

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
MAY 13, 1981

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. BROCKELBANK: — I would like to take this opportunity to introduce a very important group of guests who are in the Speaker's gallery today. They are 16 students from the University of Saskatchewan Department of Economics and Political Science, and they are accompanied by 16 people from Memorial University in Newfoundland Department of Political Science. The purpose of the exchange with Memorial University, as I understand it, is to acquaint the participants with the essential features of Saskatchewan's cultural heritage, major political and constitutional issues, and the province's economic and social environment.

The group here today is led by Professor Hans Mitchelman, Professor Graesser and Professor Gilchrist. I'm sure all members will join with me in welcoming this group to the Saskatchewan legislature and we hope that their stay here will be interesting and productive.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. members for Saskatoon Eastview and Saskatoon Riversdale are not able to be in the Chamber this afternoon. Consequently they have asked me to perform a very pleasant task, and that is to introduce to the Assembly, two groups of students from Saskatoon schools: 26, I believe, from St. Mary's School and 10 from St. Charles School. They are seated in the west gallery and they are accompanied by two teachers, Mrs. Noonan and Mrs. Karwacki. I understand that the students visited the RCMP depot this morning and also the Museum of Natural History. I know they enjoyed themselves there and it is my hope that they will enjoy themselves here in this Chamber, particularly in light of the fact that we are in the dying days of this session. I will be meeting the students later and it is my hope and the hope of all members here that they have a very pleasant day in Regina and an extremely safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, last but not least, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the House, a group of 31 grades 8 and 9 students from Grayson School in the town of Grayson. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Ben Appell and Mrs. Audrey Bogdan. Their bus driver is Bill Ottenbreit. They have made a yearly visit to this legislature and every year they stay for two days. They started their tour of Regina yesterday, visiting the University of Regina, the RCMP barracks, Sask Tel. I guess this morning it was the Leader-Post and CKCK. I know they want to visit a number of other places and I am sure we all appreciate the fact that they came to see how this House operates. I'm sure it will be of some

benefit to them and I hope it is going to be of a great deal of benefit to them to see the happenings that occur in this House on behalf of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. So, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members want to welcome them here, wish them a very good afternoon and a safe journey back home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Water Level of Boundary Dam

MR. BERNTSON: — Question to the minister responsible for Sask Power. It's my understanding that the water level of Boundary Dam is down eight to 12 feet, and there's some concern that for lack of cooling water, unit six may have to be shut down at the Boundary Dam power generating station. Would you confirm or deny these reports?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, with the water problems that we are having this year, particularly in the southern part of the province, there is concern about whether we are going to have adequate cooling water. But I cannot say at this time that there are any definite plans or contingencies with respect to how to treat that.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister will be aware that Boundary Dam has the capacity of about 60,000 acre feet, and another dam, Rafferty Dam, five miles up the road, which has been on the drawing board for some time, has the capacity of about 600,000 acre feet. Has the minister responsible for Sask Power made any representation to the Minister of the Environment to advance the argument in favor of Rafferty Dam, which would obviously give you the capacity that you would need forever? If you haven't, would you give that some consideration?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there have been discussions between officials of the Sask Power Corporation and officials of the Department of the Environment with respect to that project. The hon. member will understand that a project of that sort involves many considerations, and it is not simply a decision of the Sask Power Corporation, but is rather something that would have to be looked at comprehensively. There have been discussions involving the Sask Power Corporation and the Department of the Environment.

Government Action on Inflation

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, tomorrow we'll be hearing again some sad news from the Bank of Canada on new interest rates. The Minister of Finance of the federal government has indicated (as headlines in today's newspaper will show) that high interest rates are here to stay. Today in his press conference, the Premier indicated that your government has not made any representations to Ottawa regarding high interest rates, and has also admitted that there is no quick and easy solution. Mr. Minister, my question to you is this: isn't it time that the high interest rates, inflation, and general economic chaos we could be facing very shortly became a top priority of your government? Should you not make representation to the federal government, and should you not take action yourselves to control government spending, which increases inflation and causes high interest rates?

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I was not at the Premier's press conference so I do not know exactly what he said. But I do not think that he would have said, "We have not made any representation on the situation of high interest rates," because if the member had been reading the press releases I have sent out, he would have know that every time I have gone to a meeting with a finance minister, whether he be federal-provincial, as well as just provincial, we have raised on every one of those occasions the questions of inflation and high interest rates. What appears to be taking place on the part of the federal government is a massive disregard of those issues, as of recent a date as yesterday.

Mr. MacMurchy, the Minister of Agriculture, who is not here today, made a very strong statement at a meeting of ministers of agriculture called by Mr. Whelan, the federal Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, on the question of high interest rates, and what effect they are having on farmers throughout all of Canada.

So, we have been making those submissions. We will continue to make those submissions. We are urging the federal government that economic meetings should be reinstated between the provinces in Canada, so that we can begin to come to grips, to our best ability across this country, with the issue that faces Canadian consumers because of the high interest rate situation, which is not, as some people claim, improving the inflationary situation but is (I happen to believe) aggravating it and making it even worse.

MR. LANE: — A question to the minister. There have been recent reports that interest rates may in fact attain a level of 30 per cent by the end of the summer. For the first time in this legislature, last Friday, the Premier of Saskatchewan finally admitted that the Government of Saskatchewan has a role to play. Would you not be prepared to put the financial ability of the province of Saskatchewan to immediate use to reduce mortgage interest rates for new home buyers, and to reduce the borrowing costs for the consumers of Saskatchewan, in particular, the farmers of Saskatchewan? Would you not set these two immediate priorities for the Government of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, it has been a priority of this government for some time. It is not a question of all of a sudden considering it a priority. Maybe the members opposite have just discovered that it is a problem, but we have spoken of it for some time as an important issue. Therefore, the nature of the budget, which we have been considering in the legislature since it was introduced on March 5, was such that it was an attempt, within the ability and the capacity of the province, to assist people because of the impact of the inflationary situation and the interest rate situation.

We have introduced a beef stabilization plan, which is one way of assuring that there will be some returns to farmers on the beef production which they make. It will work as well, I predict to the member for Thunder Creek, as SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program) has been working for hogs. We also have a mortgage interest rebate program which is in existence. The FarmStart program provides subsidized loans to farmers in a very substantial way. So it is not as though there has not been some effort made by this government to meet the pressures which are being caused by inflation and high interest rates.

If the member for Qu'Appelle is suggesting that somehow the Government of Saskatchewan has a role in controlling the interest rates (which I don't think he is suggesting, because he knows we can't), I would have to disagree with him. That is strictly a national policy of the federal government and the Bank of Canada. That is

May 13, 1981

where it has to change. We are going to do all that we can to try to convince them that the route they are taking is not going to meet the objectives they have in mind, and that it is going to do more harm than good.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the minister. Is the minister not saying that while farmers and small businessmen of Saskatchewan are going bankrupt, the Government of Saskatchewan is bankrupt of ideas? In fact, we have made several practical suggestions to help the consumers of Saskatchewan and none of them have been accepted.

As well, every one of the program you have announced (except the beef stabilization program, which the farmers out here certainly do not think is a fight against inflation) have become irrelevant in times of 17, 18, and 19 per cent interest rates. Would you not now admit that it is time for the government to call an economic conference in the province of Saskatchewan with businessmen, farm organizations and, I suggest, members of the opposition because we seem to have more positive ideas, to take immediate action to assist the consumers of Saskatchewan and to use the financial resources of the province to give direct and positive aid to the consumers of this province?

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the member for Qu'Appelle would like to take the heat off the federal government in Ottawa and his colleagues, who are the official opposition in Ottawa and who were recently the government. Whether it is the Liberals or the Conservatives who are elected, it doesn't seem to make any difference. Mr. Joe Clark, the former prime minister, supported high interest rates, as did Mr. Crosbie, in the same way as are Mr. MacEachern and Mr. Trudeau.

Now, if the member suggested that we should somehow establish an economic conference in Saskatchewan in order to take the heat off the government in Ottawa, he is not being very accurate in what he thinks might be a potential solution to the difficulty which is there.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have had some suggestions, two or three, which they indicate would control inflation. I should have brought my file with me because I have a couple of clippings which quote the Leader of the Opposition (not the one who sits in the House, but the one who sits in the gallery), in which he had some suggestions. I was going to point out that somehow they were not going to deal with the question of inflation. They have had suggestions which have not been practical so we have not implemented any of them or considered them. Our mortgage interest rebate program, for example, returns a lot more money to home buyers who have a mortgage in Saskatchewan than the proposal that the member for Regina South indicated which would return about one-quarter as much money.

Mortgage Proposal for New Home Buyers

MR. THATCHER: — My question is to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, you have indicated that your government has very little concrete action to propose for new home buyers. In most parts of the United States and some of the more progressive parts of Canada, such as Alberta and British Columbia, developers and builders of homes are helping new home buyers on a private basis by reducing the interest rates and building the amount they are reducing it into the overall purchase price. In other words, they are offering homes for the first couple of years at 12 per cent and 13 per cent. This is quite common. This is something which the private sector is doing.

Mr. Minister, the same people who are doing this say that if the government were to guarantee the mortgage (put the credit of the government behind that), they could make these mortgages available for about 10 per cent. Have you ever investigated this procedure which is working relatively successfully in many parts of the United States and very commonly in Alberta?

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, first of all let me indicate that the government of this province does provide mortgages (financial assistance) for home buyers and home builders. In addition to the many others which exist, this year we introduced a program dealing with energy efficient homes where a loan of \$3,000 will be available at no interest charge. I think that is a fairly significant innovation. Not only will it assist a new home buyer but it will also provide some incentive to build a higher quality home from the point of view of energy conservation. We have a co-op housing program which provides a very substantial subsidy, as high as \$150 a month for people who want to take advantage of it. We have a massive public housing program which is probably the best and the most substantial in all of Canada. We have considered some of the things which are happening in other parts of Canada (and that was what the member was asking me). We have not, at this point in time, considered that those program which we see across Canada would meet the need in Saskatchewan as well as programs which we have already established.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, we have heard a lot of talk from you and we have heard a lot of speeches. Mortgage rates are about 17.5 per cent. Are you going to take action such as they are in other parts of Canada and the United States, to make some first-home buyers available in the 12, 13 and 14 per cent bracket? Give us a yes or no, and for once spare us a lot of talk.

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I practised up on the talking when I was telling the member for Thunder Creek how he should pitch the ball the other day. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we are always interested in programs that exist in other jurisdictions. We make a point to look and find out how effective they are. Up to this time we have not implemented anything that the member may think is a good idea, because we think some of the programs we have now meet the needs in areas where the need is the greatest.

There is one other aspect to mortgages and home buying which I think we should not lose sight of. If you take a three-bedroom house in Saskatchewan, the cost is about \$63,500, give or take a little bit. If you go to Alberta, it's \$115,000 a home for the same kind of house; in British Columbia it's \$175,000. Now, that is a pretty big difference. I think it is a good reflection on the province of Saskatchewan.

Relief from Financial Strains

MR. BIRKBECK: — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance in light of the fact that we have before us a very serious situation here in the province of Saskatchewan, here in the country. We have these given facts: nationally, we have a \$127 billion deficit and that breaks down, Mr. Minister, so that you can see the seriousness of this matter to the people of Saskatchewan, to \$4,390 per capita for all of Canada, and \$11,970 per taxpayer. We look at a \$126.4 million increase in the provincial government's borrowing; we look at mortgages at 17 per cent to 18 per cent; we look at consumer and business loans at 20 per cent; inflation at 12.4 per cent.

May 13, 1981

Mr. Speaker, what do we have from this government? From the Premier, this morning at his press conference, we heard a defeatist attitude. Today we hear no answers from the Minister of Finance. Simply my question is, Mr. Minister, would you not agree that you and the Premier are prime candidates for Saskatchewan's own Herbert Hoover? Would you not agree that it is now time for the government to take some positive action and reduce this immense strain on the people of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know much about Herbert Hoover but the last time we had the kind of situation to which the member alludes is when we had a Conservative government in Canada led by someone by the name of Bennett. I don't think we are about to reach that under a government in Saskatchewan which is NDP. We have not ignored — I don't want to make light of the situation — the impact that inflation and high interest are having on Saskatchewan people.

We have very substantial financial transfer programs to municipalities and individuals. We have a very substantial amount of assistance to families on low incomes, through the family income plan. We have a very substantial and probably the best revenue-sharing program for municipalities anywhere in Canada, including the province of Alberta. All of those things, Mr. Speaker, are meant to assist not only those individuals and those municipalities, but are meant to assist them in meeting their increased costs, which obviously are being created because of inflation which affects them as it affects anybody, whether they are individuals or whether they are municipalities.

The province of Saskatchewan indeed is going to be borrowing money. We don't borrow money for the consolidated fund expenditures and operating expenditures of a government like they do in Ontario or like they do in the federal government. We borrow money for investment purposes which will have a return in the power corporation, the potash corporation and so on, so that we are better able in the future to pay for the programs and services that Saskatchewan people might have. We will have a balanced budget this year. Alberta (and I don't know why) will have a \$300 million deficit. I think that's a pretty good explanation and a pretty good tribute to the kind of management we have had in this province since 1944.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, somehow I get the impression there is a lead shield around your head and we are not getting through, we are not penetrating it for some reason or other. I don't think you will disagree that governments, generally speaking, will cause inflation or are a great cause of inflation — whether they be provincial, federal or whatever they may be. The worst cause or the greatest cause of inflation is governments.

You have shown — not very often, but once in a while — during your 40 years of tenure as government in this province, some leadership in some areas and some aspects. It didn't happen very often, but it has happened. I would ask you today, Mr. Minister, to take some leadership in the crisis that is facing the people of Saskatchewan today.

The member for Thunder Creek and the member for Qu'Appelle talked about the high interest rates for mortgages and the suggestion that we made to you to borrow on the government's credit, \$100 million or so to assist the people of Saskatchewan to build homes at subsidized interest rates. We have asked in the past for public utility rates to be frozen. We have made a number of suggestions. In light of all the suggestions that we have made, will you and your government take some action to help the people of Saskatchewan where they have the greatest concern, that is in pocketbook issues

where they are being taxed to death? They can't afford any more of the kinds of taxation that you are imposing on them.

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I would be most happy to commit the government to taking that kind of leadership because it is already being done. I am not saying there are not areas which, as we review the things that we are doing throughout the year, we may not need to change. I am always prepared to consider the kinds of changes that may be helpful and may be useful and may be reasonable to implement.

I want to address the member's comment about governments causing inflation. Indeed, expenditures by governments can cause inflation. But I want to remind the member that governments which have balanced budgets do not contribute in a major way to inflation. The biggest contributor to inflation is budgets which are not balanced. That is not the case in Saskatchewan, and we have been very careful to make sure that would not happen in Saskatchewan.

We are further showing leadership, Mr. Speaker, by having in this province one of the most progressive and one of the lowest taxation systems in Canada for low- and middle-income people. I think even the member for Regina South couldn't argue against that.

We already have a mortgage interest rebate program. I am not sure that the member's suggestion that we establish a public utilities review board would achieve anything other than higher utility rates than would otherwise take place and remove the responsibility for having to answer for those higher rates from the government. This is the case in provinces where they have public utility review boards. You can name any province you want or the CRTC when it comes to Bell Canada — bar none. In those situations, utility rates have been increasing at a more rapid rate than have been the utility rates in the province of Saskatchewan. If you take the province of Alberta the utility rate review commission has guaranteed to the utilities of power there a minimum of a 15 per cent return.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Telephone Rates for 1981

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of Sask Tel. In light of the comments just made, Mr. Minister, will you guarantee the people of Saskatchewan, and will you take the lead role in promising to the members of this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan, that there will be no increase in telephone rates in this year 1981? And will you try to help the people with the financial problems they are having due to the high interest rates and inflation running out of control?

HON. MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very foolhardy on my part to guarantee to the member opposite that we will not have an increase in telephone rates. After all, it is incumbent upon the management of Sask Tel and the board of directors to review constantly what the rates in any Crown corporation should be — the utility rates in this particular case, or the Sask Tel rates. I certainly couldn't give a commitment such as that. After all, if we see that materials and costs are extremely high and want to continue to give the top service that we do in Saskatchewan, I think everyone knows that we need the additional money to do so. For me to now guarantee to the member that we will not have a rate increase would simply be foolish and I cannot do that.

Power Rate Increase in 1981

MR. GARNER: — A question to the Minister of Sask Power. Mr. Minister, Sask Tel will not take the lead in Saskatchewan. Will you, in light of the fact that you've had \$60 million in excessive profit in Sask Power in the last two years, now tell the people of Saskatchewan that there will be no power rate increase in the year 1981 to help combat high interest rates and inflation?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, our power rates are reviewed on a regular basis and the consideration of those rates will be taking place when the time is due. I can't make any commitments on the outcome of those reviews. I can tell the hon. member that costs are obviously increasing significantly with inflation and so on. The electrical system basically runs on a break-even basis and therefore, it is impossible to give any kind of guarantee that there will be no rate adjustment as costs increase.

MR. GARNER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I take it then, Mr. Minister, you are not going to guarantee the people of Saskatchewan that there will not be an increase, but you are saying we are going to have an increase in Sask Power rates at a time when inflation and interest rates are out of control. This is nothing more than ripping off the taxpayers of Saskatchewan by the NDP government.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I could not find a question in that remark, but I will remind the hon. member that Calgary Power (a privately owned power corporation in Alberta of approximately the same size as Sask Power) on electrical production alone made profits this past year of over \$100 million. In the Sask Power Corporation, the profits on the electrical system were of very little significance. So I would point out to the hon. member that Sask Power has been producing and supplying electricity at as low a cost as possible and must face the realities of cost increases. We do, therefore, have periodic increase in rates.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Regrets on Attempted Assassination of Pope John Paul II

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I would like on behalf of the government to make a short statement on the attempted assassination of His Holiness Pope John Paul II. This morning, Premier Allan Blakeney issued a statement expressing, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, our shock and dismay at the attempt on the life of Pope John Paul II.

It would like to add here, to this Assembly, that all of us were deeply disturbed at the news of the attempted assassination. We can only hope that the Pope's injuries are not serious and that his recovery will be rapid. I am sure this hope is shared by all of us here in this Assembly.

As the Premier said this morning, Pope John Paul is a man who has taken his faith, his moral leadership into a world threatened by violence. He has spoken out fearlessly against the violence of war, the violence of hunger and the violence of repression. It is sadly ironic that such a man should fall victim to the very forces he has attempted to combat. I sincerely hope that the Pope recovers quickly from his wounds and continues to be a voice for peace in the world. As we all know, voices like his are desperately needed in our world today.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the words of the minister, on behalf of the members of the opposition, our sincere concern and regrets for the unfortunate attempt on Pope John Paul's life.

Mr. Speaker, His Holiness has shown to all peoples of the world in his short time as the spiritual leader of the Roman Catholic Church his deep concern for justice and peace throughout the world, not only through his words, but also through his actions.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, all members of this Assembly and indeed all the people from all the faiths in the province of Saskatchewan, to say a special prayer for His Holiness's speedy recovery.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 116 — An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act, 1979

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act, 1979, and I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honor The Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this bill, recommends it for the consideration of the Assembly.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 117 — An Act to amend The Statute Law

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Statute Law.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 118 — An Act to amend The Executions Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Executions Act.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 119 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend the Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act. I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

May 13, 1981

Non-Controversial Bills

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the select standing committee on non-controversial bills, I present the first report of the said committee which is as follows:

Your committee met for organization and appointed me as chairman and Mr. Johnson as vice-chairman.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the non-controversial bills committee, I wish to report Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend the Department of Health Act, as being non-controversial.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole be waived.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 75 — An Act to amend The Family Services Act, as being non-controversial.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assistance Act

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assistance Act, as being non-controversial.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 77 — An Act to amend The Rehabilitation Act

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 77 — An Act to amend The Rehabilitation Act, as being non-controversial.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 78 — An Act to amend The Housing and Special-care Homes Act

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 78 — An Act to amend The Housing and Special-care Homes Act, as being non-controversial.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 114 — An Act respecting The Consequential Amendments resulting from the Amalgamation of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan and The District Court for Saskatchewan

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 114 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the Amalgamation of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan and the District Court for Saskatchewan, as being non-controversial.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 115 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Medical Profession Act, 1981

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 115 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Medical Profession

May 13, 1981

Act, 1981, as being non-controversial.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

MOTION

Legislative Library

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I wish to beg leave of the House to introduce a motion consequential to the report of the special committee on the Legislative Library. Just by word of explanation, that report recommended that the standing orders as they applied to the Legislative Library be consolidated covering the general management of the library, the regulation of admission hours, the management of the collection, and the publication of a catalogue of books. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Rosthern, that:

Pursuant to recommendation 20 of the report of the special committee on the review of the Legislative Library, tabled and concurred in by this House, May 7, 1981, rules 105 to 111 inclusive of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly shall be abolished as of the first day of the next session and replaced by the following:

Rule 105 — The management of the library, including regulation of admission, library hours, and security and preservation of the collection is the responsibility of the legislative librarian, subject to such special orders as he or she may receive from the Assembly, and the legislative librarian shall make an annual report to the Assembly through the Speaker.

Rule 107 — A catalogue of books belonging to the library shall be kept, and pertinent statistics relative to the collection and its utilization shall be maintained and reported in the legislative librarian's annual report.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Koskie that Bill No. 111 — **An Act to amend The Condominium Property Act** 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.

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

McArthur that Bill No. 70 — **An Act to amend The Education Act** be now read a second time.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on Bill 70. I have noted with some concern a number of the amendments that are proposed and I would like to deal with those amendments briefly.

The proposal of the ward system has been discussed to some extent in the House, though I haven't taken part in the discussion until this point in time. I have a real concern that the Minister of Education is overlooking the fact that the trustees in the province are on elected boards, and that they are elected by their constituents the same as we are. Now, when you look at the constituency of the trustees as being the city of Regina or the city of Saskatoon, it's not an extremely large area. It's much smaller than the constituency that I represent, even though it's more heavily populated. There is opportunity under the system as it exists now for people to get to know the candidates who are running for trustee. I see no need at all of moving to the ward system process that is being proposed here.

The trustees in both cities, from all four boards that would be concerned by this amendment, have registered their concern with the minister. The minister refuses to listen. I think that is a very clear indication of the way the government of the day is operating. It doesn't pay attention to the people out there. It would rather force things down the throats of the people. That is what the Minister of Education is about to do again. I believe that the minister is making a very wrong move, and should reconsider his position on this matter. He is moving on into a number of other areas that have been of much concern to trustees and to ratepayers in the province who understand what is in The Education Act. I'll admit that a number of them do not understand what is there because they don't have time to read acts as large as this.

I want to deal specifically with one area of the bill, and that is the one that is changing section 232. I would like to draw to the attention of the minister a note from Judge MacPherson in a hearing that was held in Moose Jaw dealing with exactly this section of the act. They are the words of the judge in his judgment on that particular case. I am only going to read one paragraph of it. The rest of it, I'm sure, is on file and can be reviewed by the minister at his leisure. He says:

Most importantly, the statute forbids the collective agreements to contain any terms concerning selection of teachers, administrative or instructional duties, or regulating the nature or quality of the instructional program. These, if I may say so, are certainly rights and privileges which the plaintiffs have every right to claim. The absence of any one of them would remove the ability of the board, as delegates of the minority, to operate the school system. Such would be a denial of all the rights and privileges protected in section 93 of the BNA Act as amended, and therefore, unquestionably prejudicial. But they are here preserved untouched.

I believe that's as clear as anybody could state the concern about that particular section of this bill. That was the judgment of Judge MacPherson in the Court of Queen's Bench. This judgment was taken to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal and it was upheld in its entirety. There was no change in the appeal court. So I believe that if the minister moves to change this particular section of the act in the form that he is suggesting, he will again see that the department and the province will be before the courts of our land to

May 13, 1981

review the very same thing. It seems to me that he's flying in the face of the laws of the province of Saskatchewan when he makes the suggestion that this is to be changed.

I would encourage the minister to bring forth a House amendment that would, indeed, leave this particular section of The Education Act in force as it presently exists.

There are a number of other amendments that I don't feel quite as moved about. There are some of them which are going to have some effects that I don't think are going to be beneficial to boards. Some of them are going to have effects that will not be beneficial to teachers.

I don't understand the minister's reasoning in some of the areas when he suggests that he wants to change them. When he is amending section 92(j), dealing with the right of a board to hold property in its name and to lease it out, I think he is looking at a very serious move indeed.

Many of the properties about which we are talking are older schools that have come to the end of their lifetime of usefulness as schools. They are being rented to other community groups for a short term. Most of these schools were built at a time when the boards, indeed, paid practically the complete cost of construction. The schools should really be considered as being properties of those school boards.

Under the amendment the school board is going to lose its right to hold the property in its name and to bring in revenue for the school system by the leasing out of the property.

I think the minister is making a move that is not going to be beneficial to the province. The province has very little need of a bunch of older school buildings. If the board can benefit the system and perhaps save its taxpayers something in tax dollars, I think that the right should be left for the school board to make that move. Now, they aren't going to be making large windfall profits but they can at times make a few dollars. Anything in this area can be beneficial.

We may see as well a time in the downtown core (and this is usually where these older schools are finding that they don't have population at this point) when these buildings may again be needed as schools. If they are taken back by the province they will likely be converted to other uses or destroyed and the land used for other purposes.

I see a concern here. I ask the minister to respond to some of my concerns. He may have other reasons, but these are the ones I see. They are the concerns that are being raised by the boards. They feel these buildings should be left in the hands of the boards and that the boards should have the opportunity to derive some usefulness, and in some cases, some revenue from these particular pieces of property.

Because of the items that are in this bill, I would not be able to support the bill in its present form. I ask the minister to give serious consideration to House amendments which would bring the bill into a form that we could deal with. I would be glad to talk to the minister if he wants further clarification of my concern on item 92(j). I think I have made my points clearly enough.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, to give very serious consideration to your move on section 232(4) as it affects the whole province of Saskatchewan. This particular section can have a very injurious effect on the education of children in the province of

Saskatchewan. If you change that particular section, and you are opening up the bargaining scope, then you are going to find that many of the decisions normally made by a school board to protect the educational standard they look for in Saskatchewan . . . In rural Saskatchewan, as the population drops, it becomes an even greater need. Let me just use an example, where at the bargaining table, the decision is made that the largest class size one can have is 18, and in some school systems in Saskatchewan they have found it necessary to combine grades (perhaps grades 1 and 2, or 3 and 4) and they may have 21 children who need education in that grade. Because of negotiation, it is possible that they could not put that number of students in that grade. Then, indeed, it becomes incumbent on the board to hire an additional portion of a teacher, or a full teacher. Part-time teachers are not always available in rural Saskatchewan.

It is going to mean an increase on the tax burden out in the province, and it's going to affect the decision of whether or not the board can offer the subject material that should be offered at that grade level. Potentially, it could mean that the quality of education would suffer.

The minister has said that they are only minor and shallow amendments, and that the boards, at the time of bargaining, can still make decisions. But I believe that what you're doing is opening up the bargaining act to the point that items which should never go to arbitration or mediation will move out of the hands of the school boards and into the hands of judges or whoever you appoint to make the decision at the time of an arbitration award. Often judges will be the first to tell you that they have no particular expertise in the area of binding arbitration, or none as to decisions about spending of the public purse. They're trained in law, not economics. Many of them do not have close contact with the school system at that point in their lives. They're not fully aware of the concerns being registered by the parents of any particular school division. Often, decisions made under these terms are not decisions which will be beneficial to children or to the rights of parents.

Mr. Minister, with those comments, I ask you to reply when you get up to close debate. I would like to have you make some positive responses in the form of House amendments.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to address some of my concerns regarding the proposed bill, Bill No. 70, an act to amend The Education Act.

I think I'd like to first address my concern about the ward system, which will be introduced by this bill. The minister has indicated from his study, the de Vlieger report, that there was a great deal of concern. In newspapers, he has said that he has received many letters. The minister should table the correspondence he has received regarding proposals that the ward system should be introduced in the city of Saskatoon.

I would also be very interested in looking at the number of responses that Professor de Vlieger received. I've found out from questioning the minister that some of these were from individuals, some from groups and some from school boards. It is my reading that the majority of the school boards, especially the ones that were concerned, unanimously and flatly refused the implementation of a ward system in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. I thought the words of one of the board chairmen, who compared the actions of the minister and the government opposite to those of the federal government vis-a-vis the new constitution, to be quite apropos. We are virtually having that rammed down our throats in Canada. The urban school boards in both Regina and Saskatoon feel somewhat the same way with the imposition of the ward

May 13, 1981

system by the government opposite. Perhaps one of the most vocal opponents to the system was Trustee Mary Hicks, and I quote:

Public School Trustee Mary Hicks says the provincial government is acting like the federal government by imposing wards on Saskatoon and Regina school boards against their will.

From my reading and talking to school boards, virtually that's what is happening. It is being proposed against their will. Now, if it is being proposed by the will of other people and groups, who have made representation to the minister, then, I think, it would only be correct that the minister would be kind enough to table those in the Legislative Assembly for all members, myself and the members on this side of the House, as well as members opposite, who have made representations in regard to the ward system. In fact, I remember some situations where individuals were cautioning members on both sides of the House that perhaps the ward system was not the correct way to be going to deliver the best education programs in the urban centres of Regina and Saskatoon. There is the crux of the problem — the delivery of the best educational programs in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon. That is the paramount objective of the school boards in those areas and that should be the paramount objective of the Department of Education in this province.

If it can be shown to me that the ward system will definitely improve the delivery of education to the consumers, to the people in Regina and Saskatoon and to the students, that their education will somehow be improved by the institution of the ward system, then I would take a very serious look at it. But at this point in time, it hasn't been shown to me. It hasn't been shown to the elected members of the people in this province, the school boards in the urban centres. On that basis, we question the motive behind the introduction of the ward system in this province.

Now the minister says . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will take a break when I pound something in your head, so don't worry. I have more energy and stamina and ideas; we can go a long time on this one. Just don't anger me or we may be quite a while. The minister says, because the cities of Saskatoon and Regina, which once the existing system served well, have grown and have become larger urban centres of about 150,000 (not large by any man's scale in Canada or North America), that it necessitates a move to the ward system. Now, if that logic is correct, if that rationale is true, then are the people and in all the other cities in Canada, in the provinces of Alberta, Ontario, Manitoba, B.C. and Quebec, wrong? Those provinces do not have the ward system in education. The majority of the larger cities in this country have refuted the ward system. In fact, some of them have tried it and decided it wasn't satisfactory and have discarded it. But no, not in our case; it is to be brought in.

What must be the rationale behind it? It makes one wonder. Is it going to deliver better education, because that is the only criterion upon which it can be developed. Now, the government opposite says that you may get to know your school board members better and you will vote better, because the candidates will be close to the scene.

Trustee Hicks answers this question, where she says in one of her articles that in one case two candidates ran from one neighborhood and voters in the neighborhood cast far more votes for outsiders. That defeats another argument presented by the de Vlieger report, Hicks said, (referring to some groups' arguments) that wards would make it easier for neighborhood candidates to get elected because voters know them very well.

I think the more important aspect of this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that with the existing system we have a global view of the educational needs within urban centres. These are changing needs and changing very quickly. If you have people from a cross section of the city who don't represent their own little ward and fight for that because they see it as their way to stay in power, then I think you are going to get a more judicious expenditure of the educational dollar. I think that is what other cities in Canada see. I think that is why they are rejecting the ward system.

Now, what is the rationale or the reason that prompts the government opposite to go against elected officials and many people in education; what makes it bound and determined to institute the ward system? I maintain that the only reason the government opposite is bringing in the ward system is to develop a hierarchy, or a ladder, to expose potential candidates for this legislature so it can develop little teams to develop their shadow in these wards and then they can run for the legislature in this province. That is the only reason I can see for the government opposite to bring in the ward system. I think, when it comes down to delivering basic education, I have yet to be shown that the ward system is going to do a better job than the system which is in place today.

I would like to quote some of the people who I think have some impact in education, since they are elected representatives. The SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association) at its annual convention on November 18-20 passed the following resolution by an overwhelming majority.

Be it resolved that this convention go on record as being opposed to the implementation of the ward system in the urban centres of Saskatchewan.

There was considerable support for the motion by the SSTA at their convention.

Therefore, it is very obvious that the elected officials . . . Now, I know what will come from the other side. You will say, "Oh, they are just safeguarding their own positions." That is the rationale you have over there. I dispute that. I believe the people who have been elected to school boards in the urban centres of Regina and Saskatoon are dedicated people. They are people who want to give their time to improve the education of their children and other children in this city. I believe these people deserve to be listened to as to how they would like to be elected to the boards of education in this province. I don't know the opinion of the group opposite. It may be that they're insincere; that could be. I've heard the statement, "Oh, they just want to maintain themselves." If that's your opinion of elected school trustees in this province, let it be known. But I don't hold that opinion at all. I believe they are sincere, concerned individuals who are giving seriously of their time to improve education in this province.

I would like to read summaries of some of the submissions in case the minister isn't going to table them. I haven't had any agreement from him that he would. This one is from a fair-sized board, the Regina Board of Education. They say this:

The prime reason for having an elected school board is to ensure that local citizens have the opportunity to determine the type of education offered to all pupils. The elected members of the board represent all electors. They are ready and willing to listen to any individual or group wishing to present particular views on the subject. The members of the Regina Board of Education are of the opinion that the introduction of a ward system is not

May 13, 1981

desired by the citizens of Regina. However, if the Minister of Education deems the ward system to have merit, the board would respectfully suggest that the change be referred to the electors in a referendum vote, and that a 60 per cent majority be required before implementation.

The introduction of a ward system is, in the opinion of the members of the board, comparable to a significant constitutional change in a corporation or other organization, and such changes normally require more than a simple majority vote.

That is a summation of the viewpoints of the Regina Board of Education. Another group of considerable size is the Saskatoon Board of Education. Their conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the following:

Our analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the introduction of the ward system for school board elections leads to the conclusion that there are no educational, financial, cultural or political advantages to be gained by its introduction. Indeed it would be our view that such a system would result in a reduction in the individual citizen's power to influence the direction of education. The creation of artificial boundaries that are irrelevant to school attendance areas, partisan politics in local school government (let's hope and forbid that doesn't get in there), higher costs and ineffective use of resources.

Pretty strong words, a pretty strong conclusion from perhaps the largest school board in the province of Saskatchewan, which the government opposite fails to heed. These are the two largest school boards in the province and they don't pay any attention to their conclusions.

In short, we can see nothing to be gained and much to be lost. Surely because no board has taken advantage of section 18(3) of The Education Act (1978) and there has been no enthusiasm for the establishment of wards in urban school systems, our board can only conclude that general satisfaction exists with the current method of electing school trustees.

And they end with the following recommendation:

The Saskatoon Board of Education recommends that the provisions of section 18(3) of The Education Act (1978) be retained and that no legislation be enacted to enforce the electors of school divisions in urban centres to elect their school trustees on a ward system basis.

I don't know what it takes to convince the government opposite that not every brainchild of theirs is by divine creation and best for the people of Saskatchewan. The two largest boards of education in this province speak out plainly and clearly against the implementation of the ward system, as do many other submissions.

I ask the minister if he is going to introduce and force through this bill, the least he can do is to table in this House every letter he has had pertaining to requesting the introduction of a ward system, every letter he has had saying to forget this stupid plan and every submission that was made to Professor de Vlieger. Then we can see that it wasn't the boards of education and it wasn't the people who have been elected because of their

interest and expertise in education who made this decision. It was some of the political hacks in the party opposite who, I know, put in a submission supporting the ward system. It seems that their submissions had a much greater ear than the submissions of the two boards in this province. Knowing the track record of the government opposite, I'm sure that regardless of my warnings you will not heed them or you will not heed the warnings of the boards of education in the province. You will go through with this legislation whether it is to the benefit of the children or not. Perhaps if you do, Mr. Minister, we could look at improving the situation in that we could elect at least the chairman of the board of education. I know it would mean new legislation, but maybe the chairman could be elected on a global basis, as is the mayor in our civic government. Then we would have one person in these large school divisions, in which there are tremendous expenditures, who would be looking at a global picture of education and not looking through the tunnel vision of the ward which he is representing or, worse than that, perhaps a tunnel vision colored by a political ideology.

That is the fear which I see creeping into education through the implementation of this ward system. That is the reason which I think the government opposite, regardless of who opposes it, is going to try to ram this through in these two urban centres. I think, Mr. Minister, I have given my reasons in what I hope was a convincing manner on behalf of the people who oppose the ward system as being implemented or suggested under this piece of legislation, Bill No. 70.

I have a couple of questions which I would like to ask. I hope legislation is to bring about clarity. Maybe the minister or some of his cohorts, who appear as though they will get into the act today, will answer these questions (and that is the recycled minister). What about the elections and the boundaries? I know the boundaries are going to be struck by the educational boundaries commission, but are they going to be coterminous with the civic wards? I can see such a conglomeration come out of this that the people in these two cities, when it comes to vote, will not know where they are going, who they are voting for, or what is going on. You are going to have a ward here that is a civic city ward; then superimposed over here, you are going to have a public ward of education and over top of that (I wish I had a chalk board or a diagram — I would put it to you pretty plain), you would then have a separate ward. If you have your school board elections on the civic election date, you are going to have people so confused they won't know where they vote or what they are voting for. I would like to hear your answers to that. Are you going to stagger the vote and are you going to stagger the boundaries?

I know you have to readjust the boundaries, because in the wisdom of de Vlieger who recommended this, if he were to follow the boundaries of the civic wards (and most people think a coterminous boundary is rather a good objective), in the city of Saskatoon some of the ward boundaries would run right through the school grounds. The Minister of Labor would call that convoluted reasoning. I think that is how he would package that term.

Now I am sure, Mr. Minister, you are going to take action to straighten some of these things out, but I would like to hear how you are going to have these boundaries established and if everyone is going to vote on civic election day? If they are all going to vote on civic election day and have to go somewhere to vote for their alderman, they have to go somewhere else to vote for the mayor and they have to go somewhere else to vote for their school trustee, if I were you, I would go to the lake that day, because your door will be knocked on because of all these confused people. I have voted in many elections and I can tell you, I've always known which way to vote, that's for sure.

May 13, 1981

You are going to cause . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What? Will you quit swearing! Shall we go on? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Trust you to be prying into the Election Act to find out what everybody would vote, but you can mark my words I never voted for you and I never will.

Now, let me see, are there any other things that you fellows need touching up on in this ward system because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll give you more major speeches yet, don't you worry about that. I think those are enough things. If you answer all those questions it will keep you quite busy for a while.

Now my colleague here, the member for Rosetown (I appreciate his picking up on this as I had to be out for a minute) started to talk about the problems in section 92(j). But before I go into section 92(j), I just want to tell you, Mr. Minister, (I hope you have been listening to what I said about the concern that people have about the ward system) that I'm sorry to say that the accusations that I made about you and your department in your estimates the other week are absolutely correct. You are losing more trust among educators in Saskatchewan than any minister of education I have seen in my tenure in education.

No, no, you can "aw" and "caw" all you want but I will give you some proof here to show that your actions to try to control, to try to manipulate, to try to force your ideology in education . . . Since you fellows want to know something, I will tell you exactly what's going on because I know of situations of very highly-qualified people, who went for applications to be on the new curriculum steering committees. I am not talking about somebody who doesn't know what he is doing. These people have Ph.D.s in education . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no, you just pay attention because you have a little lesson to learn. I don't think you really understand anything other than your co-op philosophy, and I don't think you know what is going on in that department.

These individuals went to find out if they could be on the steering committee for the kindergarten. I want some of the members over there who are good fellows to sit and listen to his, because I am sure you won't like this. They went to apply for a job and they were told foursquare right there that the philosophical basis of the new curriculum is based on humanism. One of the top educators in the city of Regina said that if that was the philosophical bent, then he was walking out of here and going to see some of the people who can perhaps bring about a change.

Now I don't know if you fellows understand and I would doubt if you would see it . . . It struck a nerve. I don't think the rest of you really understand what that means, but I will certainly meet with you and explain it to you, because when that is explained to you, you are going to be a little bit disturbed. I think there is going to be pressure put on this Minister of Education, because I believe that is wrong and that it is not what you want to see in education. I think you can see by his reaction that we certainly touched a sword there. However . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There is enough of this cutting people out by the department opposite without giving their names. I'm not going to jeopardize a person like that. Oh, no, that is not fair. You just ask your department. You go and ask your recruiting team. Ask them who they are turning down — some of the top brains in education in this city. I tell you, I know the reason is that they don't believe in the kind of philosophy that is the underlying and very dangerous philosophy for the new curriculum in this province, Mr. Minister.

Today we will go on with this bill, because that is a whole new debate that you and I are

going to have. We are going to make it known to the people of Saskatchewan what is taking place within the development of curriculum in this province. I was getting back to where you were losing some trust and unfortunately this is so. This has to do with section 92(j) which is being amended. Section 92(j) of the act (and some of you people who are interested in making money will probably pay attention to this) indicates that boards will lose the power under this new act to lease property. Now why should boards lose the power to lease property. I don't know. Also, the subject of the sale of property will be under the minister sitting opposite.

I want to read you some quotes from elected officials in education which will tell you very plainly what they feel about your kind of legislation under section 92(j). I quote the following from Art Hindmarsh, from the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*:

“This is simply arrogance. It's running roughshod over the elected boards in the province,” said trustee Art Hindmarsh of amendments which would give the minister the power to stipulate conditions under which school properties could be sold. “It's almost as if there were no need for local school boards, because he, the minister, Mr. McArthur, has all the authority anyway.”

Mr. Gren Smith-Windsor agreed:

Boards would be completely hogtied with respect to dispersal of property. The minister now would determine whether we can dispose of a property, under what conditions and what we must do with the proceeds.

Now if that isn't total control, then what is? Mr. John Egnatoff is one of the more respected educators in the province of Saskatchewan. John Egnatoff is a man who has been in the field a long time. I am proud to say John Egnatoff was the principal of the same school I was, and so he comes from a good source. Chairman John Egnatoff said:

The amendments would give McArthur more power than any minister of education has ever had in the history of this province. The amendment brings into the act the regulation adopted last fall requiring boards to earmark 90 per cent of the proceeds from the sale of a school property toward future capital projects of that school in that school division.

Now, because of the demographic shift in the cities, schools that were once occupied are becoming vacant. What is wrong, Mr. Minister, with allowing them to lease these things? If they can lease or sell them, they will reduce the mill rate and the tax burden on the people of Saskatchewan. I can't understand that.

Furthermore, Mr. Minister, what you are doing in the Department of Education is similar to what the Department of Agriculture is doing with its bill to take the \$90,000 in the horned-cattle checkoff that was put in by producers (it isn't government money at all; it is producer money). The Minister of Agriculture is trying to pass legislation this session so that money will come into the consolidated fund. In other words, it is thievery — that's all it is. That's what my colleague from Thunder Creek called it the other day.

With regard to school property, I've checked with the board of education in Saskatoon and these are its facts. There were no capital grants before 1957 in this province. After 1957 it was based on the ability to pay. What that means, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is that school boards that have the ability to pay, the ones with the higher tax base, did not

May 13, 1981

receive any kind of capital grant. They did it out of their own levies — the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. Some of the other areas after 1957 did get capital grants, but in the cities where they had the ability to pay they did not receive one cent in capital moneys from the provinces. And they went out and built schools.

Now, some of these schools, as my colleague points out, have become obsolete and the student enrolment has decreased to the point where these schools are now closed. I want to give you statistics for the city of Saskatoon. Thirty-seven elementary schools and all of the collegiates were built before 1970 — before there were capital grants from the government for capital construction.

The minister opposite is saying that the money is really the money of the Saskatoon and the Regina taxpayers. But is he going to allow them to have that money to do as they want in education? Not without his approval. If it were government money that was put in there I think that might be a different piece of cake. But when it's their own money, when it came right out of the hip pockets of the people in those cities, then what right have you to tell them, "You cannot lease these buildings, and you cannot sell these buildings, and you cannot use these dollar bills from the sale of them as you would like"? that's the concern. You are saying that my colleague didn't understand the problem in 92(j). I now hope you see what the problem is in 92(j) because it's subject to your provisions in 352.

Those are some of the concerns that I would have pertaining to this act. There are a few others that I would like to touch on, and then we would be interested in hearing the minister's reply. I think it is section 1063 that is being amended, where we have the appointment of a local director of education and previously a principal in a small jurisdiction (as I understand it) could be appointed director. That is being deleted now. My question is with that deletion, who then would be the director? Do they hire the services from an adjoining jurisdiction, Mr. Minister? Are you going to put a provincial man in there? What is going to be the situation if that is to be changed?

The other thing is the representation of native people on school boards. I support this. I believe this is one way that we can overcome the problem of native children perhaps not feeling at home in integrated schools. I think the fact that some of their parents could be on the school board is probably a worth-while objective. The thing I don't understand as spelled out in this act, is, if there are one or two or three native students in a school does that automatically allow one native person to be appointed to the school board? I don't see any quota there. Is this going to be covered by a regulation or could it be that for one student there would be one person on the board? I ask that as a matter of clarification, Mr. Minister.

The next area that I'm concerned about — I looked very carefully at the terminations of contracts — is sections 206 to 213. I believe, as the explanatory notes say, these are probably grammatical clean-ups and grammatical changes. In view of that, we would accept your statements on this concern.

Section 232(4) is certainly a concern of people in Saskatchewan. I think my colleague, the member for Rosetown-Elrose spoke on that and expressed it very adequately.

Mr. Minister, I congratulate you for the other things that are in the act — the accessibility of native education, the provision for education for the handicapped. I would like to have you respond to some of the concerns, ending on this: I would

certainly appreciate (as I asked you at the beginning) the tabling of these documents which have so overwhelmingly convinced you to introduce the ward system in the urban jurisdictions of the province.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Initially I wasn't intending to rise in this debate, but having heard some of the nonsense from abroad, I couldn't let it go by.

I take great pleasure in rising in support of the bill to amend The Education Act. The bill incorporates a number of improvements. The one I'm going to focus on particularly is the introduction of the ward system. I strongly support that reform. I may say as well that most of the public I have talked to in Regina do as well.

I recall the wars we had over the introduction of the ward system in civic administration. I recall that battle and it was a very difficult battle. I think it's fair to say that we very nearly lost that battle through public opinion. I was anticipating somewhat the same kind of struggle over the ward system being introduced to the school boards.

When I spoke in the throne speech, I spoke in favor of the introduction of the ward system. Those comments were carried in the media, and I got a response which totally surprised me. I also sent out a newsletter to people in my constituency, and I got the same response.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yeah, they threw them away.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, they don't, not in Regina Centre. That only happens in Meadow Lake. In Regina Centre, they save them and put them all in books and keep them. It's very valuable literature in Regina Centre.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I uncovered surprised me. I uncovered a lot of frustration with the way school boards operate in the city of Regina. A lot of people phoned up and said, "Great stuff, do it." and "Just what we need." And then a condemnation of the school board would follow — a condemnation of the school board for being undemocratic, unrepresentative and inaccessible.

I was interested, as well, that the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley referred to a number of cities where he felt the ward system was not in place. I would just say that the ward system is in place in his constituency and has been for just under 40 years; that's a very long period of time. It was introduced in his constituency because when they introduced the larger school units the territory was just too large to elect members at large. People simply could not find out anything about trustees who were running for election from one end to the other of a larger school unit. For better or for worse, we have reached that same point in the cities.

I was interested that the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley referred to a number of cities where he felt the ward system had not been introduced. I took the trouble to take a trip past the library and I pulled out a research paper which was done by one Shirley Strutt, who is now a colleague in the legal profession. At that point in time, I believe she was a research officer with the Executive Council. She did some research on the matter. The hon. member might be interested to know that the ward system is in effect in all of Ontario; this is the law in all of that province by an edict of the provincial government. It's in effect in Winnipeg and my information is that it's in effect in Calgary and Edmonton as well. Indeed, if I hadn't gone any further, I might darkly suspect that the

May 13, 1981

ward system in Canada was a bit of a Tory plot, as it has been the Tory government in other provinces that have introduced it.

Our present system of electing school trustees is an historical anachronism. It has long outlived its usefulness. City-wide elections are as appropriate in cities of 150,000 as a horse and buggy in rush hour traffic on Albert Street. City-wide elections had a place in the days of yore when Regina and Saskatoon were much smaller than they are now. Before the Second World War, both cities were small, relatively close knit prairie communities, Citizens knew their neighbors by reputation and generally knew them first-hand. But with the end of the depression and the end of the war, Saskatchewan underwent rapid demographic changes. Regina and Saskatoon grew from under 50,000 people and in a relatively short space of time they were transformed from small prairie communities to large, modern cities.

These changes were accompanied by subtle but very important changes in the cultural life of the cities. Regina and Saskatoon were no longer small, tightly knit communities. People no longer knew their neighbors, no longer knew who lived on their block, and no longer could a citizen rely on a candidate's reputation in the community. These changes created problems which went unaddressed. For many, many years they resulted in a situation where most of the trustees came from the same part of the city, the southern portion. This part of the city, Mr. Deputy Speaker, retained and still does retain, part of that culture of old — that concept of being part of a community. All of the trustees came from that part of the city. The rest of the city went unrepresented. What is more serious is that they couldn't have cared less.

School elections were distinguished only by the widespread apathy in which they took place. There were no real links between the electorate and the elected. The citizens in the northern part of the city had no representation and no contact with the trustees. What is worse is that they couldn't have cared less.

The people who telephoned me were saying, when you boil it down, that they had no one to whom they could call. They had no one to whom they could turn, when they were upset about school problems.

The most serious indictment of the whole system came at the time of the last election. Voters in the city of Regina were presented with a ballot that was only slightly smaller than a newspaper page. It contained over 40 names. It didn't come as a surprise to me or anyone else who was familiar with that election to hear the next morning that of the 10 trustees elected, nine were among the first 10 on the ballot.

The truth of the matter is that the ballot was so long and unwieldy that far from understanding it, they never read it. They simply voted for the first names on the ballot.

If the machinery for elected school trustees has broken down (and it is utterly broken down) so has the political system. By that, I mean that the trustees under a city-wide system simply lose contact with the electorate. I guess that is what those who called me were saying.

The political judgment of the trustees lacks that fine honing which is bred from constant contact with those who elect or defeat you. In many cases, I am sorry to say trustees have come to see their role as of second guessing the administration. That is not of course the function of any elected official.

In a book published by the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, entitled *Organization in Canada*, there is an excellent description of the role of an elected official. I may say, by way of background, that in the preceding paragraph of the quotation I am about to read, the author, Thomas J. Plunkett, was outlining the frustrations which many appointed officials feel in dealing with politicians. He granted to the appointed officials that they should be respected for their technical knowledge and efficiency. He then went on to say:

In return for this respect, to which his technical efficiency entitles him, the appointed officer should recognize the qualities of the elected public servant. He must learn that in the variability and sentimentalism of the elected representatives is a reflection of the characteristics of the public he is serving.

While the councillor has to recognize that the good officer is in many respects his superior, the officer does well to concede the superiority of the good trustee in another field.

To spend one's life beneath the eaves of the school is not the best contact one can have with the day-to-day hurly-burly of life. The prejudices, superstitions and intuitive punches which go to make up public opinions are not easily measurable. The basic idea of a democracy is the belief in the inherent soundness of the reactions of a common man — the good judge of men and horses.

To provide these reactions is the main function of a councillor. He has to look at board decisions, not in terms of the calculating rationale of the expert, but as they will appear to the average citizen — what fears they will occasion, what passions they will arouse and what purpose this discomfort and unthinking enforcement will cause.

The elected trustee is the expert in nothing more than being an ordinary man and seeing, with the essential shrewdness of the ordinary man, with the wide experience and deep human sympathy which can only come from service to the community. If he lacks these things, whatever his education and whatever his party, he lacks the only thing he needs to be an elected representative.

The kind of judgment this quotation so aptly describes can only come about by regular contact with a community of people to whom the elected official must answer, and who see the elected official as both accessible and responsible.

A trustee elected city-wide has no regular contact with a community of people beyond that which anyone ordinarily experiences.

A trustee elected city-wide in a city of 150,000 is neither accessible nor responsible. The public who must weigh the merits of not one incumbent, but 10, find the task of dividing the responsibility by such a school board so well diffused that the task is one of nearly impossible complexity. The public simply cannot fix responsibility in trustees elected city-wide.

It is often said (and it was said by the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley) that the

May 13, 1981

ward system will introduce ward politics. I say, Mr. Speaker, those who really believe that have been watching too much American television. Ward politics is a peculiar feature of American municipal systems. It occurred, not because those city councils and those American cities were too powerful, but because they were too weak. In some larger cities, councils were ineffective. Their size would range up to 40, 50 to 60 members. But their effectiveness was really emasculated because in the American cities, the American system introduced a unique feature of electing a lot of administrative officials. They elected water commissioners, treasurers, police chiefs, and a host of others. All of these officials, because they are elected, march to the beat of their own drum. It was in the absence of an effective municipal council that predatory, patronage-ridden municipal politics grew up.

I think it is apparent to any thoughtful observer that none of these conditions exist in the school system in Canada. We have never elected administrative officials. School boards are relatively small. Hence, Mr. Speaker, the bogeyman of ward politics is just that — a bogeyman.

It is further argued by those who oppose the ward system that trustees elected in wards will act only for the benefit of the wards and will be oblivious of the larger needs of the school system. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that argument ignores ordinary human experience. Is that what happens at the provincial level? Of course not. Is that what happens at the federal level? Of course not. All of us who hold an elected office seek a fair balance between our responsibility to our ridings and our responsibility to the province as a whole and, in doing so, we simply reflect the average voter who seeks the same balance. That argument, Mr. Speaker, insults the intelligence of the ordinary electorate. It suggests that voters are motivated only by their own narrow self-interests, wanting everything for themselves and are blind to the needs of the larger community. That does not describe the electorate. Hon. members of this Assembly, of all people, should know better than to so sorely underestimate the intelligence and the compassion of the public.

A slight permutation of this argument suggests that the introduction of the ward system will lead to unco-ordinated administration in the school system. To this argument I would repeat what I have just said about the intelligence and dedication of the elected official and the people whom he reflects.

I would also add just one other thought, and that is that much of the co-ordination of school administration is done at the managerial or official level. By and large, elected officials do not develop policy. Their role is largely to weight the merits of policies and programs brought forward by the administration.

One body firmly resisting the introduction of the ward system is the trustees (those with whom I am familiar). I want to address myself to the comments and the allegations of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley who said that we might suggest, uncharitably that they were seeking to protect their own office. I think that is true. I would say to the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley that the more candid among the trustees have admitted publicly that that is true. That has been said publicly in the *Leader-Post*. I am sure they would be less than human if they did not worry about their own offices. I am sorry in a sense, because they are dedicated officials and individuals. But in another sense, I welcome that development — the fact that some of them may lose their office. It is not because I have anything against them personally, but the flip side of the coin, for the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley, is that the way will be open for a new infusion of fresh blood. Surely, the essence of any democratic institution is that elected

offices should be open to anyone who seeks them, regardless of their means. Campaigning in a city-wide election is a very expensive proposition, beyond the means of all but the most affluent of those who are already famous for some other reason and thus don't need a campaign. Reducing the size of the electorate by one-tenth significantly reduces the cost and make it possible for the ordinary Joe to run for the school board. I may say that's what happened when the ward system was introduced in city council in Regina; it did democratize the system.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more way in which the introduction of the ward system will return democracy to the administration of our school system and I urge all hon. members to support these amendments to The Education Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to close off this debate and to just react to a few of the comments and statements that have been made by the members opposite and in particular, some of the comments and suggestions that have been made which are obviously, if not misleading, certainly misguided, ill-founded and not based on fact.

Mr. Speaker, I should say, first of all, with respect to some quotes that were ready by the hon. members opposite (I think, particularly, the hon. member for Indian Head) about the powers that rest with the minister under The Education Act and about the fact that the Minister of Education (as I remember the quote now) has more power than any other minister of education in the history of this province, that our Education Act is recognized (I have said this before and the hon. member well knows the truth in this matter) for having provided to school boards in this province more autonomy and, with it, more responsibility and with that, more power than any other education legislation in Canada.

You do not have to take my word for that, Mr. Speaker. You have only to talk to the president of the Canadian School Trustees' Association, who, last year, spoke in this province and said those very words about this education act. He said that this act should stand as a model of education legislation in the provinces of Canada and that he wished and fervently hoped that this kind of legislation would be adopted by other provincial governments and particularly, I would suspect, Conservative governments in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member now wishes to say, 'Look at this goody,' and he holds up the bill that we are debating here. He says, 'This changes all of that.' Mr. Speaker, I met, one week ago, with the executive of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and that executive said, 'We have some advice and we have some concerns with respect to certain aspects of the proposed amendments to this act.' But they said, 'We want to make one thing very clear. We do not want anyone to interpret what we are saying as being a condemnation of The Education Act, even with the amendments, or of it being any suggestion that the powers that the school boards have in this province do not continue to be strong and complete and the kind of powers which we want to see.' That's what they said.

Now you can see from that, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is certainly exaggerating. The school trustees said that they are concerned about some of the amendments (no question about that and I want to be very honest and clear about that), but they denied (as I understood the discussion) any of the suggestions that the

May 13, 1981

amendments here drastically altered the powers and responsibilities that rest with school boards. Of course, anyone who cares to read this legislation can see that that is not the case.

There are some relatively insubstantial amendments in certain ways; there are some other substantial amendments, but none of them, with the exception perhaps of one small section, affect the powers of school boards in any way that could even be noticed. The hon. members have been referring to section 92(j) and section 350. I should say to the hon. members first of all (there was obviously some confusion in the mind of at least one of the hon. members opposite) section 92(j) is consequential to a change that is being made with respect to section 350. Section 350 is being clarified, not seriously altered, in order to have it confirm with what was clearly the original intent. I want to point out to the hon. members that in section 350(2), which is this so-called objectionable section, it's said the minister now is demanding that boards have his approval before they dispose of property. The members are saying that provision never existed before. I want to read to the hon. members (they obviously do not read the legislation) section 350(2), before amendments.

A board of education may, with the prior approval of the minister, dispose of lands and buildings erected or otherwise acquired to be used by the instruction and accommodation of pupils.

That is what the act said; that is what the act said for years. So the hon. members, when they bring forward the suggestion that the minister is now by means of these amendments bringing in a new requirement that they must have his prior approval before they can sell property, are simply stating an untruth and misleading this House. What this suggestion does is to clarify it, because it was legally believed that prior approval also meant, if it was to mean anything, with condition. The section is now being clarified so that the part which says, "with conditions" is added and made clearer. That's all. It is just clearing up the wording of the legislation. Any suggestion . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It is strictly consequential to section 350.

With respect to the suggestion of the hon. members that the boards will no longer be able to lease property (as I understood it), I don't understand what they are talking about there. Of course, boards will continue to be able to lease property. In fact, I was just reading in the paper the night before that the Regina Public School Board is considering tenders for the lease of the old Victoria School. That is certainly within their rights; there is no problem with that whatsoever. The suggestion does not make any sense at all.

I want to say that the hon. members have been dealing with a point (and they seem not to understand the point) with regard to the equalization of capital revenues. A change in policy was made recently with respect to now requiring (given that we have large increases in the capital value of school properties in some of the city areas) that that revenue, when those schools are disposed of, is treated as capital revenue. That, Mr. Speaker, is being done because just as we have an equalization system on the operating grant side so we must have an equalization system on the capital side. The fact of the matter was that for many years there were no capital revenues of sufficient size or amounts to require that kind of thing to be explicitly provided for in our capital grants policy. We recently made a change so that now large sales of property which yield large amounts of revenue, will be counted as local capital revenue in the same way that local taxation revenue on the operating side is counted as revenue.

I say to the hon. members that when they object to that they are simply being wrong-headed about the way school finance should be done. I would defend the principle of equalization, and I would say to the hon. members that they should also do that. I believe some of the hon. members opposite have defended that principle with respect to operating grants. What we are doing here simply applies the same principle to capital grants.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief reference to the objections raised by the hon. members opposite with respect to the amendments to the collective bargaining provisions of this act, and particularly with respect to section 232(4). The member for Rosetown-Elrose obviously made it clear that he does not accept the principle that teachers, like other employees, should be in a position to bargain collectively with respect to the terms and conditions under which they work. It is simply that, and he confirms that he does not believe that. He does not accept the process of collective bargaining. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is simply something that cannot prevail in a society such as ours. It is simply not possible to do what the hon. member obviously would like to see us do, which is pass legislation that would prevent teachers from bargaining as employees of school boards.

The view he held is not held by the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association. I refer to a quote from the president of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association. She said, in November 1980 (and repeated at the April council meeting of the new Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation):

Whether we like it or not, collective bargaining is here to stay, and the responsibility of the 1980s is to learn to live with it, and to be effective.

She goes on to explain:

It is time to adapt to the process of collective bargaining, to enter into it sincerely, and to participate as full participants in it, because it is a fact of life today.

When the hon. member for Rosetown stands up and says that the rights to bargain on the terms and conditions of work should be taken away from teachers, I say to him that I simply do not accept that point of view. I would say to him further that we cannot have a healthy environment in our school system unless we recognize that collective bargaining is an important aspect of life today, and that the teachers should have a right to do so.

I want to say to the hon. member that with respect to the provisions that we have here, the change in 232(4) is simply an attempt to clarify the original intent of that section. There still is a restriction, granted, in that section of the act, on the rights with respect to collective bargaining. It is still the case that a collective bargaining agreement will not be able to contain provisions with respect to who teaches, what is taught (that is, the program of studies), and how it is taught, (that is, the professional methods and techniques employed by teachers). We are leaving those as prohibited areas of bargaining because we do believe that we have established in this province a co-

May 13, 1981

operative process involving trustees, teachers, parents and the Department of Education in the development of the program, and in development of instructional methods and techniques used as guidance in the schools.

That co-operative system has worked well, and in our view, does not need to be encompassed within the framework of collective bargaining agreements, because we have an alternative mechanism.

That is all that is being done here. With respect to other terms and conditions of work, the amendments here will clarify that nothing else is excluded, except who teaches, what is taught, and how it is taught. I believe that that is perfectly consistent with the original intent of the legislation and, furthermore, that that is necessary in order to have an effective bargaining climate which recognizes the rights that teachers should have.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Rosetown raised a question, as I understood it, about the constitutional validity of the amendment that is being made here. I would say to the hon. member that the amendment which is being made has been reviewed by constitutional lawyers. While I suppose all constitutional law is debatable, it is not the view of the constitutional lawyers whom I have consulted that this section would in any way infringe upon or derogate the rights of separate school boards, in terms of the rights to have separate school programs that are consistent with the original ordinances of the Northwest Territories.

It is certainly true that separate schools are protected; they can be organized by the minority religious faith — in Saskatchewan, largely the Roman Catholic faith — and that those schools have the right to have religious programs, and to have aspects of religion taught in those schools. But beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any case can be made to suggest that this section 232(4), as amended, would not be one to want to interfere with those rights, and I don't believe any case can be made that these amendments do that.

I want to close by again making reference to the ward system. We've had the subdivisational system. We've had a great deal of debate in this legislature on the question. I want the hon. members to note what is being done here in terms of the amendments to this section. We are simply altering the section that requires the subdivisational system to apply in large geographic areas so that it will also apply in large areas of population.

The hon. members say that the act is being used to impose upon school boards a type of electoral system that they do not accept. I would say, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that the act now sets out where the subdivisational system will apply (and I've never heard the hon. members say that that should not be there). The act now says that in the old, larger school units the subdivisational system will apply. The reason that's in there is that those systems have large geographic areas, and it is recognized that in order to have the local democracy work well, you are going to need something different from the old system — so that you can have effective communication, so that the representatives can do an effective job of representing their electorate, and so that there can be an active participation in the whole process. That is recognized now in the act with respect to rural systems. I believe that it was always recognized that, as the urban areas become larger, that subdivisational system would also have to apply at some point to the urban areas.

We say that we have now reached that time. The urban areas are now a relatively large conglomeration of population in this province, i.e., the areas of Saskatoon and Regina. But I point out to the hon. members what I said earlier, and that is that under the at-large system in Saskatoon and Regina (in the public school system) the trustee who represents the people in those systems must now be expected to represent upwards of 80,000 electors. I say to the hon. members that that is impossible. It is not possible to expect a trustee to do an effective job. That is not a criticism of the trustees; it is simply true that when you reach that size in terms of population, it is not possible to do an effective job of representation.

By going to the subdivisional system, you will open up the possibility of trustees and the electorate's being able to reflect each other's wishes and being able to communicate more effectively, and through that have a more effective system of presentation. That's not saying it is going to be a total solution to the problems that exist in the school system. It simply says that it will be an improvement.

The hon. members say that this is some radical plan that is coming into Saskatchewan and that everyone else has rejected it. I refer to the province of Ontario. Kingston has a ward system; Burlington has a ward system; Windsor has a ward system; London has a ward system; Mississauga has a ward system; Hamilton has a ward system; East York has a ward system; York has a ward system; Etobicoke has a ward system. In fact, all of those cities have ward systems because it is the policy of the Government of Ontario that in these urban centres there should be ward systems.

The hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley said that this didn't exist in Ontario. He has never checked this out. Every argument he has presented against the ward system indicates that there has been no research done whatsoever. I ask the hon. members to consider St. John's, Newfoundland; Winnipeg, Manitoba; St. James-Assiniboia, Manitoba; and Brandon, Manitoba. They all have this system. I ask the hon. members to consider the cities in Quebec, all of which have the ward system.

The hon. member says that governments have not brought this about in other provinces. You might be interested to know that in the city of Toronto, the Hon. John Robarts (whom you may recall as being the former Conservative premier of Ontario), when he recommended in his royal commission report on the structure of government in the city of metropolitan Toronto, said this:

The electoral system is the essence of any form of local government. In this chapter the commission has proposed a number of modifications to enhance the qualities of clarity, accountability, representation, representativeness and effectiveness that it considers essential to enable the electoral system to meet the needs of the citizens in this city in the years to come.

And do you know what kind of a system he was recommending and that was imposed upon the city? It was the subdivisional system, or the ward system. Obviously, the hon. members have not done their homework in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that there is debate about this subject and there is no question that there are those who disagree. But I would say to the hon. members that the experience with this system in municipal elections has proved its worth in this province. I would say that the experience in rural school division has proved its worth in this province. I would say to the hon. members that its experience here, in the cities of

May 13, 1981

Regina and Saskatoon, will also prove its worth. The members opposite, just as they were at the time the system was brought in for municipal elections, will be proved wrong on the point and it will be something which will be widely accepted by the people of our cities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close off by making reference to one final point which the hon. member raised. It illustrates the typical kind of unfounded, unresearched, confused kind of criticism which these hon. members raise. The hon. member opposite makes the suggestion that a committee of the Department of Education, a committee which he refuses to name or identify, was refusing people for membership on that committee because their beliefs were not consistent with some sort of stated beliefs of the Department of Education. He has given no evidence whatsoever to support that charge. I can tell you right here that there is absolutely no truth to that charge. He can't even name a curriculum steering committee for me — name it, what is the curriculum steering committee? What does it do? Does it exist? Does it have members on it? He can't answer the questions because he has no idea what he is talking about.

Secondly, he says somebody was asked if he had a humanistic belief, or something, before they could be named to the committee. I would ask the hon. member to give us the name of that person, the name of the committee and tell us the circumstances under which this existed, because I can tell you that the hon. member has absolutely no evidence to support that suggestion. I can tell you that it is absolutely untrue. It is just like the “dirty hospital charges” and all of the other kinds of attacks that these members opposite try to mount. There is simply no truth to it whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Education Act will, I am convinced, take what is already a good and effective bill and make it an even better form of legislation which will continue to be recognized throughout Canada as the most effective educational legislation in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question before he sits down?

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

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Sure.

MR. SWAN: — The Education Act has been in place now since 1978 — the bargaining section of it came in in 1973, I'm sorry. That particular section of the act has worked well from that point in time until now and each year we have had agreements reached between the two bargaining committees. I have served a number of years in that area. I'm wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would tell the House, before you take your seat, what circumstances prompt you to amend that particular section of the act, section 232(4) when the bargaining structure has indeed worked well, to the benefit, I think, of teachers and to the school system for a number of years? Will you tell us what prompts the change in that particular section?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is referring to section 132(4). I would point out to him that it is true that there have been agreements reached both at the provincial and local level, between teachers and school boards, which have reflected a co-operative and constructive approach to collective bargaining. But I would also point out to the hon. member that there have been cases of individuals and

groups having suggested that the interpretation of section 232(4), as it now is, can be read to suggest that there is nothing which needs to be bargained in addition to salaries. That construction is simply one that was not the original intent of this section and it is, I think, incumbent upon the legislature to clarify that section, if that kind of interpretation is being placed upon it.

I would say to the hon. member that what we are doing is making clear that this section conforms to the original intent, which was that the scope of an agreement could not include the questions of who teaches, what's taught (the program of studies, that is) and how it is taught. This clarifies that and gives it a good, tight framework and for that reason, I believe, will confirm the original structure of collective bargaining that was intended in 1973.

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

YEAS — 27

Pepper	Banda	Cody
Allen	Vickar	Koskie
Kaeding	Kowalchuk	Shillington
Tchorzewski	Dyck	Prebble
Baker	MacAuley	Johnson
Skoberg	Engel	Long
McArthur	Feschuk	Nelson
Rolfes	Byers	Solomon
Mostoway	Cowley	Chapman

NAYS — 11

Berntson	Rousseau	Katzman
Birkbeck	Swan	Andrew
Duncan	Hardy	McLeod
Taylor	Pickering	

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Cowley that Bill No. 112 — **An Act to amend The Crown Corporations Act, 1978** be now read a second time.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this particular bill. Given the unnecessary, lengthy debates which we have just heard, I would be tempted to give the members a lesson in verbosity, but I will refrain from doing that.

Mr. Speaker, the point which I think needs to be made very clearly with regard to the current amendment before us to The Crown Corporations Act is that it is a further broadening of powers within that total conglomerate of Crown corporations. The government opposite has persistently and consistently been opposed to multinationals; they have made that argument repeatedly. They seem to be able to tie that into almost anything. The fact of the matter is that this government has now created its own multiconglomerate, a multicorporation, if you like.

May 13, 1981

I don't really see the difference between multicorporations and multinationals. It would seem that the powers which are vested in The Crown Corporations Act and are now being broadened through this particular amendment, 112 (which I suppose would be more appropriately numbered 113 or 114, information or trouble) would indicate that they are continuing in that particular direction. They are continuing to make provisions for greater expansion, financially, of the Crown corporations. It doesn't just refer to one corporation.

Take a look at the bill, in particular section 5 with respect to 23(1) of the original bill — The Crown Corporations Act:

(2) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may designate one of the members of the board as chairman and one other member of the board as vice-chairman.

(3) In the absence of the chairman, or when the position of chairman is vacant, the vice-chairman has authority to act in his place and stead.

(4) The board of directors shall manage the affairs and business of the corporation.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in those three subsections provisions are made by The Crown Corporations Act to be, quite frankly and in real terms, totally controlled by the minister — by the minister, by the cabinet, and I suppose subsequently by the Premier of the province. They have the power, through the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, to appoint the chairman and the vice-chairman, and after all, those are the two top positions on any board. And they shall, along with the other directors, manage the affairs and the total business of the corporation.

So, although that's not the key argument against the bill, it is one of them. Again, we have, as we have said many times before from this side of the House, a breaking down of the parliamentary system, whereby government is moving out the business of the province of Saskatchewan from the legislature to the Crown corporations. They don't consider employees of Crown corporations as employees of government per se; that is a means of reducing the number of government employees — if we use the government opposite's interpretation of government employees.

We on this side of the House believe strongly that employees of Crown corporations are, in reality, employees of the government. To say that these Crown corporations are in some way separate entities, and that they don't have anything to do with the government of the day, is being naive, to say the least. Although the point I make with reference to the chairman and vice-chairman may seem insignificant (I suppose it is, in itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker), it is part and parcel of our particular opposition to the growing conglomerate of multicorporations that we see here in the province of Saskatchewan. I suppose, to use an extreme example, a Crown corporation was necessary for the Celebrate Saskatchewan program in the year 1980. Look at another recently formed Crown corporation, the grain car corporation. It seems that this government is unable to do the business of the province from this legislature through the normal channels of the parliamentary system. It seems that it can only do the business through Crown corporations and, in my view, there are many bad side effects of those Crown corporations.

For example, \$22,000 was spent by the Department of Agriculture to advertise the opening day of the grain car corporation at Melville not so long ago. It could be argued

that a similar provision for grain car allocation and expenditure of provincial government funds for those cars would have cost the same amount of money regardless of the Crown corporation. But it is not the particular view of this side of the House.

We find, in terms of Crown corporations, that it is very difficult to get at their advertising costs on a corporation per corporation estimate, if you like. We have to wait until the financial holding company, CIC (Crown Investments Corporation), comes up before we might be able to get at the kinds of expenditures that are being made in regard to advertising. So what I am saying is that it makes it very difficult for members opposite the government to get at the financial workings of the Crown corporations, as opposed to those kinds of businesses being performed and being passed through the legislature, giving all hon. members an opportunity to peruse those particular expenditures.

Let's take a further, more detailed look at the bill itself, An Act to amend The Crown Corporations Act. Look at clause 6, where it refers to the superannuation of employees. It reads as follows:

It is to devise, establish, administer a scheme for the superannuation of the employees, or any group of employees, of any department, board, commission, agency, office, or Crown corporation to which this part applies, or of any other board, commission, agency, or Crown corporation that has applied to and been approved by the corporation for participation in such a scheme, and, for that purpose the corporation may make and receive contributions for the establishment and administration of any such scheme that may be agreed upon.

So you can see very easily, Mr. Deputy Speaker, through the provisions in that particular clause of superannuation for all, or part of any board, commission or corporation, the sweeping powers of that amendment. That to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not essential or necessary to the effective operations of government on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. It makes provisions farther down in that same clause, which reads:

To provide loans and other assistance to, or guarantee any indebtedness of corporations in which the corporation or any subsidiary of the corporation holds shares, bonds, debentures, or other securities.

So that ties in, Mr. Speaker, with the comments that I made earlier. It makes provisions for an expansion of the financial abilities of the Crown corporations to make loans to any corporation, board or commission. And there can be a juggling of funds there that we, as opposition members, won't know of (quite frankly), until approximately 18 months after the fact. Then we may simply get a "no comment" in Crown corporation committee. So I find it very difficult to support an expansion of those spending abilities within the Crown corporation. It is a very significant point which I want to make, and I could very well be wrong. I am sure if I am the government members will be quick to jump to their feet to correct me.

When I look at section 7 of the amendment, it says:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, or any provision of any other act, the corporation may pay to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund . . .

May 13, 1981

Now, I will just stop there. There was a substantial payment, I believe it was \$50 million, from PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) to the heritage fund. Now, if we are making provisions in this amendment for that kind of payment to be made, then I would have to ask the question, how was it made originally? There was, apparently, no authority to make such a payment to the heritage fund. That is a key question and it is one which is unanswered. As I said, surely the government members opposite will be quick to advise us how they made that particular payment to the heritage fund.

It goes on further with regard to the heritage fund. I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, what the extent of these payments will be. It says that it will be able to make as payments to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund:

All, or any part, of the funds received from a department, board, commission, agency, office, or Crown corporation pursuant to clause 24(1)(c) where the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund has provided equity capital to that department, board, commission, agency, office, or Crown corporation.

Now, simply speaking, if the heritage fund were to make a loan of, say, \$10 to a department of the government or a commission, or a board, or one of its many Crown corporations, then under this act and under this amendment they could require that that particular Crown corporation, or board, or commission, or whichever one received the \$10, pay all or part of its proceeds back to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund. I suppose that could be considered drawing a long bow. Maybe it is. But it is not something which is clearly defined in the amendment, nor is it clearly spelled out. Again, I would ask the government members, or whoever would be replying on this particular bill, or the minister (in closing debate), to clarify that particular point along with how they achieved the authority to make payment from PCS to the heritage fund.

I find in the amendment that clause 7 is the one which bothers me the most. It, again, provides for an expansion of that financial interchange, if you like, between corporations to include all these boards and commissions. It is hard to spell out, Mr. Chairman, just why it is wrong, because we won't know until such time as there is wrongdoing under the authority of this act. Now, when you look at it you can take any clause you like and in itself it doesn't look all that damning. I suppose it could be best compared to The Natural Products Marketing Act. There are provisions in there that heaven help us if they should ever be employed. But the powers are there, Mr. Speaker. So, of course, our question is: well, if you don't need powers or authority under a particular act, or a clause under any given bill, then why should that authority and power be there? There is no reason to use it.

That is what I find in this amendment, and in particular, in the new section 24(1), the many sweeping powers which are contained within that bill and particular clause.

Now just before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I know that the member for Kindersley would want to elaborate on some other aspects — in particular clauses 8 and 9 of Bill No. 112.

I just want to reiterate again the concerns I have, which reflect the concerns of the opposition. We have seriously questioned (and I think sincerely questioned) the necessity of this government to have the many Crown corporations that it has. We question it in terms of their financial and managerial accountability to the legislature.

I suppose, in being somewhat old style in terms of politics, one would like to think that this legislature was the place which acted on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, that all matters of government had to come through this particular channel (this path, if you like). We, and I know that other jurisdictions in the country, are looking at this aspect of Crown corporations undermining the parliamentary system to a point where it is very difficult, if not impossible at times, for opposition to effectively scrutinize, if you like, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

Let's be realistic again, Mr. Speaker. There is no scrutinizing of expenditures or legislation by the government opposite. They don't care. Their cabinet drafts the legislation. Their backbenchers go along with it. Occasionally we hear the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland raise some concerns about a bill and speak very critically of a minister with respect to that bill, but then not have the courage of his convictions to stand up and vote with the opposition against the government. It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I express a great deal of concern as it relates to these Crown corporations.

This amendment, it should be noted, is an amendment to The Crown Corporations Act. This is the big mama which breeds them all. This is where they are all coming from. We have to have some concern about that. I have made a point in Crown corporation committee meetings this year of asking almost in every Crown corporation meeting, "When was this Crown corporation formed? How was it formed?" A good majority, if not the majority, of those Crown corporations are formed under the authority of The Crown Corporation Act.

Now we see the amendments to The Crown Corporation Act broadening, again, its powers and including the heritage fund. So, it is with those concerns, Mr. Speaker, that I would at this time, until given more detailed explanation by the government opposite (I suppose more convincing from the members opposite) have to oppose this particular bill.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make mention of one item. It is a matter I raised in this Chamber before about the government once again moving to pull the provincial auditor, this time out of CIC; earlier it was out of SaskOil.

What we are going to see is a continuation until the point where the provincial auditor in this province has no jurisdiction whatsoever over any of the Crown corporations. I don't know what I can say, other than what was said before. The provincial auditor is a significant function of the legislative process. When that audit function is taken away from the auditor (as on CIC) we're into the area where the government is, in fact, controlling the other Crown corporations — where the money is being buried, where it's going from one to another.

It seems to me that that is a pretty fundamental Crown corporation for the provincial auditor to handle. What we are doing with the provincial auditor is . . . He is complaining himself about his independence. He is not being allowed to look at the question of value for money.

Now, what we are seeing is the government taking another Crown corporation, another one and another one, to the point where there will be none left. Once you do that, of course, then you downgrade the office of the provincial auditor. There will be fewer people and fewer experts. Methodology cannot be developed for the smaller operation. It is pretty fundamental. Obviously, the government opposite is moving in that

May 13, 1981

direction. Regardless of what we say, they are not going to change. They are the same arguments I advanced before, Mr. Speaker. I think it is wrong for the government to move in that direction. It is wrong for people who claim to be legislators to stand by and watch as now CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) goes by the boards because the provincial auditor no longer deals with that corporation. That is the wrong way to go.

When all of the Crown corporations, I suppose, are out of his jurisdiction, we will get private auditors to do the rest of the government departments. This is a wrong system. It is the protection which is given to the people. It is the vehicle by which we are going to have to address the whole question of productivity in government through comprehensive audits in the future. We are moving against that. We are eliminating that office. I think that is wrong for the reasons I have advanced at other times in this Assembly.

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I won't take very long. I am sure in committee of the whole we will have a chance to address some of the issues raised. I have just some general comments with respect to the position taken by the members opposite respecting the auditor. I think it is interesting to note that one of the first acts of the Manitoba Conservative government, when it was first elected, was to take all of the Crown corporations in Manitoba and put them out to private audits — every single one of them. There is nothing to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that having private auditors provides any less of a check on the validity of financial statements presented by Crown corporations than using the provincial auditor. I think the fact is that the auditor accepts the work of other auditors. If he finds it is unsatisfactory, etc., he obviously has the right to go in and to check it out.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that at the federal level, private auditors are used. In other provinces, private auditors are used. I don't think there is anything to suggest that the public is not served well by those private auditors. I think to suggest that indicates some lack of confidence in the private auditing firms, which do some of the largest corporations in Canada, whose shareholders obviously have as great an interest as our shareholders do here in the validity of those financial statements presented to them.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I will be supporting the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to 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. Vickar that Bill No. 107 — **An Act respecting the Economic Development Foundation of Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

MR. MacAULEY: — Mr. Speaker, an act to establish the economic development foundation is good news for northern Saskatchewan. Under the terms of the act, the foundation will oversee the northern economic corporation which is for the development of the northern economy by and for northern people.

Mr. Speaker, this act is legally and significantly an extension of northern economic development initiatives taken by the original government in 1972.

Let me briefly outline each year's record of achievement in this important area of northern development. Simply stated, the government set out to end the colonized state where northern people had almost no involvement in the economic life of their communities. Of course, many communities had no economic life (or almost no economic life) at all.

Where pockets of progress, which originated under the CCF government had managed to survive the progress years of the Liberal administration, Northerners were given an opportunity to participate in their own economy. Indeed, this initiative of the former government in economic development meant sell out, as far as the northern people were concerned. In contrast to the progress and policies now in place, the Prince Albert pulp mill and the uranium mine at Collins Bay were developed without any consultation with the northern people involved. It is no surprise that the Northerners received no benefits from these projects at all.

By contrast, in 1972, Northerners had directly participated in their benefit from northern economic development, supported by the provincial government in four basic ways. First, major progress to develop community services, create jobs and job training for northern business opportunities was implemented. Secondly, educational and training programs were developed to help Northerners gain needed skills and participate in northern development. Thirdly, resource development project work was encouraged to benefit the northern people. The establishment of a sawmill at Weyakwin and uranium mines at Cluff Lake and Key Lake must ensure that northern people will fully participate in these areas.

We are about to begin an exciting new era of economic development in the North. Northern Saskatchewan will come alive if northern people will accept the challenge and opportunities facilitated by the government. Through the co-operation of communities and corporations, individual enterprises and joint ventures, and development of their own economy, they will benefit.

This will provide an agency to continue to expand and support northern economic development. The new agency is timely for several reasons. First, northern people are taking more direct control of their own affairs on all fronts — education, local government and economic development. Just as Northerners have succeeded in establishing their own school boards, civic councils and business opportunities, they are now ready to more directly participate in their own financing and development of operations.

Mr. Speaker, the new northern corporation will include Northerners as directors on its board. Its head office will be located in the North. It will facilitate venture in economic development initiative, not just for achievement of economic benefits, but for ensured social benefits by helping establish the economic base for the future well-being for northern communities. Another reason for this new agency is to simply modernize the northern development.

May 13, 1981

The Department of Northern Saskatchewan economic development branch will be hard-pressed to keep pace with the needs of an association with the growing economy. Instead, the branch will be able to focus more closely on the development of training and management support. It will assist Northerners to identify their development ideas and will leave the more direct financing responsibilities to the new corporation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I express my satisfaction with what this act provides. The development foundation will have impact not only in the North, but across the province. The foundation can be an important step in assisting native people to more fully participate in Saskatchewan's economic life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the introduction of this act. I have discussed it with some of my colleagues and with other people. The first question that comes to my mind after having reviewed it and studied it a little is: why a foundation? First of all, we already have an economic development corporation in Saskatchewan, known as Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). Qualified people operating the Crown corporation are quite capable of handling this kind of economic development. Why a foundation? Answerable to whom?

I have serious concerns about this bill, Mr. Speaker. The reason I have serious concerns is that the member for Cumberland indicated that it's to assist the Northerners. I don't read the bill as such. I read it as assisting Northerners and native persons within the province.

A foundation, rather than a Crown corporation, answerable to whom? I'm told that it would be answerable to public accounts and to the estimates in this House, which is different than the scrutiny of a Crown corporation. I fail to understand why we need a second development corporation in Saskatchewan. We already have one. Why can it not be handled through, perhaps, a branch of Sedco, which already exists, if necessary?

The other day, we discussed at great length in the Crown corporations committee the benefits of the housing program under SHC (Saskatchewan Housing Corporation) with the Minister of Urban Affairs. I recall the minister at that time suggesting that all governments in Canada and Saskatchewan have had a great concern for the natives of this country, and that all governments have attempted to deal and cope with the problems which exist with the natives of Canada. These are the words of the Minister of Urban Affairs:

All governments have, to a degree, failed in really dealing with the problems of the natives.

It seems to me when I read a bill like this one, that what we're looking at is exactly the same kind of problem which we've had for so many years. What will it accomplish? The foundation is supposedly set up in order to assist Northerners and natives in economic development. Will it, first of all, provide necessary management skills to operate their businesses? I see nothing in there for that. Will it just be money which will be poured out again, as has been done by all government and all parties for many years? You put a lot of money out from which you really get no results. Are we going to see a foundation which will assist the natives to develop and set up a business through grants and loans

and so on, only to see it fail because proper guidance is not established along with it? That is, I think, doing a disservice to the native communities of Saskatchewan, rather than providing assistance, as this bill is probably intended to do.

Will it be a tool with which the NDP government can provide grants in order to get votes? I say yes. That's what this bill will be. That's what this foundation will accomplish . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, very much so. If that isn't the reason, why not operate this foundation under the umbrella of Sedco, as a branch of it, and take away the politics in it? Why, in this province, are we so insistent on keeping the native people segregated from the rest of the people? That's what this bill does. The intent of the government in introducing this bill — not by words — is to make them a different class of citizen than other peoples in this province.

When you introduce this kind of a bill or establish this kind of a foundation, that is exactly what you are saying: they can't participate in what is already there, that they must be a separate entity. You are saying that they must deal with different people and that they're not allowed to deal, like everyone else, with the proper organization which is already there — Sedco.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the reason for, or the logic of, this bill. I have not yet heard from the government opposite any suggestions to establish a proper training in technical skills for the natives of this province. That's a fact, as admitted by the Minister of Urban Affairs in Crown corporations just this week. What percentage of native people have taken advantage of the technical school in Moose Jaw? It's very small. We have poured millions of dollars, for example, into Sask Housing to teach natives how to build houses. Yet, when we review the estimates of that Crown corporation, we find out in many, many cases that less than 50 per cent of the work was actually done by natives. Is that providing a service to them? No, I say it's providing a disservice to them. There was no follow-up to find out how many learning skills they received from the involvement in the building of these homes. When asked in Crown corporations, the minister had no idea of what those very same people who had worked on these homes to learn certain skills were doing today. He didn't know and he had not bothered to follow up.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that I, as a member, do not support this bill because it discriminates, it segregates, it does a disservice to the natives of this province. The natives of Saskatchewan could deal just as well with Sedco, which is by its very nature, the same kind of a corporation — Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. We can expect by the establishing of this foundation, to see certain abuses. I don't believe that there is any provision made or any thought been given by the minister or by the government opposite to provide not just money through grants and loans, but to provide what they need far more and that's management skills, technical skills and all of the requirements needed first. You know, it's the old story: you learn to crawl before you walk. And that is not what the government has done in this case.

I would like the minister, in his closing remarks, to explain to me why we've had to go this route, how we intend to supervise it, who will accept responsibility, whom will they be answerable to, and all of the other questions that I posed during my short remarks. Mr. Speaker, I will close with saying that there are other members on this side of the Assembly who wish to say a few words on this bill. They would like to do that tomorrow. As such, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

May 13, 1981

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Long that Bill No. 100 — **An Act to amend The Vehicles Act (No. 3)** 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. Smishek that Bill No. 109 — **An Act respecting The Assessment of Real Property, Businesses and Special Franchises** 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. MacMurchy that Bill No. 113 — **An Act to amend The Agricultural Implements Act** be now read a second time.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, this bill certainly has some implications for the agriculture implement dealers in this province. My colleague has some of the bill out with the dealers. We should be able to get a reply tomorrow. So I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 117 — An Act to amend The Statute Law

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1981. Many of the amendments proposed in this bill are consequential to changes made to other legislation. The amendments contained in section 3, 5, 12, 13, 15, 18 19, 33, 40, 41, 50, and 56 are of this kind. Corrections of internal reference errors and spelling and editing errors are proposed in sections 2, 4, 6 to 11, 14, 16, 17, 20 to 32, sections 34 to 39, 42 to 45, 47 to 49, 51 to 55, and sections 57 and 58.

The amendments to The Automobile Accident Insurance Act in section 3 of the bill also change citations of the federal legislation to conform with The Interpretation Act of Saskatchewan. Section 46 of this bill repeals subsection 12(1) of The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act and re-enacts the new subsection 12(1). The existing subsection has not accomplished what was intended. The Department of the Attorney General and the Department of Agriculture have been anxious to clarify the section in order to enforce it properly. It will now be clear that the non-agricultural corporations may not hold more than 10 acres of agricultural land after May 5, 1980, and must dispose of the excess before 1994. The change is not substantive but merely a clarification.

The amendments to the Wakamow Valley Authority Act, contained in section 59,

involve for the most part changes to all references to coming into force of this section. This is necessary because only portions of the act have been proclaimed into force. There are also spelling and editing corrections to the act.

The provisions in this bill, which are changes to an act which come into force on a specific date, are by section 6(a) declared to be in force retroactive to that date. All other provisions come into force on the date of assent.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Statute Amendment Act, 1981.

MR. TAYLOR: — We would just like to have a chance to look over this. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 118 — An Act to amend The Executions Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, the amendment comes forward as a result of the ongoing discussion between officials in the department and members of the bar. The amendment effects a change in a policy choice which has been requested by the private bar. The amendment gives grandfather status to writs of execution issued before May 1, 1981.

In addition to the priority over chattel mortgages unregistered prior to delivery of a writ of execution by the sheriff, these writs will be granted priority by the amendment over security investments taken after May 1, 1981. There are some exceptions but I need not enlarge on those, Mr. Speaker.

The second amendment allows the personal property registry staff to work in concert with the sheriff's office to ensure that the registry for writs issued prior to May 1, 1981, is as complete as possible.

The third amendment ensures that the execution creditor will be able to discharge a writ of execution in that other provisions of The Personal Property Security Act will apply to allow the execution creditor to amend his registration and also to ensure that he will discharge. These amendments will be welcomed by the legal profession and the financial community.

Accordingly, I am pleased to move second reading of The Executions Amendment Act, 1981.

MR. BERNTSON: — I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 116 — An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act, 1979

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, It is my pleasure to speak on second reading of An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act, 1979.

Provision is made to increase the annual payment the Minister of Finance makes to the

May 13, 1981

superannuation fund from \$350,000 to \$500,000. A new formula for supplementary allowances is proposed this year. In past years the formula was specifically designed to provide large increases for those who had been in receipt of pensions for longer periods of time.

From 1974 to the present there has been a significant improvement in the pensions of those who retired some time ago, when the indemnities and allowances paid to members were very low. The new formula gives more weight to years of service. It will still provide adequate supplementary allowances for those who have been in receipt of pensions for long periods of time.

The bill before the House also contains an amendment providing that in every year that supplementary allowances are paid to members of the public service under The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act, a supplementary allowance will be paid under this act calculated in accordance with that new formula.

For persons who cease to be members prior to April 1, 1979, we propose to extend the period during which they can elect to transfer the money to the new money purchase plan to April 1, 1982. The amendments also change the time for an election for members who cease to be a member after April 1, 1979. They will have until 30 days after the return of the last writ of the general election at which they ceased to be a member. If they resign between elections, they will have until 30 days after the return of the last general election after they ceased to be a member.

Changes are also proposed in the section respecting discontinuance of allowance. These rules will apply to allowances paid both under the money purchase and formula plans. The period during which a person may be employed in the public service or render services to the government has been changed from six months to 100 days.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act, 1979.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, we have some concerns about the provision allowing the chairmen of corporations, boards or commissions to still receive their pensions while they are serving in that capacity. I note that that is not limited to the 100 days. With that concern, Mr. Speaker, we want to give more thought to the bill and beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.