerns which are logical and reasonably put forward. I throw this out as a suggestion rather than any kind of a criticism of your bill today.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Well, I think the member for Kindersley echoes my sentiments. It's our objective, of course, to have this whole matter flow smoothly, in light of the fact there has been an involvement by members of a variety of political faiths. The Hon. Doug Neil (who will be known to you) was originally on the policy committee, and because of his duties was unable to attend on a regular basis, but he does have a deep concern and an interest in the development of the program, as he has for years in the development of the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park.

I think perhaps we can all be wise after the event, and I suppose it's always a good deal easier to go to school on someone else's mistakes. I think we all acknowledge the fact that Meewasin was perhaps a trial run. Accordingly, some difficulties that had manifested were unknown at that point in time. I'm rather grateful, I expect, that we hadn't been attempting to develop Wakamow ahead of Meewasin, or perhaps we might have been experiencing some of those difficulties. I think it has to be acknowledged that it's a different set of circumstances in Wakamow than was the case in Meewasin particularly in light of the fact that the entire geographic area of Wakamow falls within the city of Moose Jaw. Accordingly, it's more manageable, and less of the pitfalls are evident in Wakamow than was the case in Meewasin.

I think we've learned also in terms of some of the practices. For example, when we proclaim the act, we intend to proclaim it in sections in order that not too heavy a burden is placed upon the new authority immediately, because of some of the administrative difficulties that beset a new authority when it starts out fresh on a brand new project. So with all of those considerations we're hopeful that it will proceed, and that over the next 50 years our children and our children's children will enjoy this as an indication of the kind of foresight that will create, I think, a God-given resource that will be of great benefit to the community. So I take the member's advice in good taste and thank him for it.

Sections 1 to 78 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 40 — An Act Respecting the Establishment of the Wakamow Valley Authority.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

CULTURE AND YOUTH

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 7

Item 1 (Continued)

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, last year in the estimates we discussed the amount of money in the restoration of Saskatchewan House. If my memory serves me correctly, there was a subvote there for about \$1 million, and I think the total package was in excess of \$1 million. I think we are in agreement with the restoration of Saskatchewan House and all the furnishings of the day, but it makes one wonder why the government opposite, when it came into power in 1944, saw fit at that time to take the contents of Saskatchewan House and put them up for public auction.

I don't know if they viewed the office of the Lieutenant-Governor as some type of bourgeoisie or what it might be, but anyway the complete contents, as I understand it, of Saskatchewan House were auctioned off for a mere pittance. I suggest at that time when the ideological viewpoint of the brand new CCF Party of the day (which was supposedly representing the dirt farmers and the man on the street) that this magnificent structure looked like the opulence of splendour. Therefore, it was the philosophical viewpoint to discard these things, to auction them off for very little.

Since that time, I think the history of Saskatchewan House has been — sit down and you'll hear more my friend — that it was allowed to go to wrack and ruin. If I remember correctly, when I first came to Regina it was a veteran's hospital or residence in very poor condition. Now I see that the new NDP, which is the spawn that you are in and which has spawned ministers like yourself, has realized and is regretting the tragic step taken by your predecessors, the CCF. You have now seen fit to spend virtually millions, or \$1.5 million of the taxpayers' money to restore something which I say should have been there all the time. And when I hear you on the other side talk about the culture of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you don't like it go out; it won't hurt my feelings at all. You're talking about a corporation to develop culture when in the past years you have allowed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, so am I having a little trouble with one minister over there. You just keep quiet, or else we'll go on to health,

too.

When we talk about the great concern that this government now seems to be having for culture, and when I look back at what the people of Saskatchewan for the past 36 years have been deprived of . . . Now I see you're out scurrying all around the country to buy the furniture that you virtually gave away before. You've lost touch with that dirt farmer and the man on the street, and basically you're a closet capitalist government. That's what you really are. Now you think it is great to restore Saskatchewan House.

I'll go one step further on this topic, Mr. Minister. I've checked around and I've travelled throughout the country. Last year I was down in the residence of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. He has a fine place; he's a nice gentleman who entertained us very well. I really appreciate that. I think we have a fine Lieutenant-Governor, but where have we put him? We have him cooped up in the Saskatchewan Hotel for 37 years because the NDP sold the furniture in his house.

Now, I think it would only be fitting, with a fine gentleman and a fine lady like our present Lieutenant-Governor and his wife to show a little class. But why don't we, in Saskatchewan, why don't the closet capitalists opposite really restore Saskatchewan House and make up for this horrendous problem and this misdeed that was done to the office of the Lieutenant-Governor, and let the Lieutenant-Governor and his wife reside in Saskatchewan House as the head couple in our province? Let's do it up right and make amends for that shameful, dastardly act which happened in 1944, done by your predecessors, the CCF.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the hon. member raised the question of Saskatchewan House because it is, indeed, something we are very, very proud of. As the hon. member probably knows, it doesn't fall under the subvotes of the Department of Culture and Youth, as it is managed and administered by the Department of Government Services. But I, nevertheless, want to take the opportunity to make a couple of comments on the hon. member's comments.

I've had the opportunity to visit the renovated Saskatchewan House, to tour through it, and to spend some time in it. I would say to the hon. member that it is something about which we should all be very, very proud — the renovations which have taken place and the restoration of the heritage character. I don't think that I accept, in any way, the hon. member's characterization of what we have done to Saskatchewan House. I want to say to the hon. member that the subvotes for 1944 or 1945, or whatever year he was referring to, are not under debate in these estimates. But I do want to point out to the hon. member that, consistent with our policy of the restoration and maintenance of heritage sites and buildings, will be the policy that Saskatchewan House will be devoted to the people of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan House will provide an opportunity for the people of Saskatchewan to visit a very important heritage building to gain a better knowledge of Saskatchewan's past. In addition to that, it will be used by the public. I think the hon. member should not be ashamed of the fact that the farmers and the ordinary people of Saskatchewan are the people we're concerned about. I know that they are not people his party are concerned about, but our party wants to ensure that important sites of this sort, in which we have made an important investment, will continue to be open to, accessible to and used by the average, ordinary people of Saskatchewan. That is how we intend to use Saskatchewan House. There will be an official opening on Victoria Day. I would invite the hon. members to come along and visit and see Saskatchewan House and take

the kind of pleasure from it that I personally have taken from my visits.

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Minister, last night I was questioning you about the swimming pool courses. I see in your initial brochure that you had six courses last year with 97 individuals taking part. Do you plan to increase that training course for individuals? Are you going to put more money into this year's upcoming budget for that?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that these swimming pool operator courses are sponsored jointly by the Department of Health and the Saskatchewan Parks and Recreation Association. We have an allocation of funds for the payment of instructors and for the printing of materials this year, which is roughly equivalent to that of last year, with allowance for inflationary costs. However, we do respond to these programs to a degree, in terms of demand, so, exactly what, in the end, we would be spending on these programs would depend a bit on the demand for them.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Just a few remarks, Mr. Minister. Getting back to the study done by someone from outside the province: last night we talked about the things we do agree with — the thrust the government should have a hand in. But there are certain areas of the study that we are quite upset with; one area is the main recommendation of creating a Crown corporation for culture. You will remember that a few nights ago you couldn't even define culture. You couldn't define the alien experience we might be subjected to.

Creating a Crown corporation for culture, I think, is a very dangerous thing, as we all know Crown corporations are controlled by government and they surely aren't at arm's length from government. Another aspect of this report which disturbs me deeply is the outlined potential involvement areas that the government might get into, in particular, the control and operation of a film making department on behalf of the government. You and I both know that each government has its particular biases, and those biases no doubt will come out in the educational films that I'm sure will be shown in schools.

Another aspect which disturbs me deeply is that the cultural corporation accredit bookstores and publishers, and that these bookstores and publishers meet certain standards of Saskatchewan ownership and operation so that publishers and bookstores have a cultural as well as a commercial role. I'm sure that you know you can go into any bookstore in the malls in Regina, and any time a book is published by a Saskatchewan author the bookstores here (even though they might be chains) have them available. I think this is the first step into censorship.

You are talking about creating a recording studio, and the corporation would create a distribution network throughout the province. I think these are very dangerous, dangerous things.

I just want to close by saying, Mr. Minister, that perhaps the aims in the "Regina Manifesto" are going to come to light. It clearly states in the "Regina Manifesto" that the first thing in a social planned order type of existence is to establish a socialized economic order which this manifesto calls a national planning commission. Well, I think this particular report fits right in with the "Regina Manifesto." Another aspect of the "Regina Manifesto" is the socialization of communication, and I think that is the exact intent of this report, especially if you create a Crown corporation. I think it's a dangerous thing, and I hope the people of Saskatchewan realize that you have mixed a few good things with a bunch of bad things in these recommendations.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all with respect to the question of a Crown corporation for films. I should point out to the hon. member the recommendation for the possible establishment of a cultural corporations industry outlines a number of different options and possibilities that could be pursued. It does not say, as a recommendation, that any particular feature, accrediting bookstores or whatever, should be included. It did point out that that would be one possibility, and one possibility that could be discussed in terms of providing consumers with information about certain standards of supplies that would be carried with respect to that kind of bookstore. It's done with respect to other kinds of businesses, and in principle there is no reason it could not be done with respect to bookstores. But I take note of the hon. member's objections and will keep them in mind.

I should point out, though, that the recommendation itself simply makes reference in general to film making, cable television, record making, publishing and the crafts, and possibilities in terms of assistance with marketing and financial assistance and other forms of support that could be provided.

Specifically with respect to films, I should point that that is the one area where we currently have a Crown corporation. We have SaskMedia which is currently involved in film making. I agree, not nearly to the extent we would like to at the present time, because we have limited resources and so on. We don't have the same involvement yet in the distribution system, not to the same extent as Access Alberta or Ontario Education Communication. Our Crown corporation is not involved to nearly the extent that those two Crown corporations are. However, we do have SaskMedia which is currently involved in doing, I think, an excellent job with respect to both the production of films and with respect to the distribution of films. I think you will find that the school system is not finding that it has been utilized as any kind of propaganda tool, but rather it has been utilized to provide further support in the school system for this most important kind of medium that has now become an important part of instructional programs.

The hon. member objects to that kind of approach to education. I take the hon. member's objection. I will say, however, to the hon. member, that I stand behind SaskMedia. I believe SaskMedia is doing a good job. I would envisage the day when I could convince my colleagues that we might extend the role of SaskMedia further and that we might have further support in the whole field of educational communications.

I might say again that it is interesting to look at the pattern which has been followed in Alberta and Ontario with their much greater resources in that regard. I have one concern about the Alberta and Ontario model, which the hon. member has not raised, and that is, I think it is somewhat too centralized. I think we do need to look at the possibility of having greater ability of individual communities and individual schools to utilize that system in a more flexible way. That is difficult, I agree. But that would also offset some of those concerns which the hon. member obviously must have about the operations that do take place in the two provinces which I mentioned, where they do have an educational communication system through the distribution system as well. I agree there is a need. I am not so concerned because I think those communications corporations operate very independently. I am not concerned about the political control; I am more concerned about the standardization which comes from a very highly centralized system. I would like us to explore more flexible systems.

MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Minister, last year in consideration of culture and youth estimates,

I asked your predecessor some questions regarding the possibility of implementing sports awards for intervarsity athletics in Saskatchewan. I raised this as well at another time during private members' day. At that time he answered that there may be some consideration of this, or he would give it some consideration this year. Could I ask you if sports awards for intervarsity athletes at our two universities are now under consideration by your department?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think there has been any discussion of sports awards. However, perhaps the hon. member is referring to the possibility of athletic scholarships. I know there has been some discussion within the Canadian Inter-University Athletic Union about the possibility of introducing into the Canadian system something which we have never had, and that is athletic scholarships. We, of course, have not had those athletic scholarships for some very, very good reasons. Many, many people (and by the way, this does not involve government directly) from the university administrations and university athletes and so on, have objected to the use of athletic scholarships for some reasons associated with the competitive nature of recruiting that becomes involved and also certain kinds of dangers and abuses with selective scholarships of that sort. There are discussions taking place with respect to a Canadian system being established with respect to athletic scholarships. Our departments, both continuing education and culture and youth, have been indirectly involved in those discussions. We have not precisely established what it is they have in mind. We are observing and watching those discussions with interest.

MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Minister, I agree with you, to some extent, with regard to some of the abuses. Certainly, we have heard stories from American colleges over the years about some of the abuses in recruiting, and some of the things that go on. I would think that you would be aware of the program which has been in place in B.C. now for a couple of years, I think. When I said sports awards, I was in fact referring to scholarships or awards to students who already are members of intervarsity teams at the universities in the province.

In B.C., I believe, first of all they have to be residents of the province. Secondly, they would have achieved entrance to the university, and made the intervarsity team for which the award would be given.

I believe that in the province of Alberta a program similar to this will be put into place. The hopes there are that it will be in place before this coming fall. My information is that it is also under active consideration in Manitoba. If you take that into consideration, the three other western provinces considering athletic scholarship . . . Certainly I am not asking you to consider any more than that until we get into the abuses which can take place under the American system. But certainly with awards like \$1,000, as they are in B.C. . . . But I won't put any figure on it when I am asking you to consider this.

My concern, and the concern of many students athletes in the province, and the concern of many people who deal with young aspiring athletes, or people interested in this area (as we all should be, and I would hope that you would be) is the drain of our top athletes to American colleges. I would ask you to take this into very active consideration, because I think the concern in Saskatchewan's two universities at the inter-varsity sports level is that if the other three western provinces end up with awards or scholarships of this sort it will put Saskatchewan in a very difficult position from a competitive standpoint. I would just ask for your comments on that, and I hope you can give it some consideration.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, I should say, first of all, the hon. member, by his last comment, has pointed out exactly the difficulties. He indicated assurances that there would not be problems of competitive recruiting between provinces. Yet he makes the point that if Saskatchewan doesn't go, there would immediately be problems of competition for students between provinces, and so on, which illustrates that it is a very, very difficult question. If you move into these kinds of athletic awards you have questions of ensuring that they are maintained at the same level so that you don't have that kind of thing; you have to make sure that in fact they do not recruit from outside the province, as the hon. member has indicated. That seems to be a very real possibility under the scheme which he envisages, because he is warning Saskatchewan that if we don't go in, students are going to be drawn away.

I point out to the hon. member that, I think, there are a lot of unanswered questions. However, as I said, we are involved in discussion with the universities which are involved in discussions with the Canadian Inter-Varsity Athletic Union. We are following those discussions. There is certainly no provision in our budget for such athletic awards. There is no provision in these estimates for that. If the universities make a formal request to the government to support, in some way, we would then have to consider that question. If the universities choose to do so out of their own resources, that is not something over which we would have any direct control.

MR. McLEOD: — I just want to clarify a couple of things here, Mr. Minister. At no time have I suggested that our Saskatchewan athletes would be drained off by the other western provinces, because the programs are either in place or are being considered in the other western provinces and stipulate that students must be resident of the province and so on. What I am saying is that a similar system here in Saskatchewan would ensure that our students, our good, young athletes from this province don't continue to be drained off to the American scene, which is where they are going. I think the discussions with the athletic people at the University of British Columbia, for example, reveal that the B.C. sports scholarships to intervarsity athletes have basically halted that drain. To a great extent, it has halted that drain of B.C. athletes to the United States. Certainly, it is a small amount compared to what that student might get from the University of Washington, or whatever. I am saying that \$1,000 for a student here, when you consider the students, with their tough training schedules, and so on, just aren't able to carry on with part-time jobs, as many other students are. Certainly, I'm not saying there should be a greater emphasis on the athletic area than on the academic or scholastic areas, but athletics is a big part of the university program. I ask you to consider this very seriously. And don't think for a moment that I'm suggesting any kind of a competitive recruiting program between universities.

I say that Saskatchewan will not be in a competitive position, as it relates to other western provinces, because our good athletes will be going to the United States, while British Columbia, Alberta and Manitoba young people will be remaining in their home provinces. I maintain our young people should remain here in Saskatchewan, either on the Saskatoon or Regina campuses.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, did culture and youth send out any calendars last year?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — No, we didn't even count the number of days last year, much less put them into a calendar.

MR. GARNER: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. It looks as though there is perhaps one department that isn't completely out of control.

Item 1 agreed.

Item 2

MR. PICKERING: — I notice quite a substantial increase in the staff? Would you explain why you have an increase in staff of 10 people?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, there was a reorganization within the department during this past year. The previous subvote 6 and subvote 13, which were responsible for youth employment services and facility grants administration, were brought together into one general grants administration. So what has happened here is a transfer of positions that appeared in two previous subvotes that have disappeared into one subvote. I think, in total, there is an actual decrease of 1.7 person-years, when you bring all of those together and then count what you had in the three areas combined, compared to last year.

Item 2 agreed.

Item 3 agreed.

Item 4

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, I notice a decrease in this culture and multicultural support. What is the reason for the decrease?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Yes, that is totally due to the fact that the Department of Culture and Youth did in the past operate a translation service for the rest of the government departments. That service has been discontinued. With the development within the Department of Education of a new official minority languages office and the development of translators available under contracts through private services, it was deemed that this service could not really be any longer justified. So that service has been taken out.

Item 4 agreed.

Items 5 and 6 agreed.

Item 7

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, I brought to your attention last night that there was a decrease in sport and recreation overall and you said that there was, in fact, an increase. There's an indication here under item 7 that there is really a decrease. I think there should have been an increase rather than the decrease. Would you explain why?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, that also is associated with the administration. The positions in funds have not been eliminated, but they appear in item 1 under general administration again. There's a transfer and I neglected to mention this. There's a transfer of funds and a position to general administration. The position is that one of the consultants is now going to be doing policy and planning work that cuts across both sports and recreation in relationship with other items. There was also a transfer of printing funds to a central administration, with the printing being done out of that kind

of area.

MR. PICKERING: — Would the minister permit me to go back to item 7 for just a moment?

Under the youth employment services program, why was that discontinued? Was it not a program that was helping the youth get jobs during the summer months?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — That goes back to my earlier answer. I should point out that it has not been discontinued, but the administration of the youth employment services program was brought into the general administration area; the staff was brought under one common management service. And so that staff and those funds, with an increase for inflation, have been folded up into subvote 2.

Item 7 agreed.

Items 8 to 11 inclusive agreed.

Item 12

MR. HARDY: — There's one question on that I'd like to ask the minister. You show \$3 million there and there was \$7.4 million last year. Is that \$3 million a carry-over from the original program, or is that new additional funds that have been put into there?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Those are additional funds that will allow communities which did not draw upon the program up until the end of this fiscal year, to draw upon the program within the regulations (that is within the \$25 per capita for those who act alone; \$30 for those who work together). Those who did not draw their per capita funds will be able to draw those capital funds during this coming year from that \$3 million. That's our estimate of what will be drawn as a result of communities still to participate.

MR. HARDY: — So this wasn't a carry-over from last year; this is a brand new amount being put into it.

Item 12 agreed.

Item 13

MR. HARDY: — Just one question on that one, too. Could you explain what the youth employment services is going to be, or where that's going to be spent in youth employment services — just in general?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Under this item, this is separate from administration. These are the actual grants and they're made to municipalities and non-profit organizations for youth, cultural and recreational projects that are undertaken and employ young people. We provide a wage subsidy to those organizations out of this grant money, so this is the grant money for the actual wage subsidy. The earlier one was for the administrative costs and staff internally to administer the program.

Item 13 agreed.

Item 14

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, could you tell me what measures, if any, are going to be taken with regard to support for museums under that particular heading? I refer to the smaller museums that are finding it difficult to find adequate funding to even put together the artifacts that they have. As I have travelled throughout the province I have come across a number of collections that are virtually sitting out there in the elements. I don't think that that's good. We've talked about preserving whatever history that we have had in our short life as a province. There are artifacts that are available and have been gathered by certain individuals that find that of interest to them; primarily they are hobbyists — people that like to do that kind of thing — and it's neither here nor there. The fact of the matter is that in many instances the collections are getting to a point where they are worth nothing and, in fact, should be assisted by some means to provide cover for those different collections, you know for smaller communities in particular, not museums on a grand scale, but a place for those to be housed and certainly preserved. I think that that's basically my reason for asking the question. I want to know if there are means by which those will be able to be preserved in the years to come.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hon. member is referring specifically to the preservation through local and community-based museums, and I should indicate to the hon. member that we have approximately quadrupled the funds to be available for support of small museums. It really is the bringing in of a whole new policy and program for support of small museums. We are currently involved in discussions with the museum association about the administration of those substantial new funds, the criteria that should be used, and so on. We are having full consultations with them so that they can give us their advice on how to go about that. In addition, we are providing staff advisory service in the new budget year for small museums to assist them in their planning, administration, and collection work.

MR. BIRKBECK: — What is the sum total of those new sums?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Specifically for small museums the figure will be \$245,000 this year.

MR. BIRKBECK: — And how do people go about getting a piece of the action, so to speak?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, upon completion of our consultations with the museum association and the development of the criteria for the administration of these funds, we will be making information available both publicly and directly to all the small museums of which we are aware, so that they will know how to proceed to make application and to have their grants processed.

MR. BIRKBECK: — And how soon will that information be available — within a month or two?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Our aim would be to have it completed by spring or early summer.

MR. HARDY: — Do you say Mr. Minister, that the grants to small museums will be approximately four times what it was last year? Is that the understanding?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Yes.

Item 14 agreed.

Items 15 and 16 agreed.

Vote 7 agreed.

MR. PICKERING: — I would just like to thank the minister for supplying us with the answers to our questions, and I would hope that you don't form a Crown corporation under culture. Also, I'm a little concerned that you did, in fact, cut back in culture and youth. I think it all came from sports and recreation. I would hope, in another year, that you would perhaps get a little more money and support our sports and recreation throughout the province.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I only have one comment for the member. The change in funds is entirely related to the fact that Celebrate Saskatchewan is no longer functioning and that it was the final year of the culture and recreation grants program, and not because of any cutback in sports and recreation.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:45 p.m.