

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 7, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Communications

ASSISTANT CLERK: — Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the standing committee on communications, presents the second report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee has considered its reference of February 23, 1983, namely, the matter of taking still photographs of members in the House.

Your committee recommends that the taking of still photos in the legislative Chamber be permitted, subject to approval for use for publication by Mr. Speaker; that the photos be taken only of members on their feet, speaking; that the photos be taken without the use of flashes, and only from the press gallery location; and that a trial period for the taking of such photos be set for the start of the next session, to include only the address in reply and the budget debates.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter:

That the second report of the standing committee on communications be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

Department of Rural Affairs

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, it becomes more and more difficult to ask questions. But my question will be directed to the Minister of Rural Affairs.

The minister will be aware of news reports out today of 191 jobs to go under government overhaul. In that report the minister will be aware that his department, rural affairs, is one of the departments that is looked at to be gotten rid of. What I want to ask the minister is whether or not he will confirm or deny this.

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the article the member is indicating from. I would like to indicate to you at this time that I would advise the Assembly that the Attorney General will make a statement. So I will yield to him.

HON. MR. LANE: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, the government has made its position quite clear that, in fact, there will be a departmental reorganization. That decision has not

been finalized, nor has the final proposal been brought to cabinet. As a result, I caution members opposite and the public to treat the article as speculation because that's precisely what it is.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Rural Affairs. In light of the fact that the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities is meeting in Saskatoon and a great deal of concern is being expressed by delegates at that major convention, and in light of the fact that when the department was established, it was established on the advice of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, will you give this Assembly your assurance today, as well as the members of SARM, that you have no intention of dismantling the Department of Rural Affairs?

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member that this government and its 55 members is fully cognizant of its support in rural Saskatchewan, its obligations to rural Saskatchewan, and the actions that it's taken for the betterment of rural Saskatchewan. And I just simply remind the hon. member again that the article is pure speculation.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I have been referring my questions distinctly to the Minister of Rural Affairs simply because he is the minister responsible for that area. I think that what the public would like to know, as well as the convention which is going on in Saskatoon, from the minister is whether or not he has any plans, or is aware of any plans, to do away with the Department of Rural Affairs.

HON. MR. LANE: — Again I remind the hon. member and I caution him about the rules as to repetitious questions, Mr. Speaker,. But we have made it clear. I apologize for my error in my last answer. There are 56 government members, not 55, many of whom are from rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, which I do not need to remind the hon. members opposite, but I just simply caution the members again that the article is speculation.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural Affairs. Have you at any time in the past 10 months discussed with SARM the possibility of deleting or getting rid of the Department of Rural Affairs at all?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the hon. member's question is dealing with the question of government reorganization, and is from the article in the paper, as most of their questions are, Mr. Speaker,: that any question of government reorganization is speculative; that should there be any changes they would be discussed with the appropriate people if there are to be any changes; and I just simply caution the members opposite to very carefully treat the article as speculation.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, once again, the Attorney General appears to be answering some of the questions, but not necessarily answering the question, but merely trying to avoid any other member or minister answering a question.

Once again, I direct my question to the Minister of Rural Affairs, and I'm sure he would have a better idea of whether the department has talked to anyone, or whether he himself has talked to anyone. Have you at any time in the past 10 months discussed doing away with rural affairs, with SARM, or any other organization?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, I remind the hon. member that in my position as acting, acting,

acting assistant Deputy House Leader or whatever position that I have today, I believe that the tradition was well established by my predecessor, as a matter of fact, that when there is obviously an article that affect several departments, and the government's position is being made clear the House Leader will articulate that position. That's what I'm attempting to do. I'm obviously not getting through and I apologize.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I direct a question to the Minister of Rural Affairs and my question does not have to do with what appears in the press. My question is a very simple one. Have your officials, sir, been discussing with the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities the reorganization of the Department of Rural Affairs and the elimination of the Department of Rural Affairs?

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, just to remind the Leader of the Opposition that in fact the material in the article is speculation — speculation, Mr. Speaker. All I can do is continually repeat the same answer to the members opposite, that the matter of reorganization by the government is certainly a government policy, that in fact there will be a reorganization. The form of that reorganization has not been decided upon.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I direct the supplementary to the Minister of Rural Affairs.

Up to March 1 of this year, and prior to the appearance of any articles in newspapers, were your officials, sir, discussing with the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities any reorganization of your department which might affect them?

HON. MR. LANE: — I remind the opposition leader again what I have said repeatedly., and you will note that the SARM seems to have been somewhat concerned by the statements, according to your own statements opposite. Now what conclusions you wish to draw from that . . . But again I just, as a result of that, I would caution you to treat the article, and the suggestion in the article, and any suggestions of reorganization and the details thereof, as highly speculative.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'll ask a supplementary. I want to advise the minister, and all ministers, that I am not talking about any newspaper articles. I am talking about discussions of the Minister of Rural Affairs' officials. I'm surprised that other ministers are aware of what his officials are discussing, but I ask again, to the Minister of Rural Affairs: what discussions have your officials had with respect to any reorganization of your department with the SARM?

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, it would certainly be unwise for government to discuss any proposals for reorganization when it doesn't have any proposals upon which it's stated to act, and I attempted to indicate that the proposal did not come before cabinet, and as a result, cabinet hasn't made a decision.

Department of Labor — Women's Division

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to begin by saying the conduct at this question period is an absolute outrage.

MR. SPEAKER: — Is the member on his feet to ask a question? If he is, he has no right to be making statements.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a question to one of the very few remaining ministers left

who had the courage to come to the House this morning. My question is to the Minister of Government Services, as I understand it the senior distaff minister in cabinet. My question to you is: do you see any need for the continuation of the women's division in the Department of Labor? Do you as the senior woman in cabinet see any need for the continuation of that department?

HON. MR. LANE: — I don't know what difficulty the hon. members opposite have, Mr. Speaker. I recall on numerous occasions in the past the precedent well established by the opposition members opposite that when there was a matter that crossed several different departments, policy that has not been determined, the House Leader in his role as such took the answer to the question. That's all I'm simply doing. Again, I just simply repeat that in fact the government policy has not been decided upon. The proposals have not come forward.

But let me tell the hon. member . . . He may not like question; I don't accept that as a criticism of Mr. Speaker. I assume that his criticism is directed at the government, and that's his criticism. But the fact is that the precedent of how question period has been handled in a situation like this is a precedent established by yourselves. So I don't know where your complaint comes in, hon. member. And I state it again, what the government policy and the government position is. And again, I simply caution you against speculation.

SGI Layoffs

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct this question with some temerity to the minister in charge of SGI, and expect an answer, I don't know from whom. The question is this. As I understand the minister's position, he indicates that a number of the persons, and a large number of the persons who were laid off, were persons who were employed with respect to SGI's plans to expand. Would the minister give an indication of which classes of employees (and I have a list, and he has the list) which have been laid off were ones associated with the proposals to expand? Was it perhaps the adjuster 1 in the claims department; or the safety staff; or the licence staff in Swift Current; or was it the commercial artist; or which ones were working on these plans that he says involve dozens of people?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, in response to that member's question, I believe what he's doing is taking out of context some answers I may have given. I believe what I did say — and he can put it in whatever words he wishes to himself — was that we were reducing the complement of staff in total, and that the reduction was as a result of the halting of expansionary plans that had been contemplated by the previous government. We have taken those plans and we have removed them. We've halted them. We've said that we will not go into the life insurance business, we will not expand our corporation into the province of Alberta in the general insurance field, as you had planned on doing.

Oh, don't frown. If you want the documentation on that, I'll be happy to provide it for you. We would not expand and buy out some body shops in the province of Saskatchewan but we would direct our attention to the service that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to from SGI as was originally established, or the reason why it was originally established.

We have then reduced the number of people, Mr. Speaker, to what best can provide the

service. We've increased that number from what it was in 1978 before they got into grandiose schemes for expanding SGI. We still have about a hundred people more today than they had then, when they decided to go from the 1,200 and some people that they had at that time to over 1,600 in their last budget to take care of all these plans that they had in mind. We've removed them. We are not going into that now. We've levelled off to a number that we feel will be able to provide the service the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to, that they forgot to give when they were in government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I really did not get the answer to the question I asked: which employees were involved in these alleged expenses? I'll try another question to the minister in charge of SGI: did your staff consult with any of the city officials of Weyburn or Estevan or Swift Current or North Battleford before deciding to close down the licence issuing offices of SGI in those cities?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, Mr. Speaker, we did not. I don't believe that any government crown corporation, who made business plans, would discuss these plans with other officials or cities.

I don't want the impression left here by the Leader of the Opposition that by closing down these offices we are in fact eliminating a service. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is improving on that service. The cost of handling those offices in those four communities, that we removed, was higher than what we were bringing in. That's one of the reasons for the kinds of operations and losses that that opposition, when they were in government, were experiencing in SGI. The service that we will be providing under agents by appointing issuers that are already agents will provide better service than was being given before because they won't have to go to two places; they can go to one — one-place shopping.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, under their own administration, most agents in the province of Saskatchewan were also issuers. There is nothing different about what we are doing today than what they did then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I thought I was in trouble before but I can see that it's even worse when the ministers, other than the Attorney General, do answer.

I'll direct this question to the Attorney General as, in his own description, acting acting assistant House Leader. Would he advise the House whether or not it is now the policy of this government that when a crown corporation, let us say Sask Power, closes a district operator's office in a community, or when Sask Tel closes out an exchange in a community, there is no consultation with any of the local authorities because, as the minister in charge of SGI indicates, it is a business decision which requires no consultation? Is that the policy of your government, sir?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, the government doesn't have a definitive policy on whether there need be consultation at all times. I would suspect that in the interests of an efficient operation of crown corporations — and I think that's an objective of all members — that is primarily a management decision. Should there be a major impact on communities, I'm sure that crown corporation management, in their wisdom, would in fact consult. Whether this is a major impact . . . I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that in

fact there may be a positive impact in the communities as a result of the decision, given the fact that existing agents will have some increased workload and benefits as a result. And I would be very doubtful if this is the type of decision that management would necessarily take, but certainly, if there's one — and I don't know where you draw the line — where it has a major impact on a community, I'm sure that any crown corporation management would, in fact, sit down and talk to them.

SGI Rates

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A question to the minister in charge of SGI. By way of background, let me say that in the minds of many, the Premier's statement on Friday created more smoke than light. I would ask the minister for a comment on that if we might. It appears that the government has decided to delay the implementation of the higher deductible. Will you confirm that is because you now realize that you have no right to increase the deductible without referring it to PURC?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Most definitely not, Mr. Speaker. I reiterate the position, and the Premier did not contradict a statement that I made. He has put a freeze on it to allow the people of Saskatchewan the opportunity . . . In my mind, if you're asking me what I say the rule or regulation is, I say, absolutely not. And I make that very clear: the deductible is not a decision for the public utilities review commission. However, as the Premier has said, and I confirm and concur, because it is a gray area in perhaps your mind that it is not necessarily perhaps a gray area in the minds of some people, and that it is only fair that we say to the people of Saskatchewan, "we gave you an opportunity to have some input into it." In my mind there is no doubt that that is not an area. It is nothing to do with the rate. It is not a rate. The public utilities are there to establish and decide all rate increases or rates as such, and the deductible is not a rate.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. Trying to find out what is in the minister's mind is far too challenging a proposition for me. I had hoped that what I might get from the minister was a concise statement of the government's position. Is it the government's position, as distinct from yours and the Premier's and Mr. Black's, is it the government's position that the deductibles have to be referred to PURC when they are going to be increased? Is that the government's position?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, it is not the government's position.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why not?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I could turn it around and say why should it be?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I'd better start with a new question. The supplementaries don't seem to be elucidating the matter very much. By way of background to the new question, let me say that you said in the House that they did not have to be referred. The Premier said in a scrum outside the House that it was a gray area. Your general manager seems to yet have a third position. Can you give us any assistance in which of these three positions we ought to choose?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, all three of us are of the same mind on it, the president, the Premier, and myself. In submitting the package to the public utilities review commission, it is part of the package as to why we want an increase that has a direct effect on what that increase should be, but they do not decide on what the deductible will be, and that seems to be very difficult to get through your head. But it's

very simple. It may have a bearing on what the rate is going to be, but the fact that it's there is our decision — not theirs. And that is very precise in the mind of the Premier, and the mind of the president, and in mind, and the rest of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. If the public utilities review commission does not determine the deductible, then my question to the minister is: what purpose will the 90-day freeze serve if you are going to continue to disembowel PURC? Is it fair to assume that the only purpose of the 90-day freeze is to get your government off the hot seat until the end of the next session on July 1?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Not at all, Mr. Speaker. They themselves asked for some time on it. The people of Saskatchewan want some time on it. The public utilities review commission would like some time on it. They may have a different idea than what we have. I'm saying to you what's in the act; I'm saying to you what is in the mind of the government — that we make the decision on what the deductible will be. No one else will make that decision. If they want to challenge an act or if they want to come in with a different reply to what we are saying, let them do so. We'll argue it at that time, though we know they may turn around and say to us. "Because of that, we'll reduce your rate." It's the rate that's important. That's what the people of Saskatchewan want to know — what they are going to pay for what they are going to get. That's why we're going to the public utilities review commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since you are eliciting views from various segments of the Saskatchewan public, do I take it that you are reconsidering the error of your ways and are prepared to reconsider the decision itself?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — You know, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely amazed at the position the opposition has taken with regard to the public utilities review commission. All of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, there is a very important commission out there, one that for four years, while I was in the opposition, they fought against having. They said, "We don't need a public utilities review commission in this province." Now we have one; now they want to know exactly . . . They think it's very important and it must be dealt with for public protection. But they didn't think that way for the last four years. Four years in a row there was a motion put into this Assembly for a public utilities review commission and you ignored it every time. Now we have one, and now we'll let it work, and we'll give them the opportunity to let it work. We will give the 90-day delay if we have to, to give them that opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Cruise Missile Testing

MR. YEW: — Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. What is the position of the Government of Saskatchewan with respect to the testing of the American cruise missile over northwestern Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, similar to the position of the former government, we have deep concerns about the cruise testing. Certainly, we acknowledge, as did the previous government, that the matter of national defence is purely within federal

jurisdiction and supersedes, I suggest, most areas of provincial jurisdiction. It's a matter purely to be determined by the federal government.

Secondly, the federal government has made it clear to us that it is going to honor what it believes its commitments under NATO, and have made that quite clear to the provincial government.

I would like to remind all hon. members with regard to the cruise testing within the province of Saskatchewan, that it was a predecessor to the members opposite, a CCF government, that made the agreement with the federal government to establish the testing range which got us into this mess in the first place, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, we share the concern of, I believe, most people of Saskatchewan with regard to cruise testing. We share the concern of most people in Saskatchewan with the proliferation of nuclear weapons, so it's not limited to just the cruise missile testing, but the federal government has made it clear to this government and other governments that it's a matter of national defence and its obligations under NATO, and it's intending to take its action.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Education Week

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to take a moment to remind the members of the legislature that this is Education Week in our province, extending from March 6 to March 12. The theme of this year's observance is "Teachers Helping People." 1983 is the 50th anniversary of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. The theme "Teachers Helping People" is therefore very appropriate. It is the way of saying thank you to Saskatchewan teachers, past and present, for the invaluable contribution which they have made to the province and to the local communities.

I think it is most fitting that our observance of Education Week this year be a recognition of the role that teachers have played in building Saskatchewan. Throughout the province, in each community, this week is being observed by a variety of school activities to help reinforce the tie between the school and the community, and the significant role which the teacher plays in that relationship.

I would like to publicly, on behalf of this legislature, pay tribute to the teachers and their association for the abundant contribution which they have made to the educational system of this province.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the Minister of Education to extend to the teachers of this province, as we honor them this week, our congratulations and our appreciation for the contribution that they have made to the development of our young people in carrying forward a high standard of education throughout the province. So all members join with you, Mr. Minister, in celebrating Education Week, the theme, the teachers of this province.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Telemiracle 1983

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment, if I might, to say, on behalf of the government and on behalf of this legislature, congratulations to the Kinsmen clubs of this province and to all the organizers of Telemiracle, who, as you are aware, yesterday raised over \$2 million for the many worth-while and outstanding projects that the Kinsmen's foundation carries on in this province.

I think it would be appropriate, as well, to congratulate and say thank you to the public of Saskatchewan. Once again, their generosity and their concern has been well-exemplified. On behalf of the government, we would say thank you very much.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to put on record our congratulations to the Kinsmen Foundation of Saskatchewan, who have done an excellent job over the last number of years (I believe seven), in raising a large amount of money which will go toward assisting the handicapped in the province of Saskatchewan.

I think as well it is in order to congratulate the many people who worked on the telephones for 21 hours and the many people who contributed behind the scenes, as well as giving a great deal of money (well over \$2 million) to a very worth-while cause.

I think it is also well to remember on this day that we, as legislators, now have a role to back up this kind of work and effort, through accessibility legislation to badly needed rehab centres, as well as the funding of non-governmental groups who very much carry out the needs of the handicapped people in the province.

So I would like to join, as well, other members of the Assembly, in congratulating the Kinsmen, as well as everyone who took part in Telemiracle 1983.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act

HON. MR. LANE: — I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly. I move that a bill to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 64 — An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act

HON. MR. LANE: — I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly. I move that a bill to amend The Department of Agriculture Act be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Public Works Act

HON. MR. LANE: — I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly. I move that a bill to amend The Public Works Act be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 66 — An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act

HON. MR. LANE: — I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly. I move that a bill to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 67 — An Act to amend The Education Act

HON. MR. LANE: — I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly. I move that a bill to amend The Education Act be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

URBAN AFFAIRS

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 24

Item 1 (continued)

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I direct a question to the minister respecting a rail line relocation in Regina, and the minister will be aware of some major proposals for rail line relocation in Regina, and more particularly the location of a rail yard in northeastern Regina. He will be aware of the proposals which are extant to have that new rail yard, at least in their opinion and in mine, comparatively close to the Uplands subdivision of Regina. He will, I expect, be aware of representations which have been made by the MP for the area, Mr. Simon de Jong, the MP for Regina East, to the Hon. Mr. Pepin, asking that the location of that yard be reconsidered. The current location has a distance of approximately 2,600 feet from the closest homes in the Uplands subdivision as it now exists.

My question to the minister is whether or not this situation has been called to his attention, and whether or not he or his colleagues in government are making any representations to the Minister of Transport of Canada with respect to the location of the rail lines and yard.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, as I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition is aware, the working authority that is making the plans for rail relocation is primarily an extension of city council. We are involved, as was their administration, at this time merely in the funding of the project. However, I would indicate to him that this evening on city council's agenda, this item will be discussed, due in large part to the efforts of the MLA for the region. There is a proposal before the council tonight to move the general corridor 800 yards further north because of the geometry of the proposal — the yards themselves, the line, 800 feet north because of the geometry of it. The yards will then end up being approximately 400 feet further away from the Uplands homes, as is now the case in the present proposal. I think that the people in Uplands appear to be much more satisfied with this and, as I indicated in the beginning, it is a decision that the city council will deal with this evening.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I understand that a petition signed by some 2,400 residents of the Uplands subdivision and in effect sponsored and gathered by the Uplands Community Association has been prepared, has been provided to the member of parliament for the area. My question is whether or not his government has been provided with a copy of the petition.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, we do not have a copy of the petition. We are aware of the petition that is directed to the city of Regina by the citizens' group in the city of Regina. We certainly are aware of it, are taking it into consideration, but of course the ultimate decision on location will be taken to the CTC by the city of Regina, and really the decision rests there, although, as I indicated, the MLA for the region has been very active in attempting to bring about some positive changes for the betterment of the situation for the people in northern Regina.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I have no doubt that the MLA has been active. I am aware of the MP being active a month ago. And I think we need all the assistance we can get from all levels of government.

My question to the minister is now a different question. It concerns the earlier indications of amendments to The Planning and Development Act. In about November or December 1, it was announced that a review of The Planning and Development Act was then under way. I am asking the minister when he believes that changes to The Planning and Development Act will be forthcoming. Is it likely that they will be forthcoming at the upcoming session of the legislature, that is before the end of May, or is it likely a much longer study and review that is proposed?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — In keeping with this government's practice, Mr. Chairman, we have undertaken a very extensive public consultation process in which we have had input from — at least an opportunity for input — and in fact in put from many of the urban and rural municipalities, many interest groups, as well as the general public. In spite of that, we are quite confident that we will be able to introduce that new piece of legislation in the spring session.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Would the minister give a very brief statement on the nature of the consultations, more particularly, from how many cities and towns has he received

representations as to the content of The Planning and Development Act, and from what other types of organizations has he received representations?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, to this stage we have received well over 100 written submissions in total. I don't have them broken down by urban versus rural, but they have come from cities, towns, villages, rural municipalities, SUMA and SARM, from various developmental interests like architects, engineers, from HUDAC, from organizations such as Meewasin, and from the general public.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Is the minister able to give us any general statement on the philosophy which is being incorporated in the new legislation?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The basic intent of the new legislation is to streamline and simplify what had grown into, I think, a rather complex piece of legislation. There are efforts primarily to make it more understandable, more readable. I guess streamlined is the best word I could offer.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I would like to direct a few questions to the minister concerning water supply in Regina, and I believe some of these have already been directed by one of my colleagues. I don't think I need to remind hon. members that there are some problems with respect to the quality and quantity of water supply in southern Saskatchewan. The members opposite will be aware of the initiatives taken by the government to appoint a committee, the Muirhead committee, and the fairly lengthy report that was produced by the Muirhead committee has been considered by the government. As I understand the nature of the government's position, they have reached the conclusion that a large pipeline from Lake Diefenbaker to the eastern end of Buffalo Pound Lake, there to connect with the pumping stations and the existing lines from Buffalo Pound Lake to Regina and Moose Jaw, is the best way to deal with the situation as it affects the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina.

My first question is whether or not it is thought by the department that other smaller communities in this general area are in need of a source of water, because of quality or quantity supplies. Are there any other communities whose needs need to be addressed at this time in this general area?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — You are referring to the area directly around Regina and Moose Jaw. In the series of hearings we just completed, there were a couple of representations made from smaller communities in this immediate area. They indicated that they do not have any immediate needs. They indicated that they would like to be considered, however, for some type of arrangement such as is the situation around Saskatoon, where smaller urbans draw their water off the pipeline directly connected to the city supply. They indicated, however, that until there was a better source of water in Regina, they weren't too interested in being hooked into the system. I guess the bottom line is that there is no immediate need, but they see a need in the future if the water is corrected.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, from time to time we hear stories that possibly White City, possibly Balgonie, possibly Pilot Butte, possibly other communities may be looking to this pipeline system as an ultimate source of water. I ask the minister whether or not there has been any consideration of the water needs of the Kalium Chemicals Ltd. at Belle Plain, and whether they are thought to be adequately addressed for the foreseeable future, or whether or not this pipeline would be thought to be of any value

to them, if it were built.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, the Kalium potash mine presently does have a supply of water that they say is very adequate. They require their water from shallow wells. It was noted in the Muirhead report, however, that that might in the future be a potential user of water off the pipeline, but at this time there has been no request by Kalium. It has simply been noted.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, have the possible needs of a heavy oil upgrader in the general Moose Jaw area been considered in any way in addressing the question of water supply from Lake Diefenbaker to the Regina-Moose Jaw areas?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I think the answer to that specific question would be no. In general though, the inference seems to be that there could be future needs in terms of industrial development in this area for large amounts of water. The point has been made that that type of development is being prevented, or at least inhibited, by a lack of quantity and quality of water. That fact has been considered in the report, and of course has been considered by the downstream users. One of the things that became obvious throughout our two weeks, has been obvious prior to . . . (inaudible) . . . was that total considerations of major diversions have to be dealt with prior to those types of diversions taking place. I don't believe that the pipeline would be classed as a major diversion. The downstream users don't have a whole lot of problems with that solution, and in fact it would probably serve the foreseen industrial uses probably into the turn of the century.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we have in the Saskatoon area a somewhat analogous situation where a number of communities, a number of potash mines, and a number of other industrial ventures are served by a ditch and pipeline system operated by the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board. That, it seems to me, is a very sensible approach when you are going to have two, three, four or five possible users of a pipeline and ditch system. I am asking the minister whether or not the approach of the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board becoming a supplier in the Regina area in the way it is in the general Saskatoon area, has been considered by the government.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — As far as a possible solution to the specific problem, I suppose it's been a consideration. I think we're looking at it in broader terms, attempting to study the problem across the province to determine if that type of an approach is in fact a good approach. It will be probably one of the options that will develop out of our recent series of hearings. It will probably be a month to six weeks before we get to the stage of studying those on a provincial basis.

It's interesting to hear the former premier, the Leader of the Opposition, discuss the merits of the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board as a solution to the problem. I suppose I might ask why, in a dozen years, you didn't attempt to implement it in this region.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I don't want to get into a debate with the minister. The obvious answer is that each year brings its own challenges. The Saskatchewan Water Supply Board has been significantly expanded in the last several years in the Saskatoon area where the needs were greater because that's where the industrial development was taking place, in the potash mines in that area. Certainly, there has been a need in this area. As Regina has grown very

substantially over the last 10 years, the need to address the problems of Regina, of course, increases and I hope that that will continue.

I don't know whether all growth in Regina and Saskatoon is likely to stop, but I would be surprised if that were the case. Even though the short-term picture is bleak, presumably there can be changes in the future where there might be jobs and there might be economic activity. So I would anticipate that we would continue to progress as we have in the past. I address the minister on what solution he thinks is the best one for providing the water which Regina and Moose Jaw need, and the other communities presumably will need in the foreseeable future, and accordingly, whose needs ought to be built into the solution which is propounded by the government.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I suppose, Mr. Chairman, the government has gone on record as favoring the pipeline from Lake Diefenbaker to solve the water concerns, the water problems of Regina and Moose Jaw. One of the reasons, again, of the series of hearings we had is to attempt to come up with some solutions or some understanding of the problems that will exist, in the member's words "in the foreseeable future." I don't really see any need in the, maybe I'd use the term immediate future, to be too concerned about the smaller centres around. As those things arise, the hope we would have is that we would have a better idea than has been the case to date on what those needs will be, and be in a better position to meet those needs as they arise rather than reacting to them after they become critical, as has too often been the case in the past.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I am uncertain as to your financial offer which your government has made to the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw. In particular, I ask the minister whether or not there has been an unconditional offer of \$10 million, or whether the offer is conditional upon the city putting in \$10 million out of moneys other than debenture moneys, and whether it is conditional upon the federal government putting in any sum of money. A number of the stories that I have read in the press seem to postulate the provincial government putting in \$10 million, the cities putting in \$10 million, the federal government putting in \$20 million, and the balance being borrowed and paid for by rates paid by the water users.

What I wasn't clear on is whether those were conditions that your government was imposing or not and whether there was a straight offer of \$10 million so that the cities could decide, if possible, that they would take the \$10 million and raise the remaining 90 by means of debentures, and that would be satisfactory with your government.

I would appreciate a clarification of that for my benefit.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The concept of the offer we made to the two cities is that there is a conditional aspect, in that they will put in \$10 million up front, the same as we will. I wouldn't say that the federal portion is conditional. We would certainly accept more than what we suggested. If it would help I could send you a copy of the letter that we sent to the two mayors and it would help to clarify the situation.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I would appreciate that, and would like to get a copy of the letter.

My question now to the minister is this: in view of the fact that this project is likely to cost in excess of \$100 million, and in view of the fact of contributions by the Government of Saskatchewan to some other urban communities — and I instance particularly Lloydminster where a contribution in excess of \$10 million was made for

under 5,000 people in Saskatchewan residents — does the minister feel that a contribution of \$10 million for close to 200,000 residents is in any way commensurate with the grants which have been offered and made in the past short number of years to a good number of other urban communities in this province?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — As you indicated, you weren't in the House on Friday, and we dealt with this in some detail at that time. However, to reiterate, the grant that we are projecting is not 10 million. We are offering an interest subsidy which will take the total as high as \$40 million, depending on the interest rate at the time that the bargain is struck. We feel it is a very substantial offer, possibly a little different concept than has been tried previously, but something that the cities, despite their public stance, have indicated some interest in.

In terms of comparing municipal waterworks on the basis of per capita, it has been clearly indicated to us that the people of this province don't accept that as a rational approach. Capital work costs the same, or very close to the same, whether it's going to serve a small or large population. Per capita funding, they indicated to us, and I believe they had a good point, was not a very rational approach to funding municipal water and sewer requirements.

In terms of Lloydminster, as was indicated, it's governed under a different act. It is cost-shared with Alberta. There are a whole number of factors that can be brought into that discussion, as well as the per capita costs, and I don't think they are really relevant to the whole issue.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I note that you are saying that the contribution of the Government of Saskatchewan might be as high as \$40 million.

In the circumstances which you postulate the contribution of the government might be as high as \$40 million. What would be the contribution of the cities in that particular formulation? Thus, if everybody paid cash, the government puts in \$10 million, and the cities and the taxpayers put in \$90 million. That's what you are suggesting. You are saying, "But the government is also going to give guarantees of interest." If the government gave a guarantee of interest which would run the government contribution to \$40 million, how much would the civic contributions be in that case?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — If I understand the member's question, the cash contribution would not change, obviously. The indication he has given of 90 million is certainly not what we are proposing. But that's not a factor. What we have guaranteed is a situation where the cities could make some definite plans. The interest rate on the debentures would be capped for the first five years at 8 per cent and 12 for the second five. And if there is an increase in interest rates, or they go higher, and when that deal is struck, it would be the province that would be forced to pay the extra interest on the loan.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I heard those comments by representatives of the government and I tried to figure out under what circumstances that \$35 million or \$40 million could be operative. And either interest rates are thought to be likely to be very high indeed, or alternatively the bonds are thought to be probably 25-year bonds. And I thought that a very likely and credible thing: that you are talking about 14 per cent interest over 25 years. That will produce a provincial contribution of something like you are talking about. But it will also produce a civic contribution of (my rough recollection is) about \$250 million. And that's a very large sum of money to ask the taxpayers and the water users to undertake.

I think that we ought to be aware of the fact that when we are talking about provincial contributions of \$35 million or \$40 million, as I hear from time to time, we are talking about those standing beside municipal contributions of well over \$200 million. Now those are very, very impressive figures. Alongside that, the provincial contribution doesn't look very handsome.

I am surprised, Mr. Minister, that the best your government can do, at least on an up-front cash basis, is 10 per cent of the value of the project. That is infinitely less, for example, than the amount provided for, let's say, building a bridge across the river in Saskatoon. The sort of up-front money put up by the province is a good deal more than 10 per cent; indeed, it's a great deal more than that.

I know that there is no direct comparison. Some cities are on rivers and therefore don't need much help with water supplies, but need some help with bridges. And some cities aren't on rivers and therefore don't need much help with bridges, but need some help with water supplies. I'm curious to know why a formula which might have some comparability would not be arrived at. Admittedly, the size of the projects is less. I guess the bridge is only \$20 million or thereabouts all in; the water supply project is a good deal more than that, but involving two cities. Does the government feel that its offer of a \$10-million cash contribution, up front, is enough in all the circumstances, having a regard to the fact that the project will cost more than \$100 million?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — As I indicated on Friday, we feel that the funding scenario that we've projected is fair. It is a suggestion, a starting point. We're certainly, as we've indicated, prepared to react to suggestions or offers from the two cities, which we are patiently awaiting. I think in terms of comparing this project with some other project, or that other project, it might be more interesting to note that our offer is, in your own terms, infinitely more than anything your government offered. So maybe that's a more relevant comparison than the one you chose to make.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I remind the minister again of offers made by previous governments to other cities, let us say, Lloydminster — more than \$10 million to Lloydminster — and your government can't even find as much as was offered to Lloydminster. You can't find that for Regina and Saskatoon. And that's a hard fact. No amount of attempting to dodge will in any way change that. The facts are that with respect to the area around Saskatoon, the capital cost was put up entirely by the Government of Saskatchewan, much of it by the previous Liberal government, much of it by the NDP government, which built the water supply system. And I am suggesting to you that that is an appropriate model when you are needing to provide water certainly for two communities — certainly two communities, and for other communities in all likelihood.

It's useful to note that with the water supply board system, many communities have been added which weren't thought to be clients of the water supply board when the system started. That's certainly true with respect to the communities north and west of the Saskatchewan River, and yet they have become clients of the water supply board, because those communities, the Martensvilles, needed it, and others . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now look, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Let's have some order. The member is asking a question.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I will direct some questions to the minister who obviously, at least in the opinion of the member for Regina South, is doing badly, since otherwise he wouldn't be interrupting so egregiously. I want now to ask the minister again: does he not think that a solution along the lines of the water

supply board's solution, which operates extensively north and east of the Gardiner Dam, is a good solution and might equally be applied to communities which are south and east of the Qu'Appelle Dam?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — There is no question that it might be a good solution, and it might work adequately, and it is something that we will certainly consider.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I want to raise a couple of other questions with the minister, and they concern the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, and their views with respect to the property tax as a preserve of municipal governments as opposed to school boards. You will be aware of the resolutions passed by SUMA on this issue, essentially saying that in their judgment no health services or no education services should be financed by property taxes, and I'm summarizing, but I think summarizing fairly. I ask the minister whether or not he shares that view of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, or whether his government has a different view.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, I think it would be safe to say that I do not favor the absolute aspect of the resolutions that SUMA has put forward. I think that the government doesn't favor it. You could find resolutions to the opposite point of view from SSTA, as I'm sure you are aware. What we feel has happened in recent years is that the provincial share of funding in education has gone down.

We feel that SUMA has a point in terms of the method in which property taxes are applied. We are sitting down with SUMA over the course of this next year, looking at the whole area of provincial and municipal funding, trying to find some equitable, fair, and hopefully more meaningful methods of providing their needs. But the feeling of the government, my own feeling, is that some portion of property tax should continue to go toward the funding of education. Of course, the argument is local autonomy, which I think we are all in favor of.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — One question, Mr. Minister. Does the consideration which you are doing with respect to SUMA involve an elimination of the system of grants developed over the last number of years: to home-owners, called the property improvement grant: to renters, called the renters rebate: and the senior citizens grant program, the senior citizens property tax grant program? Does your consideration involve an elimination or a reduction of those, or are those programs part of the policy of your government?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I think since we are discussing the budgetary expenditures for the '82-83 it's obvious where we came on that one. We maintained our level of funding for the property owners as well as introducing our mortgage plan, which everybody is aware of. We increased above the March indications for the senior citizens and for the renters. In terms of our discussions with SUMA we will be prepared, as we've indicated to them, to discuss any area of municipal funding. That has been their request; that has been our response. It is the policy of this government at this time to maintain the property improvement grants, if I can throw the three programs into one title.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just have a few questions, Mr. Minister. Picking up on the second last question, with respect to the removal of the costs of education from property tax, do I take it that the minister acknowledges the logic of SUMA's position but denies its practicality?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — No, I don't think that would be a fair statement. I'm simply saying that in order to maintain a level of local autonomy, which the trustees' association, most of the school boards, and an awful lot of the citizens of the province, agree is an essential, it's necessary to have some local source to draw funds. At the present time it's the property tax, and that's all I'm saying.

I think that there is a need to possibly look at the percentage of funding, to discuss the whole mechanism of the thing — the fact that the school boards make their demands and then the municipalities have to work within those, and tack their mill rates on top, and so on. There are some decisions that have to be made, some studies that have to be done, but I don't think that your statement was accurate.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What I hear the municipalities saying, among other things, is that it is an inequitable way to raise money for schools. It is based upon no particular logic — neither the ability to pay, nor any sort of a user-pay logic. Its sole recommendation is that it is fairly simple to administer. Would you acknowledge that the practice of paying education costs on property taxes is based upon neither the ability to pay, nor any kind of a user-pay logic? It's simply grown up over the years because it was a relatively simple thing to administer.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that it would be far fairer to base the costs of education either upon those who use them, acknowledging that might be difficult because it is of general benefit to everyone to have a well-educated society, or perhaps, more appropriately, on some kind of an ability to pay. So I'd ask you to respond to what I hear the municipalities saying in part about the education tax.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I suppose in answer, Mr. Chairman, we have indicated that we are prepared to look at it and determine whether in fact it is the best way. Contrary to the statement that you made, there is an element of equity in the system. Maybe it's not the most equitable, but there's an element in that assessment of the property and the property owner obviously would indicate an ability to pay. The grant system that is in place has an element of equity, based on income tax and so forth, and a large portion of funding comes from there.

I think the vocal member of SUMA's executive on this issue over the last number of years has obviously been the president, Mayor Brady from Carlyle. I believe if you hold a conversation with Mr. Brady, he will indicate that his primary purpose in introducing his resolutions is to get discussion, to try to find answers. We're certainly prepared to approach that. We're obviously not going to do it here.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well I say, Mr. Minister, it deserves no particular response, but I disagree with those who believe that local autonomy will disappear if there is not a very large element of local funding. I'd remind the minister that in the first part of this century almost all the costs of school were paid through property tax, and the Department of Education played a much larger role, a much more paternalistic role in education than it does now. Now we have a system whereby the department pays a fairly hefty percentage of the cost of education and has a much smaller role in the schools. So I suggest that if history teaches us anything, it may be that there is not a lot of connection between our property taxes and local autonomy.

I want, Mr. Minister, to ask you about the transit grants. As I understand the situation,

the municipalities were promised a level of funding in the budget which was read in March but never passed. I will refrain from commenting on the misapprehensions that resulted in such an unfortunate chain of circumstances. However, there was some concern expressed by the municipalities when the transit grants, in particular, which were promised in the March budget were not in fact forthcoming. I have a number of articles here from the Sifton paper. I'm sure that I don't need to read them to you.

I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, what rationale led to the decision to cut back on the amount of funding which the municipalities had come to expect for transit.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, prior to answering the question, possibly I could comment briefly on the preamble. The member opposite indicated that he disagreed with the position that local autonomy would be lost if, in fact, property taxes were taken off the educational aspect. It is interesting to note that you are disagreeing with the policy of your government for the past 11 years, which is certainly interesting.

The other point: if I want opinions on whether or not we are affecting local autonomy, I might ask the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association rather than the member opposite.

Anyway, in answering your question, the specifics of what you are asking, in March, the election platform, that was presented in this House and never passed as you indicated, proposed to raise the per capita grants to the cities for transit to \$5 from \$3. We had our own platform when we became government; we set about to institute the planks of that platform. I believe the people of the province are quite satisfied with our performance to date in that respect. We indicated to the municipalities that we would do everything we could to maintain the things that had been promised, that had led to budgeting. And we, in fact, met the promises in terms of revenue sharing and so on and so forth. This one we chose not to. We simply could not meet all the requests. We did not reduce it; we left it at the level that it had been at the year before.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, let me say by way of background that the minister is not noted for his arrogance as some of your colleagues are and, therefore, I find your comment, that our views are of little merit, somewhat peculiar and out of character. I'm surprised that an elected official who at least has a party with the same name as John Diefenbaker would not understand that the opposition also have role to play in the affairs of the government, and our views I suggest, Mr. Minister, are ones that should be listened to as well. I'm not suggesting they are the only views.

Mr. Minister, I want to discuss the review of The Planning and Development Act, if I might, for a moment.

Planning and development has long been a source of tension between the developers on one hand, and the planners on the other, if I may categorize the urban people involved in urban planning as planners. It's often been a tension between those two groups, the developers wanting less control and more freedom to operate, the planners saying, "But no, there are other considerations which we want to impose on any development you bring forth." And this tension exists.

I am sure that your comments, your press release (and I have a copy of it dated December 1, '82, which suggested there be mechanisms to encourage investment and stimulate development in Saskatchewan), I am sure it was welcomed by the developers. I'm equally sure that it was greeted by some apprehension by planners who may have

been afraid that this would mean a diminished role for planners in the affairs of municipal development.

And I'd ask the minister for a comment on whether the minister sees a planning and development act, a new planning and development act, weakening or strengthening the role of urban planning in the development of municipalities.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, I have to disagree a little bit with the premise upon which the question was based: that planners have been concerned that developers have wanted a reduction in control. I think what both groups want is a clarification of the rules of the game that they're playing under, and that's all we propose to do. We don't intend to remove any of the public input process. We hope to shorten up the time process and do some of the approval processes coincidentally, rather than stringing them out as has been the case in the past. In essence, the intent of the review and the rewrite is to clarify, to streamline, simplify if you will, and at the same time not remove any of the controls that are in place — simply make them easier to work within.

I might add that the people who have been doing the review are the planning development from the Department of Urban Affairs, plus some people from outside, plus some developers. So we've tried to put together a group that represents the various components of this thing. It's our intention to try to get these groups operating in a co-operative manner, rather than in an adversary manner, and you are right in your first statement that they have been at great conflict. We feel that by cleaning up the legislation, a good deal of that conflict can be removed and we can carry on in a co-operative manner that will allow us to develop this province in the way it should have been.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, the minister reminds me of the song from Oklahoma, "Why Can't the Cowman and the Farmer be Friends?" They can't be friends because their interests are diverse. They both want the same land for different reasons.

I suggest to the minister that you're going to have some difficulty getting planners and developers to break bread at the same table in the spirit of harmony, because their interests are diverse. Planners want to maximize their profit on a given development, and that is the system, and I'm not being critical of them for it. The developers want to maximize the profit of any given development. Planners want to maximize the public benefit from any given development. That often results in something less than the maximization of profit. A simple example is the setting aside of public areas. The developer mustn't make a lot of money when he has got to set aside some area for the public — public reserve, as I think it is usually called.

So I suggest to the minister that when you express the wish that these people will break bread in the spirit of harmony and the peaceable kingdom will exist in the area of municipal planning, you are disregarding the very nature of the relationship. The nature of the relationship is, of necessity, an adversarial relationship. They have different interests. I would seek the minister's assurance that the controls exercised by planners to municipal and provincial governments will not be weakened in the conclusions that are reached as a result of this review.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the member suggested that he was a little disappointed in my new arrogance. I am a little disappointed in your new-found cynicism. I believe it is very possible to bring these two groups together. The

example that you used of setting aside public reserve land has never been brought to me by a developer. There seems to be no problem with that aspect.

I think the key thing that we are trying to get is a balance between those two interests. There is nothing wrong with profit in Saskatchewan, and we certainly are interested in maintaining and getting maximum public benefits. The two can work together I believe, and we hope that the work we do in cleaning up that legislation will in fact lead in that direction. I guess that I just have more faith in the two groups than has been expressed opposite.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's a fine line to draw between faith and realism, Mr. Minister.

Those are all of the general policy questions I have to answer. I have a number of standard questions. I am quite prepared to accept them in writing, and in some ways I think it is more preferable. I want to know the names, positions and salaries of all members of your staff, whether that be in connection with . . . I will only ask the question once, and will not repeat it in the culture and youth estimates which are coming up this afternoon. What I want are the names, salaries and positions of all members of your personal staff.

With respect to your staff, I would appreciate knowing whether or not you have anyone who reports to you who is on contract. I would also like to know whether or not the department has retained the full-time services of anyone through a contract as distinct from hiring them. If there are, I would appreciate knowing the . . . I am not giving you time to copy these down. I am assuming that you can use tomorrow's *Hansard* if you have to. If the department has any people or is employing the full-time services of any person through contract. I would appreciate knowing the terms of the contract, and in particular the terms with respect to severance.

I would like to know the amount of entertainment expenses incurred by you, any member of your staff, and your deputy, since assuming office on May 8.

I would like to know how many vacant positions there are in the department, and how many of those positions are frozen in the sense that they are not being filled for an indefinite period.

We have asked a variety of ministers whether or not any member of their staff has a CVA car. We have been told there isn't, so I assume that's the case in your office, as well. But as a matter of form, I'll accept the minister's assurance that there are not.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Just to clarify, my deputy does have a CVA car.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, apart from your deputy.

With respect to the estimates, as well, I'd refer the member to (and particularly his officials who have to prepare the information) the estimates given with respect to the budget in March of last year. I would ask where the figures in the estimates in the dark blue book, as distinct from the light blue book, where the figures in the estimates which you provided under the various subvotes differ from the figures in our estimates. I would appreciate an explanation for the reasons and an explanation of the difference. I asked the question of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and got the response (which was exactly what I wanted) back in about a week or so. I thank the minister for his courteous and prompt response. So if I could have all of that, if I could have your

commitment to provide that explanation, I would not have any more questions on subvote 1.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, I have the written information for everything except the last question. We can provide that very quickly, in a day or two.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you might, for my information — pardon my ignorance — explain to me the relationship and the status of The Planning and Development Act in relation to Bill 61. Bill 61 is in respect to The Northern Municipalities Act which is on the order paper.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Bill 61, as I understand it, proposes, much like The Urban Municipality Act, to define the broad powers of municipalities, in this case, the municipalities in the North. The Planning and Development Act deals more specifically with planning and development areas, and will apply to the communities in the North the same as it does to the communities in the South, once they are brought into the two, three years, whenever they complete that transition. I hope that's adequate.

In fact in the process of rewriting it, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan has sat in on a number of the sessions and has provided some very valuable input into the thing. Obviously, it can't all be applied right away, but as they become fullfledged communities, it will apply the same as anyplace else.

MR. YEW: — Does the minister anticipate to have established planning districts in those areas?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I would say that at this point it's very uncertain. I would say the answer would be no, now, but what will happen in the future remains to be seen. Since we are going into '82-83 I don't see how we could go beyond that. If in fact that becomes a necessity down the road, that's something we would look at. As of today the answer would be no.

MR. YEW: — I raised that point, Mr. Minister, because I have with me just one of the presentations that is being contemplated by the communities up north. They are concerned with respect to the establishment of district planning committees. They definitely would like to have input in those areas, I am sure.

Getting back to The Planning and Development Act in the southern regions, Mr. Minister, have you set aside any funds to allow the local municipalities to review the proposals and provide them with funds for consultant and legal advice to put forth their recommendations for The Planning and Development Act?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — No, Mr. Chairman, we feel the majority of the communities, in fact, all have adequate funds to respond. All we are asking for is a response from the councils and so on. We haven't provided any funds; we didn't feel it was necessary.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to direct a couple of questions to the minister. In respect to the ambulance service in the province and the government's commitment in respect to ambulance service, it is my understanding that the government commissioned a committee to review the future of ambulance service in the province. What I would like to know, first of all, is whether the report is complete. I will leave it at that for the answer.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, the government did a great deal more than merely commission a report. We injected half-a-million dollars into that program so it could, in fact, exist through this year because of the crying need that was out there.

In terms of the report, the Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Health undertook the process. He had numerous opportunities for public input; a great many members of the Saskatchewan public took part in that. I understand that the report has been prepared. I understand that the Minister of Health has it. It has not, at this time, been presented to cabinet. I believe it is complete, if that's the answer to your question.

MR. KOSKIE: — Is it the intention, as far as the minister can indicate, to continue the ambulance service under his jurisdiction? And I'm wondering since it is under his jurisdiction why he hasn't been receiving the report.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I think, Mr. Chairman, that it has long been the position of this party, both in opposition and now in government, that that program is in fact a health program. Whether or not that is the recommendation of the committee that studied it, I'm not sure, but I would say that our leanings at least are toward moving that program into health where we feel it belongs.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 40 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 24 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

URBAN AFFAIRS

Vote 62

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Item 4

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Could the minister supply us with your total budgeted expenditures on Futurescan? I understand this is not to occur this year, but to occur some time in the future. I wonder if you could give me either now or in writing the total amount you expect to spend on this as the provincial government.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — That is the total amount of money that we'll be transferring, estimated, to Saskatoon. We have in fact presented that. We don't expect to lose any money. We expect to make money on that project; it'll be returned.

Item 4 agreed to.

Item 5 agreed to.

Vote 62 agreed to.

SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

RESOURCES DIVISION

URBAN AFFAIRS

Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 24

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 24 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

URBAN AFFAIRS

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 24

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 24 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

URBAN AFFAIRS

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 24

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 24 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

RESOURCES DIVISION

URBAN AFFAIRS

Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 24

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 24 agreed to.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank my officials for their help, and compliment the opposition on the direct line of questioning. We appreciated it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'd like to thank the minister and his officials.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would like to thank the minister and his officials for the co-operative and very helpful approach to these estimates. We look forward to picking it up again in the new parliament when we have a tad more time to deal with them.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CULTURE AND RECREATION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 7

Item 1

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce Mr. Bill Clarke, the deputy minister of culture and recreation; Mr. Dick Clarke, the executive director of cultural activity; and Mr. Ron Borden, the executive director of central services.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I entered my office just about 10 minutes ago, and someone had left an article on my desk which says it all, Mr. Minister: "Students want jobs, not more excuses." We went through last summer with a very difficult year for students who tried to find employment, without anything that could, in any sense, be described as extraordinary. I'm not denying that there may have been a few programs left from the '60s and '70s that we had, but I think it's fair to say we had no extraordinary programs to assist students.

The students this year are going to face an even more difficult time of it. I do not envy a student who comes out in April and tries to find a job in this market with this government. There are 24 people seeking every job opening in Regina, 34 in Saskatoon and 124 in Prince Albert. I expect students are not going to get to the top of that list. I would appreciate it, Mr. Minister, if you could tell the Assembly where you think we are going with respect to student employment, and what hope we may have to offer these students who will graduate?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member is aware, we instituted an interdepartmental committee who did a thorough review of the needs in terms of student employment for this year. They have submitted a report. The program that will result from that report will be announced very early in the next session. The minister's youth advisory committee has been very instrumental in the recommendations they have put forward. While we don't guarantee that every young student who wants a job will get one, we feel that it will probably be the best program that has been announced in recent times in this respect. We're quite confident that we'll meet a great number of the needs of the young people. We are totally aware of the problems. I could make a speech on the fact that we've created the only province with a positive number of jobs and so on. We've all heard that so I'll let it go at that. We know it's a . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You know, I think, Mr. Minister, I might appreciate yet one more rendition of this speech that we've heard so often by the Premier and the Minister of Finance. Your rendition might be interesting. It's like "Snowbird." It's always worth while to hear it from one new voice.

It's a fair point that your program maybe better than any that has been instituted in recent times, because this is the first time we have needed it in recent times. Until the Tory deep-freeze settled over this province there wasn't any particular need for such a

drastic program. Mr. Minister, I can well appreciate that yours is the best in recent times.

Last summer you studied the program all through the summer. When the students were looking for jobs, you were studying it. This summer you say you have some response to it. I hope that the 12 months you had will produce something for the students. I can well imagine, as I say, it's the best that has come in some time. I take it from the minister's comments that we will learn of the program at or around the time that your next budget appears. Is that what I understood the minister to say?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — In terms of when the program will be released, I don't have exact details. I imagine possibly the throne speech, possibly later. It will be in place in time, if that's the inference of that word. It won't be out in time; it will be there in time. If it's necessary to announce it earlier, we'll do that. I guess that would be the extent of it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Is the minister prepared to release the study that you received from a departmental committee, or is that considered classified?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — No, I don't think releasing that would accomplish very much at this time.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I want your specific comments on an issue which we discussed last summer. Since it wasn't you who piloted the bill through, it was not possible to get your response, but I'd like it. It has to do with the arts board. Heretofore the arts board has been considered a non-partisan board. Granted that their appointments were only order in council and could be changed at any time, nevertheless three governments changed in this province with all concerned assuming that that was sacrosanct and they were not partisan appointments. I am not, and I don't want the conversation to degenerate into the level of my asking you to defend specific names and specific people, but I would appreciate a general comment on the arts board itself, and I was disappointed to see that you found it necessary to change this board. I think this board is different than some others. This board controls, has a direct influence, on the cultural life of the province. In a sense this board has a direct effect on men's and women's minds and the way people think. I think that is why other governments treated it as sacrosanct, and it wasn't changed on the change of an administration. I wonder, Mr. Minister, why you felt it necessary to break with that tradition, which I think was sound and in the best interests of society, and reappoint your own people to the board.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, there's a . . . I have problems with the final comments of your own people. I am personally not that familiar with any of these people. I might have personally known one or two. I would indicate that the chairman of the board is a previous member. Two or three other members are returnees, if that's the proper term. It's what we use in sport. I don't know if it's right in the arts board or not. We have put in place a board that we feel is representative of the performing arts, that has a certain amount of background from outside the performing arts, which was a concern that had been expressed by others, and we feel that we would have no problems justifying this board to anyone in the province and in fact we've had no complaints about this board. We feel that it's doing an excellent job. We're totally satisfied and from the comments we get from the community, from the artistic community, they appear quite satisfied as well.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I think the minister was answering a question which I didn't ask. I specifically refrained from asking you to defend your appointments. What I did ask you to defend, Mr. Minister, was the principle involved.

You have, for some reason or other, come to the conclusion that you could not work with the old board. In essence you treated the board as partisan and you changed it, and I guess my question is: why were you unable to accept the principle that various administrations had worked well with, that that board, as distinct from many others, was sacrosanct?

Let me compare it, by way of example, with the board for the Centre of the Arts. I think various administrations changed that board, and I don't think I would have. I went to great lengths to criticize you in that regard. That's been done by other administrations. But I think the arts board was treated as different by other administrations, and I would appreciate your comment on the principle, that other governments accepts, as treating the arts board as beyond the level of partisan politics.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I find it a little disturbing to hear the member indicate that the arts board is the only board in government that is above partisan politics. I'd like to think we can find a couple more if we looked around.

In attempting to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Are you ready? Are you done? In attempting to answer the question, I would have to do what you'd determined not to do. You don't want to force me to defend my appointments; I won't force you to defend the appointments that were made previously.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, is the minister refusing to comment on the principle of a non-partisan arts board which is immune from change on the change of administration?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I'm not refusing to comment on anything. The arts board is an arm's-length organization that is put in place with a specific job to do. We placed a new board; we are quite satisfied with that board; we maintained some of the previous members, and that's the way it is. It's there, and it's doing an excellent job.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, in your view, was the old board doing a satisfactory job?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I didn't operate with the old board. I would find it very difficult to make that assessment.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, how could you pretend to change the board until you made an assessment as to whether or not their performance was adequate?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We simply made the changes because we felt that this board would be one that we could work with. If you want to get specific, we felt there was a weakness on the other board in terms of a feeling for the administration and business field. There were possibly 70 per cent practising artists. The recommendation when the board was put in place initially was that it be somewhere in the area of a third, maybe a little higher, of practising artists. We have gone back to that formula and created a board that takes in a number of practising, or people in the artistic community, and yet has some people from the outside, so that we're not always asking peers to judge their group when they're distributing money.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — But surely, Mr. Minister, if you felt the board had a flat side — the business community, I guess, is what you're saying — surely if you felt the board had a flat side, the appropriate time to deal with that is when the appointments come up, as they do: virtually every year there are some new people appointed. Why not handle your concern in that fashion? I'm by no means admitting the legitimacy of that concern. Why not handle your concern in that fashion? Why change the entire board, as if the other board was dominated by political wheel-horses in the former administration?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, I believe the process had been to add, to change, two or three people over the course of a year. We felt we couldn't pick up that flat side, if you will, by doing that, so we changed a few more. We left some, but, as I indicated, we now are totally satisfied with the board. It's doing an excellent job, and that's all I can say.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I want to register, Mr. Minister, the strongest disappointment in that decision. I think that was one decision you people made which was not in the best interests of the artistic community, and I don't think many people in the artistic community think it was. You may not have had many complaints, but I'll be surprised, Mr. Minister, if you've had a lot of people congratulating you either, on that move. I think that was a most unfortunate decision.

I want, Mr. Minister, if we may, to get off the area of the arts board and on to the area of Western Development Museum. I gathered, from an announcement that was made, that some extensive renovations will take place in the Saskatoon Western Development Museum building. I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, what plans there are to renovate North Battleford, which is in a very serious state of deterioration, and Yorkton, which is less serious but still in need of some improvement.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, as the member is aware, we had indicated to us very early in our tenure that the funding that had taken place over recent years for the Western Development Museum had allowed a lot of things to be in trouble, but primarily storage. Storage was the major issue that was presented to us. We had an opportunity to purchase a building about a block away from the Western Development Museum in Saskatoon that would solve storage problems for that specific centre but also could be, if they chose, centralized for all of them.

The decision on how the funds that we have allocated will be disbursed is not our decision. It's a decision of that independent board that runs the museum.

The communities you have indicated: North Battleford has desperate needs — as you are well aware, that hangar could blow over tomorrow — in terms of storage; Yorkton has some problems. These things will be dealt with by the board, a board which we are quite sure will handle that decision-making process.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, what requests have been made to you, Mr. Minister, by the board of the Western Development Museum with respect to North Battleford and Yorkton?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I'm sorry?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What requests, if any, have been made to you by the board of the Western Development Museum with respect to the facilities at North Battleford and Yorkton?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We have had some correspondence and some concerns expressed very clearly by the chairman of the board on behalf of the board. The funding that we have provided is for the WDM to deal with their problems, and we're not telling them where to put it. We're saying, "Here's the money; solve your problems." They say they are quite satisfied with what has happened. In fact, it's indicated it's a bit of a breath of fresh air.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Am I correct in my understanding that those funds were requested for Saskatoon, and are to be largely used in Saskatoon to purchase the building?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Within those funds was a specific opportunity to purchase the building. That took place. There is also within that group of funds financing for other problems and the museum will make those decisions. Clear enough?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, I think so. I would appreciate it if the minister would supply me with the total volume of the grant, which I think I have if I were to dig for it, but you may save me the effort, and also, the amount expended on the new building, and the difference therefore left over for other projects of the board.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We'll provide that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to get on, if I may for a moment, to the lotteries, Mr. Minister. And a couple of routine questions first. Since assuming office on May 8, 1982, have any changes been made to the Provincial, the Western, or the Super Loto, or any of the other games that may now be run? I am thinking in particular, it seemed to me there was some instant feature added to one or other of the games. I'd appreciate it if you'd give me either here, if it can be done concisely, or in writing if it can't, the changes made to the games operated through the lottery foundation.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — There have been a number of changes made in the Western Canada Lottery Foundation's modus operandi, if that's the question. There are a couple of bonus draws. Is that the type of thing you're interested in?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No. I'm not so much thinking of the bonus draws, which is normally a way of dealing with excess funds. I am thinking more of any changes made to the game to make the tickets more attractive, such as additional instant features or anything of that sort.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Well, Mr. Chairman we've introduced two new games, the 6-49 game that you are aware of, and a tick-tack-toe instance game, but there have been no meaningful changes to the ones that were in place.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Could you provide the opposition, and myself in particular, with the financial statements of the games for . . . It may be public knowledge, I'm not sure if it's in the library or not, but I'd appreciate it if you'd provide me with financial statements for the games for 1982.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We can provide you now with the statement of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation and our annual report. Is that the request?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — One further question then on the features of the game. Is any

consideration being given to the addition of any features to the game to make it more attractive, such as instant features and so on? Are there any changes being considered now that would be implemented in the foreseeable future?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I suppose it would be fair to say that the Interprovincial Lottery Foundation is in a constant situation of change. They are constantly reviewing the games they are offering, what things can be done to make them more attractive, how they can be made more productive. There is nothing in place at this time or in the immediate future, but it would be incorrect to say that there may not be. It's not really a provincial . . . Marketing them is done through the foundations, the Western Canada and the Interprovincial as I'm sure you are aware, and they are constantly reviewing them, and trying to improve them.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister will undoubtedly be aware that the manner in which lotteries are handled in this province is probably unique in that no part of that revenue (at least when I was associated with it) went to the Department of Finance. All of it went to the SaskSport trust fund, and was thereby distributed to quite a number of institutions and charities, and so on, and sports groups. Likewise, only SaskSport sold the tickets. I'm not asking for an explanation of that, Mr. Minister. I'm somewhat familiar with it. But it will come as no surprise to anyone involved with it to learn that at least some people in finance have cast covetous eyes on the profits made by the lotteries. There has, I think, been, at times in the past, suggestion that this province ought to handle its lotteries as other provinces do, that is to put at least a portion of the net revenue into the Department of Finance.

Is any serious consideration being given to changing the structure of SaskSport as the sole marketing agency of the tickets, and as the sole recipient of the profits?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I say in a not entirely jocular vein, good luck with it. As long as you're minister you will have to defend that territory. Ours is an excellent system and I wish you all the best of luck in defending that territory from those who would encroach on it. I tell you, if you haven't already found out, that there are those who would encroach on it.

I want to ask you about policy and planning. I understand that in the policy and planning sections there are either a number of terminations, or layoffs, or however you want to style it, or a number of positions not filled. Perhaps the question can best be answered by asking you to compare staff levels on May 8, 1982, and the staff levels at present in your policy and planning section.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The staff complement in policy and planning is exactly the same as it was in March of 1982.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Will the minister then confirm that there was no intention to eliminate or severely reduce in size the policy and planning area?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — No, there are no plans to reduce or eliminate that person.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I was hoping I might get an opportunity to question the minister about the next item in the absence of the Attorney General, since he seems to be acting as legal counsel with respect to the reorganization. I do so with some temerity, because

I suspect I'm going to get the same speech all over again. I'm not going to get into the area of the reorganization, since I know full well what that will draw.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Ralph will answer that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, Ralph will try for a change. I do want to ask you for your position with respect to heritage conservation. Do you see the need for any changes in your department, or the fashion in which your department carries out its functions with respect to heritage conservation?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I understand that we're dealing with the '82-83 estimates. I see no problem with the heritage conservation program as it is now. I don't think I'm giving anything away if I indicate that we have talked about the possibility, since it makes an awful lot of municipal grants, whether in fact it's in the right department or not. I don't believe there are any plans afoot at the moment.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Does the minister feel then, in any way, overstaffed in that area?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Then I take it, in the area of heritage conservation, there are no excess positions which might be eliminated in any reorganization.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I think whatever happens in terms of reorganization will happen in the future budget, not in this one. We've indicated that there are government reorganizations. The Attorney General has indicated that very clearly. I don't think that has anything to do with these estimates.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I think, Mr. Minister, my question has everything to do with these estimates. I wasn't asking you what you planned in the future. I was asking you whether or not, in the year under review (and I was careful to limit my question to the year under review), you felt you had any excess staff in the area of heritage conservation. You said you didn't. Do I take it from that that you would see no need for the elimination of any positions in the area of heritage conservation?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — At this time, no. That could change as we review it.

MR. KOSKIE: — I have a couple of questions. The question of athletic scholarships has been consistently raised with the government. I wonder whether the minister could indicate whether any policy has been evolved during the course of the year in respect to the support of athletic scholarships to the university.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We have had considerable discussion on the question of athletic scholarships, not to the university per se, but to student athletes. We are pursuing that. It's kind of strange that after all the years in power, again, we keep coming back and switching sides on these questions. Whether it's water pipeline or athletic scholarships or whatever, we seem to constantly be coming up with positions totally different than the ones that were expressed previously.

MR. KOSKIE: — One wants to start to listen to the minister. In every question we ask in respect to the policy of this government, his answer is. "You had 11 years in which to do it." Now, if you can say that on every question, then there would be nothing left for you to do. All I can say is that you must believe that, because you haven't done anything.

How do you like that? I want to go on with my areas of questioning here.

Another program which we had in place . . . I want to say in respect to athletic scholarships, we were carrying on the discussions with the universities and with the athletes. I want to say that I was basically in support of it. That's the reason why I asked the minister whether he had a policy. Let me go on to another area of concern to me and to many of the people of the province.

In the last budget that was brought down by the New Democratic Party, we had \$43 million budgeted for cultural and recreational facilities. I want to say you can't get off the hook now by saying that we didn't address it, because in the last budget we certainly did address it. We had set out \$43 million over, I believe it was, four years. There are a large number of communities which have received a tremendous amount of assistance in building up the amenities in their communities such as curling rinks and skating rinks. I want to say that there are other communities in the process of developing further recreational facilities. I would like to know whether or not, in view of the fact that the department is going to be phased out, or if indeed it is not going to be phased out, as the Attorney General indicated the cabinet had made no decision (our information is that it is likely to be), regardless of that, I would like to ask the minister: what is his position? Will he, in fact, be providing grants to communities who are seeking support which the previous government provided and planned to provide?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, I believe that the member opposite and I could stand here and yell at each other all day about what our government and their government had or has not done . . . I think I will just leave that assessment to the people of P.A.-Duck Lake, who made it very clear what they thought of what . . . (inaudible) . . .

In terms of the program that was announced in the non-budget of March, it was a \$43 million program spread over five years. We chose not to institute that program because we had some very real difficulties with it. A number of provincial organizations, most specifically SUMA, indicated that they had real concerns with the conditional programs. We chose to delay the implementation — in fact that we are going to implement one — for at least a year, while we had a look at the thing. SUMA indicated that they had problems with providing money to communities to build projects which were simply not in their minds feasible. There is a curling rink in southern Saskatchewan which was built and never opened. There are all kinds of examples of abuse. We have looked at the thing. We will be making an announcement in terms of a facilities program in due course.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to indicate that the program that we had in respect to the grants — in order to qualify, the municipalities that were involved had the decision-making process as to whether or not it was, in fact, in the interest of that community. I find it rather strange that the minister now is really criticizing the local communities and the local municipal bodies that participated in the past. I take it that what the minister is saying is that they were unable to handle it because of the example that he presented here. Clearly, if you are going to look at a future grant system, are you going to allow the input in the decision-making at the local level, the community level, or are you as you indicated in your previous answer, going to be removing that?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — It never ceases to amaze me how the members opposite can draw things totally opposite as to what are said. We intend to increase the opportunity for communities to have input. In fact, what we have been doing is not

criticizing communities; we've been listening to them, listening very carefully to them. We've been listening to their parent organization, to SUMA. We have been going through the process. We will be making an announcement in terms of that. We'll solve all those problems that were made the last week in April. We'll get the whole thing straightened out.

MR. KOSKIE: — One other area. I wonder whether the minister has reviewed the possibility in conjunction with the cultural and recreational facilities — whether or not he is considering also operational grants in respect to the communities.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Yes we have reviewed and are considering.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much. I want to ask a series of questions which are of a more detailed nature, and one has to do with the grant to the open door society. I would appreciate knowing what the amount of your grant to the Saskatchewan Open Door Society was. It may be the Regina Open Door Society, I'm not sure.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Is the question the amount of funding that's been provided to the Regina Open Door Society?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's right.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — That would be \$26,000.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Their needs have sharply decreased, Mr. Minister, I see. I note from your annual report the amount provided in 1981 was \$50,000, at least that's my handwritten note. You are now providing \$26,000. I'm wondering if you can explain the decrease, or perhaps I have the figures wrong.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — You asked for the Regina Open Door Society. They also have open door societies in Saskatoon and Yorkton. The total grant is \$57,000.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. That was the figure I wanted.

With respect to the promotion of crafts, Mr. Minister — in 1981 there was a promotion at the Saskatchewan House in London, England, where a series of displays of photos of Saskatchewan crafts was organized. Saskatchewan crafts are among the many things that Saskatchewan does well. Some of our crafts are at a world level in terms of quality, and I would appreciate the minister's comments on the effort your department took in 1982 to promote these crafts. Was anything done to promote the crafts?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — There is presently a crafts display in Government House in London. It's been there for a number of months. I don't know if . . . That's obviously not the total package. There have been a number of crafts fairs around the province. The one in Battleford is obviously a prime example — an exceptional display. There's been a number of things. But there is a display under way over there.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, without in any sense being argumentative about it, let me urge upon the minister and your department increased efforts to promote Saskatchewan crafts. They are of a quality that could be sold world wide, and I would urge upon the minister increase efforts to promote crafts. I think we could develop quite a good cottage industry which would serve two purposes: (1) provide some employment and income for Saskatchewan people, and (2) promote and enhance the

Saskatchewan cultural life. So I urge that upon the minister.

With respect to the museums and galleries grant. I would appreciate knowing the total for '81-82 and I assume you can give me the total for the '82-83 fiscal year as well.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — In terms of museums and galleries . . . Pay attention. I don't want to have to repeat this. The 1981-82 budget for museums and galleries was \$190,000. The 1982-83 budget is \$494,000.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am momentarily suffering from a dry pen. Perhaps you could give me those in writing. My pen went dry just as I was writing them down.

If that represents actual increase in funding to local museums and galleries around the province, I congratulate the minister on it. It is overdue and needed.

With respect to the multicultural festival series, is it continuing and, if so, at what level of funding?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The multicultural festival funding is for this year at 78,000, an increase of \$3,000.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'd appreciate — and the minister might want to give me these in writing — a list of the multicultural projects funded in the '82 year. You may have them there and can give them to me. If that's possible, it's preferable. If you don't, I'd accept them in writing later.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We have them, but it might be simpler if we provided them.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — With respect to heritage conservation, I'd appreciate knowing the number of buildings or sites declared to be heritage sites in 1982-83. You must have a list by now that's virtually up to date.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We can give you a list now that is maybe a month behind. We can send you an up-to-date list in a day or so.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I think I might prefer the up-to-date list in a day or so, Mr. Minister.

Saskatchewan Heritage Advisory Board. I think I've got these names correct. I would like to know who sits on it and what level of remuneration is paid to the appointees.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The people who sit on the heritage advisory board are: Ian Wilson, Archie Campbell, Eldon Johnson, Ross Keith, Bonnie Pearson, Joe Moran, Mary Heimbecker, Dr. William Sarjeant, Jessie Cameron, Mary Kischuk, Dr. Ted Regehr and Linda Weigl. The chairman receives \$50 a day, the members \$35.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A remarkably frugal level of pay, I may say. They're obviously doing it for the love of it.

The Saskatchewan Heritage Property Review Board. I'd like to know who sits on that board and what their levels of remuneration are.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The members are: Dr. Terrence Heath, Dr. John Archer,

Mel Bolen, Gladys Johnston and Jean Sloan. I don't have the remuneration level; we'll have to send that over.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — With respect to historic interpretation, I would appreciate knowing what was expended on restoration for: Cannington Manor, firstly; secondly, Fort Carleton; thirdly, the Candiack shrine; fourthly, Government House — in the year under review.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, Government House is under the Department of Government Services; it's not ours. We'll send you the information on the other three.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, the Archaeology Society of Saskatchewan (I don't know if I've got those words in the right order; it may be the Saskatchewan Archaeology Society, I'm not sure) has long been pressuring for an inventory of archaeological sites, something which I think is dearly needed. As property is developed, as land expands, and so on, many of these sites are permanently lost. If we have any hope of protecting them, I think it surely has to start with an inventory of the archaeological treasures and sites. I am wondering, Mr. Minister, if you have been able to make a start on this, and if not, what your approach to this is?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, the inventory which is being referred to presently exists; it's being constantly updated.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The Museum of Natural History. I would appreciate knowing the amount expended on the Museum of Natural History on any additions, any additional displays or renovations. I cannot extrapolate from the subvote what is spent on salaries, operating expenses, and what is spent on additional displays, restorations, and renovations to the building.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, approximately 50 per cent of the budgeted number is for salaries. The restoration to the Discovery Room, for instance, those types of things — that money comes under the Department of Government Services, I believe.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The capital funds come from the Department of Government Services. Is that what the minister is telling me for the Museum of Natural History?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We're involved in displays and so on, but for any major additions or renovations, such as the Discovery room, the money comes out of government services.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — With respect to the program, recreation for disabled persons, I am wondering if the minister can supply me with a list of projects for which grants were given. I guess this is the appropriate way to phrase it.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Yes, we'll send that over.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would also appreciate a comment on the coaching program. I'm searching my memory here, and I'm not having a lot of luck remembering what has been done with this over the last year. Have there been any extensions of the program

or any restrictions on the program? I ask the minister for the description of any extensions or restrictions to the coaching program. It is, I think, largely done by SaskSport and funded through your department.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — You were talking about the coaching certification program?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The program is run through the department, not through SaskSport. It's tied to a national program; it's ongoing. It is being extremely well received. The clinics are going on continuously. I think it's interesting to note that in Chicoutimi this year in the winter games, for the first time ever, all the coaches were certified for the first time. I think that's indicative of the type of progress that is being made.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Does our program now extend to certifying coaches at level 4? I'm just not sure.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The provincial responsibility for administration only goes to level 3. Levels 4 and 5 are national. We do have national clinics going on at that level in the province, but they're run by the national certification group.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just have one further question, and I may be asking you for yesterday's news. It seems to me that 1984, if my memory serves me correctly, would be the Saskatchewan Summer Games. I'm wondering where the process of selecting a site stands. Have we selected a site, or is that . . . Where does it stand?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — We have selected a site. Approximately two months ago we announced in North Battleford, at a major press conference, that North Battleford had been chosen and will in fact be hosting. North Battleford is the first Saskatchewan community to host a second game. As you are probably aware, they hosted the winter games previously. They are not the first, but they are one of a number who will be hosting for the second time. They have a very active committee. Their planning seems to be advancing very well. It looks like it will be an extremely successful event.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just have one final comment. There may be some comments on individual subvotes. I just want to compliment the minister. Don't look so suspicious. I am capable of that.

Your department has not been beset by the tumultuous firings and dismissals and layoffs that some of the departments have been.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's just going to disappear.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The member says it's just going to disappear. Not quite the point. I want to compliment the minister and express the wish that some of your colleagues might have taken a note out of your leaf-book.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions on subvote 1.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'd ask the minister for the same information with respect to these subvotes as I asked for with respect to urban affairs.

That is, I would appreciate an explanation of any differences between the estimates prepared and filed in the legislature in March, subsequent to the March budget, and any figures provided in the estimates that you tabled.

If I have your undertaking to provide that in writing, I would be satisfied with that.

Item 2 agreed to.

Items 3 and 4 agreed to.

Item 5

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There is a fairly sizeable increase in expenditure on the Museum of Natural History. I would appreciate it if the minister could provide me with an explanation for that.

I may say I'm not in any sense objecting, but there's an increase in expenditure of \$140,000 on that subvote.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — The increase in large part is taken up by three people in personal services, one of them an education extension officer, and a couple of people working with him.

Item 5 agreed to.

Items 6 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just wanted to make a comment under grants to recreational and cultural facilities grant program. I would urge upon the minister consideration of a reinstatement of that program. There is nothing budgeted this year because the program is finished. I urge upon the minister a reconsideration of that program.

Again, sitting on my desk in the Legislative Building was an excerpt from a comment made by the chairman of the OSAC, Organization of Saskatchewan Arts Councils, Marguerite Gallaway, suggesting there was a need for upgrading cultural facilities in the province. I entirely agree with that comment. I wonder if the department has given any consideration to killing two birds with one stone: (a) upgrading facilities with a reinstatement of a somewhat similar program, and (b) doing something about the deplorable level of unemployment which this government has visited upon the province. So you could kill two birds with one stone.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — As you're very well aware, we're the only province in Canada that has a net increase in the number of jobs, ad infinitum. However, you accused me earlier of not considering the Saskatoon School Trustees' Association rather than yourself. In this case I will take your suggestion into consideration and will, in fact, consider it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — May I say that the minister's reformation is remarkable indeed,

and I congratulate him on having seen the light.

Vote 7 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES
CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE
CULTURE AND RECREATION
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 7

Items 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 7 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)
CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE
CULTURE AND RECREATION
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 7

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 7 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'd like to thank the minister and his officials.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to extend my appreciation to the minister and his officials in this department for the courteous and co-operative way they've assisted us in getting at these estimates.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 3

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the Attorney General introduce his officials, please?

HON. MR. LANE: — On my right is Dr. Dick Gosse, deputy attorney general; behind me to my right, Jim Benning, assistant deputy attorney general; immediately behind, Gary Brandt, who is the director of administrative services; at the back, Thor Guttormsson, who is the executive director of court services.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I want first of all to indicate that in preparing for the review of these estimates, I thought that a good starting place would be to go back to *Hansard* and to extract all the wisdom that would be provided in the

examination of the estimates in the previous year. I could only come to one conclusion in respect to the then opposition critic for the Department of the Attorney General because, as I review the *Hansard*, I find that there were very few questions that the hon. now Attorney General felt inclined necessary to direct to the then attorney general.

I suppose that there were legitimate reasons for that. I leave to the imagination of hon. members that, when a department of the size of the Attorney General's came up and so few questions were directed to him, undoubtedly, in the view of the then opposition critic, things were reasonably well within the attorney general's department.

I realize that the Attorney General has had some 10 months. I have read a speech where he would be reviewing the department and evaluating it. As a starter, I would like the Attorney General, if he would, to indicate in his view what the ingredients of a good, efficient and respected judicial system are.

HON. MR. LANE: — Several factors are involved. Firstly, I'm of the view, and I have indicated it publicly, that the province of Saskatchewan and most justice systems are going to be faced with increasing demands for their services. In that regard, it's vital in my mind to make sure that the administrative structures are as efficient and as effective as possible.

We are going to have increasing demands on the courts by virtue of the charter of rights. I suspect that the young offenders act itself will have a tremendous impact on the operation of the court. So, we are looking at administrative structures such as computerization of the courts. In my mind, over the next few years, the administration of justice will have to get its administrative house as efficient as possible so that it can absorb all these increasing demands. That is a priority. It's a priority in my mind over new programs until we have, as I say, the administration as efficient and as effective as possible.

We can't forget, of course, that people must pay a price for the justice system, that you can't put everything on a basis that you're going to make money off the justice system by being efficient, etc. It doesn't work that way. So that is a major priority. The question of programs, as I say, will be dealt with once we've made what I hope to be some rather significant changes, as I say, like computerization of the criminal justice system. If it's properly done, in my view, it will easily be added to in other aspects of the court system.

MR. KOSKIE: — I agree with the Attorney General that important in the whole system is the administrative structure. I suppose that, indeed, one goes on, and that includes such things as staffing and facilities and, indeed, the complement of competent judges within the system.

My basic concern with the action of the Attorney General. It is recognizing the fact that the load continues to increase, as he indicated, both in respect to the charter of rights, the young offenders act. And I want to draw to the attention of the Attorney General what I consider to be a very serious situation, having in mind his concern with the justice system. And I want to refer to some of the comments of Mr. Justice Bayda in respect to the court of appeal. And I'm going to take some time in respect to this, because I am very concerned with the direction that was taken by the Attorney General. I will, of course, be wanting some clarification of that.

This is a portion of the notes from Mr. Justice Bayda, and he says:

The court is not a political institution. The court is not a federal institution, although its members are appointed by and paid by the federal government. The court is not a provincial institution, although it is established by and its facilities are provided by the provincial government. It is a national institution with provincial jurisdiction. The court owes no allegiance either to the federal government or to the provincial government, but to the nation.

That is, the people of Canada as a whole, with particular emphasis upon the people of Saskatchewan. He goes on:

The court is composed of five judges. When the court was established in 1915, the number was four. (And he's speaking of the court of appeal.) The increase to five was made in 1922, and remained at that number until 1981, when it was increased to seven. In May 1982, a order in council was passed reducing the number to five.

The chief justice goes on to indicate the situation within the court of appeal. And I think the record should show his concern in respect to the workload. What are these five and two-thirds persons expected to do? They must not only hear 800 appeals during the course of the year, as will be the case this year (401 actual up to June 30; 400 estimated between July 1 and December 31), they must prepare for those 800 appeals by reading appeal books, factums, summaries of memoranda of the law, and they must dispose of 800 appeals by reading case law, and rendering judgment either orally or in writing. Of these 800, about 350 are sentence appeals which will be discussed later.

He goes on to indicate that workload within the court of appeal versus other jurisdictions. And I'd ask hon. members to listen:

Last year, 1981, British Columbia Court of Appeal heard 676 appeals, as compared to our 800 this year. British Columbia has twelve and one-third judges, more than twice the number we have. Ontario Court of Appeal heard 1,763 cases, that is a little over twice the number we have this year. They had sixteen and two-thirds judges.

The increasing workload, coupled with the complexity of cases . . . In 1922 when the court was increased to five, a caseload was in the vicinity of 60 to 80 cases per year. It is now 10 times, it is 800, and yet the court remains at five. That does not take into account the complexity of cases. A 1,000-page appeal book was rarity. Today, it's commonplace.

It seems that we can look forward not to 800 cases next year or the year following, but to some figure over 1,000, excluding the charter-of-rights cases. Add to that the charter-of-rights cases and the lights start to go out. Despite this multiplicity of legislation on the part of the legislative branch, the report court remains at five.

His concerns are threefold, he indicates:

These three concerns can be distilled and reduced to three words: more judicial time.

I don't think the situation can be better outlined than what has been done by Chief Justice Bayda. What I am concerned with is that the Attorney General indicated that he

was concerned with upgrading the judicial system. In view of what the chief justice has indicated, I would like him to clearly indicate why he did in fact revoke the appointment of two additional judges to the court of appeal.

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, I think the hon. member should keep in mind that, to the best of my recollection, the increase was approved in 1980, and I believe the order in council appointing seven was in 1980 — or '81, I'm sorry. The federal government didn't act for a long period of time on its ability to appoint the two additional judges, so perhaps, and I say only perhaps, the Government of Canada did not share the concerns of the chief justice.

We've made it clear, and I believe the members opposite, when they were in government were of the same opinion, that there should be some consultation, informal or otherwise, with the provinces over the appointment of superior court judges. I suggest to the hon. member that if he feels that the appointment process in the province of Saskatchewan was universally supported, he is sadly mistaken. In fact, I suggest to you, that there was very little support for the process of appointment which has existed over the last 10 years. I believe that there should be a consultation. It may well come as a result of the actions taken by this government. There should be consultation, and I believe that most members of the bar in Saskatchewan support that position. I think the hon. member should remember that there was a very long period of time that the federal government had to be able to make the appointments. The order in council had been passed; the legislation had been passed. There was ample time for the government to act. It did not do so. Again, I cannot attribute that to a disagreement with the chief justice on the position.

Secondly, I think the hon. member should keep in mind that there's a significant number of sentencing appeals which, by and large, are fairly straightforward (not to minimize their importance) and that is increasing. I suggest that that may color the remarks of the hon. member.

I might advise that the initial request for the increase of the court from five to seven was not made until 1979. Is that 50 years after five? There are probably other factors in the decision.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.