

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 5, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### NOTICE OF MOTION

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Wednesday move first reading of a bill, an act respecting building and accessibility standards and the inspection of buildings.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, hon. members, I'm pleased to introduce to the Assembly the Consul General of Israel, Mr. Gideon Saguy. Will you stand up, sir? Mr. Saguy is on a one-day unofficial visit to the province. I had the pleasure of meeting with him shortly before introductions this afternoon.

After question period, Mr. Saguy will tour the Legislative Building. He is then scheduled to have meetings with the Mayor of Regina and the Lieutenant Governor. I hope he finds that today's proceedings are interesting and informative.

Before I ask all hon. members to join with me in welcoming Mr. Saguy, I would like to say that he is accompanied by Mr. And Mrs. Sam Barsky, Regina. Mrs. Barsky, will you stand? And Mrs. Lexier.

Again, I would like all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, to join with me in welcoming our distinguished guests.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly today, Rev. Walter Boldt, the senior pastor from the Circle Drive Alliance Church in Saskatoon, and Mr. Wes Boldt, a member of the board of elders of that church. Members will know that the Circle Drive Alliance Church is one of the largest churches here in Saskatchewan, and I would ask all members to join with me in welcoming Rev. Boldt and Mr. Boldt with us today. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery, and would they rise please?

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Extra Billing by Specialists

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. It has to do with a statement made by the minister at a conference this past weekend where he was once again defending the rights of doctors to extra bill. And it has to do with a statement that's attributed to him, and I quote:

Taylor admitted there is higher incidence of extra billing among specialists and subspecialists in the province. "That is closely monitored by the provincial government," he said.

My question to the minister is: can you inform the people of the province and the members of

this House what is in fact the percentage of extra billing in those two groups which you are monitoring so closely.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did speak at a meeting in Regina on Saturday morning in which I did outline the concerns and the situation of Saskatchewan Health. I want to make it clear to this Assembly, and to you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think it should be interpreted that I was defending the rights of the doctors to extra bill. I was indicating to the group assembled the strong and proud tradition that Saskatchewan has in health, which goes back many years, Mr. Speaker, back to the early days in this country, in 1911 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I will come to this question in a moment, if they allow me the preamble. And that is, Mr. Speaker, that in this . . . I pointed out that in 1962 in this province, as many of the members opposite will realize, there was strong feelings, and a decision was made. An agreement was made called the Saskatoon agreement in which doctors had the option to extra bill — not the right — but the option to extra bill. I indicated in my speech at Regina, as the member opposite indicates, that the extra billing is more prevalent among specialists than general practitioners, and that at this point in time I believe it's about 2 per cent of the total claims that MCIC process are extra billing.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, after that rather lengthy answer I'll go to the question one more time, and ask the minister if he can inform the Assembly, having monitored very closely the direct and extra billing among the specialists and subspecialists, will you tell this House what percentage in those two groups extra bill?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Two per cent is the total extra billing for MCIC.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, I realize that's what it is for the total number of doctors in the province. What I want to get at is this group you're monitoring so closely, the specialists and subspecialists who are directly affected, everyone who goes to them. How many of those people, how many percentage points of those people direct and extra bill. That's the question — not the total of MCIC, but the specialists and subspecialists.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to provide that information. I wouldn't want to give the wrong information. I'll take note of that and supply that to the member.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Minister. Is it true that you are closely monitoring the extra billing by specialists and subspecialists, yet have no information to offer the House on the basis of your close monitoring?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I indicated to you that the total amount of extra billing is about 2 per cent. I do not intend to mislead you or anyone else in this province as to the exact amount of specialists or GPs. I took notice of the question, and I will provide you with the exact information.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. I remind the minister of one group particularly hard hit by extra billing, and that's senior citizens. And last week the Senior Citizens' Action Now committee presented a brief to your government in which they stated as follows:

Extra billing is a heavy burden on those in the low income sector of our population and seriously weakens the concept of universal medicare. Seniors especially are affected by this practice, as paying extra fees for doctors, X-rays, lab tests, etc., can seriously deplete an already low income.

My question to you is this: do you question the sincerity or the accuracy of the statements

contained in the Action Now brief concerning the impact of extra billing on senior citizens?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite certainly knows that I do not question the sincerity of senior citizens in this province. He knows that, and he understands it. I want to remind the member opposite, and I want to remind this House that the member opposite who was just on his feet was part of the government that signed this agreement that allowed doctors the option to extra bill.

I also want to remind the member opposite, as he full well knows, that the amount of extra billing today in Saskatchewan is considerably less than it was in the mid '70s. And you were the government in power, and I imagine the seniors had as much trouble then as they do today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary. Aside from your concerns about whether or not senior citizens had as much trouble 5, 10, 15, or 20 years ago as they are having today, are you able to offer to those senior citizens any assurance that they will have relief from extra billing, particularly by specialists and subspecialists, where the particular problem is, as you well admit?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — If the member opposite had been keeping up with the discussions at the health ministers' conference in Halifax in September, you will be well aware that I came forth with a proposal to the Hon. Monique Begin that we, in Saskatchewan, were willing to meet the next day with her officials, my officials, and members of the medical profession to look at a system to regulate extra billing in this province. That was a concrete proposal, the only one put forth.

In regard to the senior citizens, let me just remind the member opposite that one of the first things that the Action Now committee asked for was a chiropody program, a chiropody program that is now being introduced by this government, that was promised by you in '75 and '78, and never delivered.

### **Senior Citizens Home Repair Program**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, a question which has to do with the unemployment statistics which came out on Friday showing this province's unemployment rate rising when other parts of Canada were falling. It has to do with your government's decision to drop the senior citizens home repair program, which was not just a vehicle to assist senior citizens to repair their homes, but a prime engine to create jobs and to create employment.

My question, Mr. Minister, is: can you assure this House that your government will reintroduce the senior citizens home repair program within the immediate future, and give this House in fact a specific date for its reintroduction?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the members should know that the program was not dropped by us. It had an expiry date. The date did come to pass, and it has expired. However, we're looking at new programs. And it's pretty obvious that the member for Quill Lakes doesn't want to hear the answer. But the task force travelling about the province now is consulting with senior citizens to determine the direction that government should take.

I want to assure the members opposite, as well, that this government will not utilize the housing corporation to solve the unemployment problem in this province. That's what they tried to do, and we don't intend to do that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that the reinstatement of the program was recommended by a brief your government just received from

Action Now, and in light of the fact that you have received a goodly number of requests from other senior citizens, my question is: why do you choose to ignore this recommendation from Action Now, and the opinions of many other senior citizens who have written or called upon you to reintroduce this program?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Mr. Speaker, I find the members' comments interesting in light of the fact that Action Now is represented on our task force and has spoken to me directly. And yet there seems to be a feeling amongst that body, as well as other seniors groups in the province of Saskatchewan, that they are welcoming what we are doing with the task force and what we are doing in the area of senior citizens' accommodation.

I find that the question doesn't arise from the particular group. Recommendations have been made to us, and we are considering every alternative, every new angle, new programs, and I'm confident, Mr. Speaker, that in the new year the seniors will see some programs which make sense, contrary to the programs which the former administration seemed to be preoccupied with.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — A new question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, if you and your cabinet colleagues are out of touch, I want to remind you that not all government members are, and I quote for your benefit an ad put in the Moose Jaw *Times-Herald* on November 4th by the member from Moose Jaw South:

#### Provincial Government Home Repair Program

Although this program is not in effect at this time, it will be reactivated in the near future. When a definite date is established, we will advise.

Will the minister admit that at least one member of your caucus is listening to the public, and will the minister not admit that he should be following the suggestion contained in that ad?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the friends opposite that all of the members of this side are listening, and in fact the task force was in Melfort the other day, and comments made to us were that they couldn't believe that fact that the government is finally paying attention to the seniors of this province. They also find it novel that we're asking the senior citizens to have some input in new programs, which apparently they didn't have previously.

#### Job Creation by Sask Housing

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, I want to ask . . . New question, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister why he has such an aversion to creating jobs and using the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation as a vehicle to do that.

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't expect the member to understand, but this government is looking at legitimate economic development to create real jobs. We have a duty and a responsibility to the seniors of this province to supply adequate housing, but that is the responsibility of the housing corporation not to create jobs if the accommodation is not required. We're determining that accommodation is required; we're determining the best and most effective way to supply this accommodation; and that's going to guide us in our endeavours in the years to come.

#### Closure of Sask Minerals Mine at Sybouts

**MR. ENGEL:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question I was going to direct to the minister in charge of Sask Minerals, but in her absence I direct this question to the Premier. In light of what the minister in charge of Sask Housing just said, that you're looking at economic development to

create more jobs, and StatsCanada says that more than 34,000 people are unemployed in Saskatchewan today, your decision to add to that unemployment by closing the Sask Minerals sodium sulphate mine near Gladmar has created that many more jobs. The mine has been closed since May 1, and in a normal winter nearly 70 people are employed there working at the facility, but not this winter. My specific question, Mr. Premier, is when will you reopen the Sybouts mine and put these people back to work?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll have to consult with the minister on the details of the particular mine, because I don't recall how often it's closed, or when it's closed, or when it opens, or what not. I'll take notice, and I'll either respond or have the minister respond.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The corporation's director of operations, in the *Leader-Post*, suggested that it's closing down because of competition from supplying sodium sulphate from other sources. This is not the same as its table cousin sodium chloride. It is found in natural deposits in alkali sloughs in Saskatchewan. It is also produced as a by-product of processing plants in plastics, vitamins, hydrochloric acid and chromium. My question is: once there's a little heat on or a little competition from other industries, is it your decision as a Conservative government to withdraw from the market rather than to go out and beat the bushes for new sales opportunities? I thought that you were a government which was going to make industry world class. I think they're your words, Mr. Premier. I thought you're going to travel the world to sell our products, and here at the first sign of a little bit of competition, your government's response was . . . It was closed down while you were in charge of Sask Minerals yourself this summer, Mr. Premier. My question is: are you just backing off because of a little competition, and you're not going to be first-class in sodium sulphates where Saskatchewan always was number one, where we made some money with that crown corporation? Now you've closed down two. You've closed down Bishopric. Your directors tell me that that's because it's tougher to mine. But here's one that's good for 30 or 40 more years.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I already said that I don't know the specific details, and I can't recall them on that specific mine. If he wants me to discuss how we feel about competition and international competition, I'll go on for the next half hour about it.

### Saskatchewan Trappers Association

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources, but, however, seeing that he is absent, I'll direct my question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. It has to do with your government's commitment to the oldest industry in this province, and that is the trapping industry. This industry is still an important source of income to many people in our province, particularly in northern Saskatchewan. My question is this, Mr. Minister: what level of financial support is your government prepared to offer to the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association for their upcoming annual convention this winter?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — I'm not sure if I heard it right, but if the hon. member is asking about the level of support for the particular convention held on a particular date for the trappers' association. I honestly can't answer that, Mr. Speaker. My colleague would probably be able to answer it. But I might say, my knowledge of the trapping industry and the trapper's association, per se, the particular group that the member refers to, and what that particular group contributes to the whole trapping industry, is a point of some considerable debate within the trapping industry as well as probably within this House, as we deal with our own particular views from both sides of the House, but within the industry, which is most important. So I can't give the particular details, but I'll take notice on behalf of my colleague, and he'll give the answer.

**MR. YEW:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister very specifically: does the minister not agree that the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Trapper's Association is an important meeting to determine government policy with respect to the trapping industry? And further to that, Mr. Minister: can you justify not providing financial support to this important

meeting, and that your government is able to yet find \$95,000 to pay the part-time chairman for the Saskatchewan labour relations board?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, we could get into quite a debate about all kinds of associations in the various industries and how much government should be contributing to them, and so on. I want to point out to the hon. member that I did not say that the government will not be providing support, or that we would be providing support. I said I would take notice and have my colleague answer you.

I know you're asking the question for a very vested interest group, a very small group who are . . . whose role is very much questioned within the trapping industry in the province. Whether you want to admit that or not, that's true. Their role as an association is questioned by a good number of people who make a good deal of their living from trapping. There's no question about that. But my colleague will answer the question in more detail, Mr. Speaker.

### **Native Advisory Program**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, question to the minister in charge of native matters and more particularly, the native affairs secretariat. Some months ago, a couple of months ago, he was quoted as saying that he had a native advisory program, and that he or his group were proceeding with a study to put together a number of solutions and some ideas regarding the socio-economic problems that the native community faces, and I am quoting from an article. This one appeared in *New Breed*, but the minister will know that this appeared in a number of other journals. And he is particularly quoted as saying, "we are going to be done with it (meaning the study) this fall. It's not going to be a year (meaning we wouldn't have to wait for it long)."

Are you able to advise the House whether or not your study is completed this fall, since fall is rapidly approaching?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Mr. Speaker, the work in the communities will be completed this fall, and the report will be complete in late January to early February, and the natives in the communities have been advised and are aware of this matter.

### **Senior Citizens' High-Rise Construction**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, I have a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, and that concerns the construction of senior citizens high — rises in Regina. I note from reading the press that one projected site for a senior citizens' highrise, the so-called Trianon property, has been put up for tender by your corporation. Does that mean that you have no plans to construct any further senior citizens' highrises in Regina in the immediate future?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — No, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, could you advise when the next senior citizens' highrise construction might commence, and what the site of it will be?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Mr. Speaker, we'll be advising accordingly, and whether the Leader of the Opposition understands or not is of no concern to me, but he should understand that we are consulting with the people who will derive a benefit from what we're doing in the field. We're consulting with the seniors as to where they need the accommodation, and I'm sure the seniors of this province will be pleased with the progress we make, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would he say specifically with whom he consulted before he called for tenders on the Trianon site?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition should know that he's talking about two different matters. The fact is that in his position as an empire-builder we amassed property in the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. Any tenders that have gone out were because we owned the property and had no need to own the property. This is unrelated to provision for accommodation for the seniors of this province. The seniors are being consulted directly, according to accommodation requirements in the city of Regina. The senior citizens' task force will be meeting in Regina in particular to obtain briefs. We have an ongoing consultative process with the seniors of this province.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister explain how he knew that this property would not be recommended for construction by the senior citizens before he received their brief? Why did he call for tenders even before he received any information from them as to where they would like the senior citizens' accommodation located?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Mr. Speaker, the property was tendered to allow prospective purchasers to look at the property for sale purposes, and as far as I'm concerned, that is not related to where we're going in the future in regards to seniors' accommodations in the province, or in Regina in particular.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — One more try, Mr. Speaker. Are you telling this House that if you sell a prime site for a senior citizens' highrise, that is not in any way related to where senior citizens' highrises might be located?

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Mr. Speaker, judging from the purchase price that was paid for the property I can see why the Leader of the Opposition now calls it prime. But, Mr. Speaker, I really don't see the connection. And I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition doesn't either. We have many sites which would be suitable for seniors accommodation in the city of Regina. In fact we're looking at peripheral areas for accommodation of seniors. I mean, we don't necessarily have to build Cornwall Centres and things like that. We're talking to the seniors about where they would like to locate, to live. And the Trianon property isn't the only site available for seniors' accommodation in the city of Regina.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Premier, and it has to do with the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Housing corporation's remarkable statement that the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation would not be used to create jobs. Will the Premier disavow this statement and assure this House that every agency and arm of government will be sued, wherever it's reasonably possible to create jobs?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan has led the nation in the creation of jobs. We have used everything at our disposal, Mr. Speaker, to create jobs, and we've broken all previous records and all current records across Canada. We've used our departments, we've used our crown corporations, we've used them all, Mr. Speaker. And as a result, Mr. Speaker, of the co-operation between industry and government, and the good co-operation for the first time in years, we have created more jobs in Saskatchewan than ever in its history. So, yes, Sask Housing is involved. Its number one priority is to co-operate with everybody else, rating housing where its needs, and where its purposeful to create the jobs that will help meet the market demands.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Productivity Improvement Survey

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today, as chairman of the productivity improvement project, to release to this House the preliminary results of a recent productivity opportunity survey, and to announce the government's intention to establish a cabinet council on productivity. When this government took office, it committed itself to good management and to spending the taxpayers' money wisely. It was towards these goals that the Government

of Saskatchewan saw the importance and challenge of productivity improvement.

In the summer of 1982 Premier Devine requested input from all deputy ministers, chief executive officers, and heads of boards and agencies regarding ways to improve productivity. Cabinet reviewed the input from senior management in the fall, and as a result established the productivity improvement project. This product is chaired by myself, and supported by a committee of senior staff to Executive Council, deputy ministers, and crown corporation executives.

We have been very careful, Mr. Speaker, not to repeat the mistakes of other jurisdictions, and have avoided the temptation of prescribing a standard program, or approach to productivity, to be imposed on all government departments and crown corporations. Our approach has been to establish an awareness of the importance of productivity to establish principles of productivity improvement which are appropriate to Saskatchewan; to develop a strategic framework that will assist in the establishment of department and crown specific productivity improvement initiatives; and to provide management with appropriate information, and employees with the necessary understanding, which will help productivity.

Mr. Speaker, then in order to assist in the development of a productivity improvement program, a productivity opportunity survey was conducted. This pioneering survey was the first of its kind and size ever conducted in Canada, and sought direct advice of government employees. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to advise the House that this voluntary survey received over a 39 per cent response rate, substantially exceeding our expectations. Of even greater significance was the number of employees that took the opportunity to provide written comments and ideas on specific ways to increase productivity, and reduce waste of time and materials. Of those employees who responded, more than one-third provided written suggestions, Mr. Speaker, which will be extremely useful in helping improve productivity, and I think we can all be proud of Saskatchewan's public service.

The productivity opportunity survey consisted of 70 questions, which measured 21 productivity factors. While opportunities for productivity exist in many of the factors, 19 of the 21 factors received an overall positive response. And I would like to share with this House some of the survey highlights.

The productivity factor of teamwork, Mr. Speaker, received a 76 per cent positive response. This very positive situation indicates that employees work well together, have a genuine team spirit. The most significant finding is that over 87 per cent of employees feel that they can get assistance from their co-workers when needed. The factor of performance achievement received a positive response of 67 per cent. In particular, Mr. Speaker, 87 per cent of the employees feel that they are held accountable for the quality of work they do. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is very significant, because it appears to contradict the widely held perception that accountability is lacking in the public sector. Organization commitment received a positive response of 64 per cent. Employees believe that this is a good place to work, and have genuine interest in the well-being of their organization. In addition, almost 70 per cent of the employees are proud of the contribution that they make.

As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, opportunities for real productivity improvement exist in many factors. For example, the factor of advancement which received only a 34 per cent positive response, indicates that employees believe that job advancement is not based on achievement. This factor also negatively impacts work achievement, seniority, responsibility, and job promotions. A 37 per cent positive response to the organization thrust factor indicates that substantial opportunities exist in the reduction of unnecessary rules and regulations, and that productivity improvement can be achieved if a work situation is established that encourages innovation and creativity.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, only 13 per cent of employees believe that here are not real



opportunities for productivity improvement. 70 per cent of employees feel that new technology will increase productivity, and 77 per cent welcome better methods and procedures.

Mr. Speaker, in preparation for the more detailed analysis of the survey results, and the formal launch of the productivity improvement program, I am pleased to announce our intention to establish a cabinet council on productivity which will do the following five things. It will assist in the interpretation and analysis of the productivity opportunity survey results; will serve as a information and communication agency and a clearing-house for productivity matters. It will provide a structure by which productivity improvements and successes can be monitored. It will provide assistance to departments and crowns in the development of productivity programs.

Mr. Speaker, the survey and the proposed cabinet council on productivity indicate the concerns that this government has to address productivity, and to make the best use of the taxpayers' dollar. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will reply briefly to that statement. Any long answer would not be making the best use of the taxpayers' dollar, who are paying this Assembly to get on with the business and not listen to very long statements.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — It is clear that something less than 40 per cent of the employees have replied. It is equally clear that if the minister had consulted with the trade unions involved he would have got a better response. The fact that more than 60 per cent of the employees did not reply renders all his conclusions and figures suspect.

We certainly wish him well in the improving of productivity. Every government seeks to improve productivity, and we're pleased that this government is doing the same. We are pleased also that many of the answers indicate that things said about the public service by members opposite when they were in opposition have no basis in fact, if in fact his figures can be believed. They indicate that a good number of at least the persons who replied have a very considerable pride in their work, believe that they work well with their persons in the same work place, and believe that while improvements can be made, the work place is good. I don't know whether these answers are accurate. The minister assures me that they are, and I am pleased if they are true. I regret that he did not take appropriate measures to get a much larger sample.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **STATEMENT BY SPEAKER**

#### **Guide-lines Governing Question Period**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Under orders of the day, I would like to read a statement that I have prepared, dealing with question period.

On Friday, December 2, 1983, a point of order was raised by the member for Shaunavon, to the effect that answers to oral questions were too lengthy. At the time, I deferred my ruling. I might advise members that I spent Friday afternoon; I reviewed completely two question periods, and then went back through a number of the question periods in the written *Hansard*.

The members well know that the chair has been concerned about oral question period. On many occasions during the current session, it has been necessary for me to call members to order during that portion of our daily proceedings. I have now had a chance to review the record, and I find that members on both sides of the House have been persistently abusing the guide-lines for

both asking and answering oral questions.

Therefore, for the benefit of all members of this Assembly, I would like to review the accepted guide-liens for oral questions.

The primary purpose of oral question period is to allow members of the Assembly an opportunity to seek information from ministers of the Crown respecting government policy. It was for this reason that an oral question period was established as a regular part of our routine proceedings. I refer members to the *Interim Report of the Special Committee on rules and Procedures*, March 12, 1976.

Unlike written questions, oral questions do not require. However, such questions should be asked only in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance as to require an immediate answer. Oral questions should not be of a nature requiring a lengthy and detailed answer, nor should they raise a matter of policy too large to be dealt with in an answer to an oral question. I refer members to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms* Fifth Edition, paragraph 358, on page 131.

I would also like to draw the attention of members to paragraph 359 of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, page 132, which states that an oral question

- (1) It must be a question, not an expression of an opinion, representation, argumentation, nor debate.

And

- (2) The question must be brief. A preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. A long preamble on a long question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same sort of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble.

And further,

- (3) The question ought to seek information and, therefore, cannot be based upon a hypothesis, cannot seek an opinion, either legal or otherwise, and must not suggest its own answer, be argumentative, or make representations.

Of equal importance and concern are the answers to oral questions. Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate. I refer members to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, paragraph 358(2), page 131.

I would like to ask all members of this Assembly to review these guide-lines. Oral question period has become a debating period of late, and that is not the purpose it was intended to serve. If members wish to debate a subject, they should place a motion on the order paper. Likewise, if members are seeking information of a detailed nature, they may wish to ask for it in the form of a written question, or move a motion for return. However, if they have questions of a timely or urgent nature which require an immediate answer, and if the question can be framed in a manner not to encourage debate, then an oral question would be in order. When oral questions are asked, they should be answered in the spirit of these guide-lines, briefly, and without debate.

In addition, I am also very concerned about the lack of decorum in the Chamber during oral question period. One of the reasons of the lengthy questions and answers has been the tendency of some members to interrupt those who have the floor by commenting from their seats, and thereby encouraging debate and sloppiness on the part of those who are asking and

answering questions.

I am especially disturbed by the fact that even when I have called this House to order, some members continue with their unnecessary comments and unparliamentary behaviour. This general lack of decorum and lack of respect of the Chair reflects poorly on all members of this Assembly, and I must caution those members who disobey the rules, and who disregard calls for order from this Chair, that their actions show a lack of respect for the Assembly and its traditions.

I have also noted that when I correct a member during an oral question period, the member often rises again and repeats the error. I feel that this action is in defiance of the Chair. If the Legislative Assembly is to maintain its credibility, its proceedings, and the Chair, must be respected.

I trust that all hon. members will co-operate in an effort to make oral question period work again in the manner for which it was designed, and with a sense of decorum.

## **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **SECOND READINGS**

#### **Bill No. 13 – An Act respecting Planning and Development in Urban, Rural and Northern Municipalities**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of a bill, an act respecting urban and rural planning and development.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 10 years since The Planning and Development Act has been reviewed in total. In that time, significant changes have occurred in Saskatchewan: changes in philosophy, structure, economics, and technology. These changes have made the rewriting of this act necessary.

Our government has become aware of problems and deficiencies in the current act. Representations have been made by business, urban, and rural municipalities and others, all citing problems with the act. Therefore, in close consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Rural Development, the planning and development act was submitted to an exhaustive public review. The result of this review is the bill now before us.

Let me emphasize that in preparing the new bill we consulted openly and often with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), individual municipalities, developers, architects, engineers, the Association of Professional community Planners of Saskatchewan and many others. Over 150 responses to our options-for-change paper were received, and these ideas were taken into account in preparing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, since the election of our government in April 1982, we have been preparing a program aimed at supporting development throughout this province. Saskatchewan is a diverse province, rich in opportunity. To build upon this great potential, our program has introduced a number of very successful initiatives.

Canada, North America, and the world have been facing difficult economic times. Saskatchewan has not been immune, but because of our government's initiatives we have fared better than the rest of the country. We have seen lower inflation rates and better employment records than our neighbours. We have seen more growth in the single-family housing market, and an increase in development interest in our communities. Now is the appropriate time to introduce this new initiative – a bill to create a new planning and development act.

Mr. Speaker, our government supports the concept of proper planning by, and for, our communities. Planning must provide for the objectives of our many different communities. It must provide for the opportunities, innovations, and ideas that private enterprise can produce. It must protect the property and individual rights of all our people, and it must be effective and efficient.

This bill reflects the traditions of planning in Canada, and at the same time moves toward the basic goals of our government.

In this bill there are two basic goals: (1) is to foster the principles of local autonomy, and (2) is to streamline the planning and development review process. In pursuing these goals we have adhered to the planning principles that a municipality must be able to ensure that the health, safety, and general welfare of its citizens are protected, and that the rights of the public to know and be heard are protected. Let's look, Mr. Speaker, at what we mean by planning and how these goals and principles have been incorporated into this bill.

Proper planning involves elected municipal officials working with their citizens to identify the goals and objectives for the future growth of their community. A set of policies and proposals is then formulated to achieve these goals. This package, when complete, becomes the development plan for the community.

In conjunction with this development plan, a zoning by-law is prepared to implement these policies. This is accomplished by managing land use to minimize conflicts between adjoining uses, to ensure development occurs in concert with municipal servicing capability, and to ensure property values are protected. The zoning by-law stipulates what uses are permitted in each area, but may also stipulate uses that may be allowed at the discretion of the council – proposals which are examined on their individual merits to judge their compatibility with their neighbours' and community plans. The zoning by-law may also specify lot sizes for each type of use, as well as developmental standards to be followed.

A third component, Mr. Speaker, is the capital works program whereby the council identifies the infrastructure investments required to support the proposed development pattern. This ensures that municipal financial planning is in step with its development planning.

Mr. Speaker, this bill increases local autonomy in planning policy and day-to-day decision-making. A legal framework is provided that allows a municipality to make its own land use decisions, decisions appropriate to that local area. This framework provides proper tools to implement those decisions fairly and equitably.

We have recognized, Mr. Speaker, the differences between municipalities, large and small, urban and rural, stable and developing. Tools appropriate to the size and location of each municipality have been provided.

In the interests of local autonomy, the role of the province in land use has been examined, and mechanisms to clearly define provincial interest has been added. The role of the province as watch-dog has been reduced. Those matters of local concern are clearly placed in the hands of local municipalities. But for municipalities without the resources to translate their valid policies into legal action, the provincial role of technical adviser has been maintained. Where the framework provided in this act is fully used, and where local resources permit, full local autonomy over plan implementation in the municipality can be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I will now highlight some of the initiatives to increase local autonomy that this bill will provide. First, the provisions for municipal policy planning have been expanded. I will discuss these later as they affect both autonomy and streamlining.

Secondly, provision has been made to clarify and define provincial and municipal roles. Provincial

land use policies will give a framework within which local decisions can be made. Local matters then will be a strictly local responsibility. This initiative was strongly supported by municipalities throughout the province.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, local by-laws will govern municipal planning commissions. These by-laws will fit local needs and will no longer require ministerial approval.

Fourthly, planning appeals will be handled at the level at which the decision is made. Where local subdivision authority exists, local development appeal boards will hear subdivision appeals.

Fifthly, final approval of zoning amendments may be a local matter. Where a complete municipal development plan exists, and a municipality has access to planning and legal resources, ministerial approval of zoning amendments will no longer be required.

Sixth. The responsibility for a five-year capital works program, in conjunction with the municipal development plan, will now be a local by-law and not subject to ministerial approval.

Seventh. Local approving authorities for subdivisions will now also approve replotting schemes. This removes a second step, that of provincial approval for these types of subdivisions.

Eighth, Mr. Speaker. More local control over public reserve land is provided. If a municipal development plan properly deals with these lands, ownership and control over leasing of public reserves can be transferred to the municipality. Only the sale of reserve lands will require government approval.

Ninth, Mr. Speaker. We have provided new tools for municipalities to implement their local policies in zoning by-laws. These include direct control districts, contract zoning, and bonus zoning provisions.

We recognize that flexible land use controls in special areas would benefit both municipalities and development proponents. Provision for planned unit developments exists in the current act. However, this tool required too many regulations, too many steps, and was too rigid in its application, and consequently it was time-rich and productivity-poor.

The alternative provided in this bill, direct control districts, gives an effective tool for complex areas, and at the same time reduces the bureaucratic steps and places clear time limits on decisions.

The new contract zoning solves another problem. Often in the past a council was forced to refuse a zoning change, not because the proposal was bad, Mr. Speaker, but because other developments the by-law would also permit in that zone were unacceptable. Contract zoning will allow the council to ensure, through a binding agreement with the developer, that only the specific proposal presented will be developed. Approval is easier and council's power is enhanced.

A new bonus zoning feature will allow a proponent to receive additional development rights in return for providing additional public amenities. In this system, both the developers and the public gain under a local initiative. All these tools, Mr. Speaker, will be made available to increase local decision-making power to implement local policies. The framework of the act only requires that the rules for development be clear, fair, and just, and that the municipality has the resources to administer the tools it chooses.

Mr. Speaker, I will now turn to the streamlining measures provided in this bill. From the outset, it has been our aim to reduce the number of hoops and delays a development project must face. We have said streamline the development review process, not dismantle, and by that I mean that the development review process must be effective, efficient, and free of red tape. The rights

of the public, the municipality, and the development proponent all must be balanced and protected. This includes the right not be left hanging and awaiting a decision.

Mr. Speaker, we have reduced the number of separate approvals required and established time frames for decisions. We have introduced more direct public notice procedures. We have reduced the number of cases where the province must be involved, and we have simplified and clarified confusing parts of the legal framework.

Mr. Speaker, discretionary use has sometimes been a development land-mine. Some by-laws have placed most uses and standards in a zone at council's sole discretion. We have clarified the use of this tool and required the types of conditions that may be attached to an approval to be specified in the by-law. This reduces the surprises and gives more certainty to the landowner and the public.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, a concept planning zoning approval system has been added. By this, a total land use pattern could be advertised and approved for an area, and then each successive stage could be rezoned without readvertising. This saves steps, provides certainty for the developer, the public, and the municipality.

The time for ministerial approval of zoning by-laws has been limited, Mr. Speaker. If a municipal development plan exists, and conditions are met, ministerial approval can be removed entirely and this shortens the process. No longer will the total discretion of the interim development control be able to replace zoning for eight years or more.

This tool is to be used to allow a municipality time to produce a zoning by-law and plan, where none exist. Only in exceptional cases, with ministerial approval, can municipalities with zoning in place use this tool. Furthermore, Mr. speaker, decisions on applications cannot be deferred. A "yes" or a "no" answer must be given in 60 days. Consecutive imposition of this control is no longer allowed.

Mr. Speaker, the subdivision review system has been improved. This act will provide that limits must be placed on the time for councils, commission, and other agencies to make required comments to the approving authority on proposals. Limits have been placed on the time allowed to negotiate development agreements. Arbitration of disputes on demands for more information by the approving authority have been provided for. Replotting schemes will follow the same subdivision approval process, often eliminating the extra step of ministerial approval.

Mr. Speaker, while on the topic of subdivisions, I would like to refer back to comments made by the member for Regina Centre during the deliberations of the committee of finance last spring. The member strongly criticized the subdivision review process of urban affairs. He described it as scandalous, as taking months and months to review a simple subdivision, and as being a dilatory and inefficient operation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the problems he described were precisely the kind of reasons for the rewrite of the act. The scandalous problems he described in the House on April 14 have caused literally hundreds of millions of Saskatchewan-grown investment dollars to leave the province over the past 11 years because of the abuses and maze of regulatory overkill of the old Planning and Development Act.

However, Mr. Speaker, even with the current Planning and Development Act still in place, during the last six months of 1982-1983, 40 per cent of the subdivisions approved by Urban Affairs were processed within two weeks. A total of 60 per cent were processed in less than one month, and a full 73 per cent were approved within two months. Mr. Speaker, that leaves 27 per cent that took more than two months, and some did in fact take a lengthy period in processing. There are four main reasons for this and they do not include inefficiency in our operation.

I might hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that these improvements in the approval turnaround time have been affected by the very same competent individuals within our community planning branch using the same Planning and Development Act, who were there during the previous administration. Further, Mr. Speaker, may I add, the changes outlined in the new legislation will go even further in increasing the productivity of the provincial administration of planning and development in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, all of the initiatives I have described reduce delay and uncertainty in the process, but at the same time enhance the principles of planning. But streamlining, Mr. Speaker, involves more than shorter approval times. We have shifted the emphasis from ad hoc reactive planning to forward planning. Where policies are developed in advance by a council, time and money is saved by both the development proponent and the council. Knowing the rules and policies, less time is spent in revision and negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, it became apparent in our review that the present municipal development plan system was inadequate. Large municipalities, the dynamic growth, diverse users, and many development opportunities, differed significantly from smaller municipalities, and rural areas. We have, Mr. Speaker, provided a framework for both situations. A municipal development plan was the only policy document recognized in the old act. Such a complex document is beyond the needs of most rural municipalities and small communities. However, many do require a legal framework in which to state their land use policies in order to avoid having to make zoning decisions in an ad hoc way as pressure is exerted.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the basic planning statement has been added. This will define the policies to be implemented by the zoning by-law. Most rural and small urban municipalities have a few key planning problems that can be resolved with short statements of policy. This tool will give them a sound legal foundation for their zoning policies.

Mr. Speaker, while a basic planning statement strengthens the municipality's authority over land use, it also helps the developer and the public. The development proponent will know what is acceptable. He will be a better able to design his proposals. The public will also have more certainty as to future development. And, Mr. Speaker, the province can ensure compatibility with provincial interest and intermunicipal concerns. Such advance planning serves local autonomy, streamlining, and the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the municipal development plan can now properly address the complex nature of our large communities. In this bill the purpose and the suggested content of a plan are expanded. This will give guidance to a municipality as to what should be part of the plan for a dynamic municipality. In using these, council will have a clear framework that simplifies individual decisions. The public will have a better knowledge of the issues, constraints, and future plans in the community, and the developer will know his opportunities and the limits to his actions.

Mr. Speaker, the changes to provisions for advanced planning make the municipal development plan more functional and more appropriate to large communities. The new basic planning statement provides the proper framework for smaller communities and rural municipalities. Increased advanced planning reduces decision delay when individual development is represented.

Mr. Speaker, there have been other changes to make the act more workable. Firstly, there are changes to the district planning sections to make intermunicipal co-ordination in these areas more functional. Secondly, there are changes to the methods for public reserve dedication, deferral, or cash in lieu of reserve. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the costs of advertising a proposed zoning change may be fully recovered now by a municipality. Fourth, the penalty sections are updated. Fifth, unused sections of the previous act have been deleted. And sixth, the position of non-conforming uses and buildings has been clarified to eliminate problems that have been brought to our attention. In general, Mr. Speaker, the act is being made a more workable piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of this new act is the first step in our program for streamlining the development review process, and for increasing local autonomy. A review of the subdivision regulations, the public reserve regulations, and the provincial role in the review process in all its agencies, and the development of provincial land use policies will all follow. We also recognize the need for handbooks and other aids to municipalities that reflect this new approach. We will act quickly to ensure that municipalities will have the tools and information to make this new act work.

Mr. Speaker, the streamlining of the planning act is only part of our government's program. We have begun the process of streamlining the whole of government, providing a leaner and more effective civil service. We are moving to streamline The Urban Municipality Act. We have moved to restructure government in a more rational way. In these times of restraint, Mr. Speaker, we have produced a responsible budget to encourage and support the recovery that is now under way. With that recovery, the need for a planning and development act that encourages development to take advantage of the opportunities presented by this growth, is clear.

In these concluding remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will highlight the thrust of this new act. First, the act is aimed at increasing local autonomy. This involves transferring more of the responsibility for local decisions to local councils and reducing the provincial role as policeman or rubber stamp. Secondly, the act is aimed at streamlining the development process. This involves fewer steps, shorter approval times, and greater clarification of the roles. Thirdly, the act is aimed at providing tools that municipalities need to handle development: powers to plan for their future in a positive and dynamic way. Fourth, the act is aimed at greater certainty for all who are affected by the process. This means promoting forward planning over reactive discretion. Fifth, Mr. Speaker, the new act is aimed at all municipalities in this province. This involves providing tools, responsibilities appropriate to municipalities – rural and urban, large and small – and their options have been expanded. And sixth, Mr. Speaker, the new act is aimed at meeting the needs of communities, development performance, and private individuals in balance. It serves all, and favours none.

I said at the beginning that this government supports community planning, planning that encourages innovation and initiative, planning that protects the values of our citizens, and planning that builds on the potential of this great province. Together, Mr. Speaker, with my colleague, the Minister of Rural Development. I would now urge each and every member of this House to support this bid.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I was wondering if the minister might entertain a question before he moves second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the minister. My question to the minister is relatively simple. I gather this is one of the bills that the government wants passed before the Christmas adjournment. Is there some particular reason why you want the bill passed within the next week or so?

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, that the bill was tabled last spring to allow the municipalities and the users of the bill to become accustomed to it, and so we could have some feedback on the bill. We have not received too much in the way of feedback or comment. There are some regulations that we would like to be put into place in the new year. The users, the municipalities, have been promised that this thing would be passed in December and be in place for next year, especially for the building season. A lot of municipalities get their rezoning requests and subdivision requests over the winter, and they'd like to have the new rules in place now.



The act itself does not . . . There is not any substantive changes in what you see now and what you saw in June. We will point out the one or, I think two substantive changes as we go into it. But it's the same bill as you had in June.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The member from Regina North, as often, making his contribution from his seat rather than from his feet, indicated that the matter might be sent to the non-controversial. It's not the silliest suggestion I've heard, not that this bill is non-controversial, but that committee provides a vehicle whereby members may question officials in a direct way.

I say this with reference to this bill, but as a general comment, that there are occasions, Mr. Speaker, when it would expedite the work of the House if we used standing committees. We never do. Our standing committees in this House are of historical interest only. Most of them have not met in many, many years. This is the kind of bill which I think would be well to send to a standing committee where the officials could be questioned in a direct way.

The inattention of all members to what the minister was saying certainly did not relate to the importance of the bill. This is an important bill which goes to the quality of life in our urban communities. I doubt that it was entirely related to the manner of delivery either. I think it was more that this legislation is simply too esoteric to interest most members, and too difficult for most members to be involved in. So I say, as something of an aside, that it is unfortunate that this House does not use standing committees, because this would be the sort of bill that we should be dealing with in a standing committee. It is too complex and too esoteric to be dealing with in committee of the whole. Having said that, let me make a few comments about the bill, and then I propose to beg leave to adjourn it.

No one, I think, would argue that we have no need of any changes to The Planning and Development Act. The process was put in motion by, if I recall correctly, the former member from Regina North East, the Hon. Walter Smishek. This bill is the final result of years of effort under two different administrations. There is undoubtedly much in the bill that is needed and good, and I suspect there is some portions of the bill that we will have some questions about.

I have some questions about removing ministerial approval. I know that municipalities like to think of themselves as free-wheeling, independent levels of government. I think our experience in the past has been that the vast majority of municipalities discharge the functions given to them with integrity, with skill, and with due regard to the public will. But here are exceptions to that — there will be in any institution run by human beings. And the ministerial approval provided kind of a check. I am not aware that it was ever abused, but it does provide a check, and sometimes provides the government to take a larger view than the strict interest of the municipality.

I recall a subdivision, and the member from Lakeview may recall it as well, a proposed subdivision surrounding the Regina airport. The minister of the day, the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy, refused permission — did so on the basis that the airport was the airport for southern Saskatchewan, and therefore more than just the Regina people were interested in it. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the fact that he disallowed the subdivision, he was, I think playing an appropriate role. In some ways, that may not be all to the good.

I have expressed in the past some concern about streamlining the bill. There is inevitably a conflict, Mr. Speaker, between developers and the community. As I think I said to the former minister of urban affairs, it reminds me a bit of the song from *Oklahoma*, "Why Can't the Cowman and the Farmer Be Friends?" That the cowman and the farmer had such great difficulty being friends is very simple: they both wanted the same piece of land.

That's true of the developers and the communities. The developer wants to develop it in the manner which maximizes profits; the community wants it developed in a fashion which maximizes the quality of life. Those goals may coincide, but they may also be diametrically

opposed. To the extent that any of the streamlining reduces any of the opportunities for the municipality to control developers and ensure that the development of our urban municipalities takes place in a manner which is in the best interest of the public, it certainly isn't for the public good.

The developers may feel themselves set upon by an endless number of rules and regulations. That certain, Mr. Speaker, is not the public perception of developers. The public perception of developers is that they freewheel and, by and large, are authorities unto themselves. I don't think there is a public perception that developers have been too tightly controlled. I think, in fact, the perception is the opposite. The perception by the public is that developers have had too free a hand.

The idea of inserting time limits in a bill is not a new idea. The divisions which approves subdivisions . . . the name escapes me at the moment. It's not the planning commission, but the branch of his department which approves subdivisions, has a 60-day time limit on it. That's honoured more in the breach than in the observance. The minister would argue that, and would say that in fact most of them are approved within 60 days, but a large number of them are not. The 60-day time limit which exists in that legislation is largely ignored.

I say to the minister, imposing a time limit does not in and by itself solve a problem. You can't legislate efficiency. You can't legislate courtesy, or industry. The time delays did not result from a lack of a perception by the public service that they should deal with these things in a speedier fashion; they knew that. It just was, in some cases, impossible for them to do so. To some extent, streamlining the steps which the planning appeal board has to take may go some distance towards speeding that process up.

I was of the impression, unsubstantiated by any sort of scientific study, I was of the impression that there was a shortage of staff, as well. And, as we say, I don't think that's a new problem; I think that both the rural planning appeals board and the urban planning appeals board have felt themselves short of staff, and that's been true for some time.

If that is indeed, Mr. Minister, the reason why there have been delays, you're not going to solve that by putting a time limit in the act. They can't work twice as fast and get twice as much done, in most cases.

I note there are occasions when the need to advertise is done away with. I think we would want to be very sure that no opportunity is lost for the public to intervene in appropriate cases where planning decisions are involved. I think, currently, notwithstanding the complex nature of the subject, the public do play a key role in determining many planning decisions.

The member will be aware of a problem which has plagued the Regina City Council for some years in the Arcola subdivision. The by-law has been before the city council many times. Each time, they've had to advertise it, and each time it's brought forth a spirited response from members of the public. About semi-annually a number of us – same group – appear back before city council.

I don't know what the solution to that kind of problem is, but the solution is certainly not to do away with the need to advertise, and deny the public the opportunity to go and make their views known. That isn't the solution. So I think we're going to want to be watching that portion of the bill, as well.

As I say, this is a difficult, complex bill, probably the most difficult we're going to deal with in this session. I want an opportunity to review the remarks of the minister in the light of the legislation. I therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 14 – An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assessment Act**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of a bill to amend The Saskatchewan Assessment Act.

As members of the Legislative Assembly know, the province is in the midst of a reassessment program. The reasons why reassessment is necessary are, first, to reflect the increased value of property since the last assessment base set in 1947, and secondly, to ensure an equitable distribution of property taxes for certain properties which have become more valuable, while others have become less valuable, since the last assessment.

In aggregate, a municipality will be able to raise the same amount of property taxes after reassessment with a lower mill rate as it did before reassessment. However, as has been seen recently, some individuals and classes of property owners will face substantial tax increases, and this could pose a hardship.

One solution, Mr. Speaker, to the immediate problem is to permit municipalities to phase in reassessment over a period of time. The purpose of this legislation is to permit urban and rural municipalities to phase in reassessments over a period of up to three years. This amendment responds to municipal requests for authority to phase in reassessment. It will effectively cushion the financial blow to property owners and give them more time to make the necessary adjustments caused by reassessment.

Any municipality, Mr. Speaker, implementing the reassessment in 1984 or later will be able to use this phase-in provision. The phase-in formula for each municipality and for each year of the phase-in would be specified in the regulations. This would permit the municipality to specify the proportions of the old and new assessment values to be used in determining the assessed value of property within the municipality.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that this government is prepared to help municipalities and individual property owners cope with the impact of reassessment. This proposal is only one solution to the immediate problem. We realize that there are other solutions to the ongoing problems of assessment and we are ready and willing to act. These include the possibility of variable mill rates for various classes of property, and staffing and structural changes to the assessment authority, as well as a review of the formulas adopted in 1976 which have resulted in the present change in tax incidence within the municipalities.

It must be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the 1976 formula adopted by the NDP administration not only updated the values generally on property, but also put more emphasis on land and on buildings, causing a dramatic shift in tax burdens to some classes of properties. Mr. Speaker, we will be reviewing the impact of this formula and the formula itself. However, in the meanwhile, we are introducing the amendment so that municipalities will have the option to soften the blow over the next three years.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members of the Assembly to support this bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I can say, and I will be brief on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, that we will not be opposing this bill. We certainly don't want to do anything to discourage the process of reassessment. It has been my view that this assessment is long overdue. Representing as I do a downtown riding, people who live in the downtown area, it has been my own view that the downtown properties are over-taxes, and those who live . . . And some of the properties on the outskirts of town are in fact under-taxed.

So we applaud the reassessment, but recognize that in some cases the increases may be very large and that it may be that a municipality may feel it appropriate to phase it in, or a municipality may not, as I understand under the legislation, and would then simply proceed to implement it as a whole. But a municipality may feel that the need to do it over a three-year period may on occasion be appropriate. We will, therefore, not be opposing this bill.

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

### **Bill No. 15 – An Act to amend The Local Improvements Act**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of The Local Improvements Amendment Act. Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly straightforward amendment, and I only want to comment briefly on it. As members know, The Local Improvements Act permits municipalities to charge the costs of certain public works against abutting properties. Works such as sidewalks, paving, curb and gutter, and certain water and sewer lines are often funded as local improvements. These charges are known as local improvement levies.

Mr. Speaker, railway right-of-way and station grounds are common features in many of our towns and villages, and railways are assessed local improvement levies when municipal public works are carried out abutting their property. Mr. Speaker, this amendment will ensure that municipalities always receive at least 50 per cent of the full local improvement levy on such properties even once the levy has been adjusted for any unique features that land may exhibit. These adjustments can be made by the local council, or upon appeal to the local court of revision, or subsequently to the Saskatchewan Assessment Appeal Board. The amendment will provide further guidance to councils and to these appeal bodies.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment recognizes the continuing responsibility that we believe railways, as major landholders in most of our communities, should have towards the development and improvement of those communities. Members will note, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of this bill are retroactive to September 1, 1982. The reason for this is to ensure that any pending appeals relating to railway land will be treated in the same manner as future appeals.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in times of economic restraint our communities, especially the towns and villages, will welcome the assurance this amendment provides, namely that railways will be looked upon to provide at least 50 per cent of the special assessments levied against their station grounds and right-of-ways when abutting local improvement projects are undertaken. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members of the House to support this bill.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Speaker, the obscurity of the need for the amendment is exceeded only by the obscurity of the need for the original provision. I am amazed that this matter ever came to anyone's attention. I assume that it caused some practical problem somewhere. We will not be opposing this. I will be asking the minister what the practical need for the amendment is in the committee of the whole, but we certainly have no intention of opposing the amendment itself.

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

## **MOTIONS**

### **Referral of Bills to Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills**

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I would move:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 11, An Act to amend the Statute Law,

be discharged and the bill referred to the standing committee on non-controversial bills.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I would move:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Surrogate Court Act, be discharged and the bill referred to the standing committee on non-controversial bills.

Motion agreed to.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Garner that Bill No. 7 – **An Act to repeal The Transportation Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could have the House indulgence on it, I would like to deal with all three bills in my speech right now, and that would sort of speed up the proceedings of the House and we could just run them through very briefly. Four bills, pardon me, four bills.

Bill No. 7, the first bill mentioned, is one that I have some concerns about and that's the bill to repeal The Transportation Act. I'm concerned about that because the transportation agency, I think, was a very important agency to the people of this province. It did a lot of work. It did a lot of work that had to do with the different forms of transportation. And we look at some of the work that they did do throughout the province, and one could say that it was an agency that met with a lot of organizations, a lot of community leaders, and a lot of people that were concerned about what was happening in their areas and what was happening in the field of transportation.

And the transportation agency was on top of this. They were a specific agency designed to deal with that. And I think there is some cause for concern when we see this agency being phased into the Department of Highways. Highways is not traditionally known to deal with very major . . . so to say, issues that would concern individuals or separate concerns of people in the province. The concern of Highways is basically to build roads and that is what they were doing. That is what they are used to doing, and I think we would have to question whether now they are going to be able to address all the other concerns relating to transportation within Saskatchewan.

The transportation agency and the minister responsible for it – the previous minister responsible for the transportation agency – in a letter of transmittal, himself stated that the transportation agency has always been a vital factor in the social and economic development of Saskatchewan people. And I think he was right when he said that. That agency was a very vital factor in the development of the social and economic development of Saskatchewan people.

And here we have today another minister saying that this agency is no longer required, that it can just be phased into highways and somehow, whenever warranted, it would be dealt with through a different department. But their agency, the transportation agency, had a lot of duties. And going back to the same report by the former minister, it specialized in very many areas that concern transportation within the province.

It had a transportation policy branch, and this branch was responsible for formulating policy in conjunction with other provincial governments wherever it was appropriate. It had a branch that

would conduct research and would analyse a large range of concerns within transportation.

It had a surface transportation division within it and that division would look at very, very large concerns within the different communities. There was a community services branch and that would focus on the transportation needs of Saskatchewan communities. It concerned itself with a large number of other areas.

And Mr. Speaker, some of the other concerns of the transportation agency was air service to all the communities in Saskatchewan – many small communities. They dealt with the issue of air service to the small communities. That was what that agency was set up to do and it did a very good job at it.

It was concerned about grain transportation, Mr. Speaker. It was concerned about railway transportation. It was concerned about rail passenger transportation. It was concerned about pipeline transportation, or transport.

Mr. Speaker, that one agency dealt with very, very many concerns of Saskatchewan people. And some of them, I think, will not be dealt in the same way through Department of Highways. They definitely will not be dealt in the same way or the same manner through Department of Highways. The air service is one that Department of Highways I think would probably say, “Well it’s there and anybody that wants anything would have to come to us. And if we can find the engineers or the personnel to deal with it, we’ll deal with it, because we no longer have an agency to deal with it, a specific agency to deal with it.” And Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that this government decided to group together so many different agencies within the government that had specific duties that they would do. I think it is very unfortunate that they would do that.

And it doesn’t really matter what the department would call itself, whether it would call itself the department of transportation or department of highways or highways and transportation or whatever the name would be. It really doesn’t change the fact that it is still the old Department of Highways with the same people in it that had a concern only for the kind of roads that were out there, and how these roads could be built, and the engineers that concern themselves with the road construction phase of that department. We’re bringing into it now different agencies. I don’t know – and I suppose we’ll have the opportunity to deal with that in third reading or in committee of the whole – as to where the personnel from these departments are now and what their functions are today.

But I think we’d have to look at what has happened in the past, and just over the past year. The agency was still in place, and we had an issue and that was the Crow issue – the transportation of grain and the statutory rate on it – where this agency could have been very effective. It could have helped the present government deal with many of the concerns of the people of Saskatchewan. But that agency unfortunately was not used. It was not used, even though it had all the information and the data that could have supported or assisted this government in dealing with the Crow issue. It could have been more effective in trying to save the statutory Crow rate for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LUSNEY:** — But no, this government chose to ignore the agency and to really ignore the farmers of Saskatchewan in the process. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this government did. They decided that rather than keep an agency there, keep it functioning the way it did in the past, and to keep it working for the people, that they would just do away with that agency and instead transfer the cost of the Crow to the farmers — \$500 million that every farmer in Saskatchewan today is going to have to bear because this government did not put the emphasis on the agencies and the people and the expertise that they had within the transportation agency. That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the concerns that I had when I see Bill 7 before us today, to repeal The

Transportation Act.

One of the other things that come into Department of Highways is the highway traffic board and that, Mr. Speaker, I think, is another concern of ours. I think it's going to be a concern of all the people of Saskatchewan, also, because here we have a department – and I think one would have to say a sort of unique department – that was set up back in about 1932 or so. At that time, I believe that would have had to have been under a Conservative government and it was a department that was in existence ever since.

It did a good job. It dealt with the many issues that were out there. It dealt with the issues of highway safety; it dealt with driver training; it dealt with the franchises for trucking firms. It had many, many responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, that were separate from the Department of Highways and separate – almost – from the government. It was somewhat of a semi-judicial type of structure, and it dealt with some of the problems that were out there.

Now we have another department, all grouped together with Highways, where the minister is going to have the responsibility to deal with all of them. But at the same time he will be able to decide whether Joe Smith gets a licence or whether he doesn't get one. Or if he gets a little pressure from a friend of his, or from a trucking firm of his, he will allow them to get a licence or a permit to operate under a certain franchise within the province.

We see the CPR moving into Saskatchewan. And when we see that happening, we might well understand why this government would like to take the authority away from different agencies within the government and group them all into one where they would virtually become lost in the shuffle, and the minister would be able to make many decisions without anyone knowing how they were made or whether they were made in a manner that would be within the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

I think we have to have those concerns there, Mr. Speaker. And I think the government, if they looked at it carefully, would make an honest decision to say that we would leave some of these agencies in existence and have the minister, as before, be responsible for them, but they would be a separate agency that would report to the legislature. And the people would have a report that they could look at, like the transportation agency used to have. And in that way it makes it an open government, an open government in all areas, not just open in where the government feels that it should be open and hide everything where they don't want the public to know or to have any of that information.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think is what is happening within the Department of Highways right now, when we see the repeal of three bills – 7, 8, and 9 – and grouping them all within Bill 10, The Department of Highways and Transportation Act.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a number of questions to ask as we go along in the committee of the whole because I do have some very serious concerns about what the government is doing, and we'll be dealing with those concerns in the committee of the whole.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Garner that Bill No 8 – **An act to amend The Highways Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I will have questions on Bill No. 8, also in committee of the whole. I will then take the opportunity to ask those questions at that time.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Garner that Bill No. 9 – **An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from certain changes in the name and functions of the Department of Highways and Transportation** be now read a second time.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Mr. Speaker, we will be dealing with Bill No. 9 in the committee of the whole. Looking at it, it looks like there's nothing more than a name change to this act. There are a couple of questions that I will have of the minister, though, in committee of the whole and I'll be asking him then.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Garner that Bill No. 10 – **An Act respecting the Department of Highways and Transportation** be now read a second time.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 10 being the one that's going to have all the other agencies within it now, is one as I stated before, one that I have some very large concerns about.

It is going to be a bill that I feel is going to deal specifically, as it did in the past, with the construction of highways and its related areas, mainly in the construction of highways and may very well ignore some of the important and specific issues regarding transportation, as has been dealt with with the other agencies in the past. So there are going to be a lot of questions on Bill 10 that I will have for the minister, and we will deal with them in the committee of the whole.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Schoenhals that Bill No. 5 – **An Act to Provide for the Taxation of Minerals** be now read a second time.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, when I took my seat on our last sitting day when we considered this bill, I had made some remarks about the general structure of the bill and what circumstances had brought it before this House, and had indicated that we agreed with the basic thrust of the bill to institute new royalty schedules and tax schedules for minerals that are extracted in this province.

The bill has its chief benefit in providing a very much simplified tax structure for freehold minerals and, as I had indicated earlier, this comes about because of the changes in the constitution which now permit our province to impose indirect taxation on minerals and the extraction of minerals, something which was not possible prior to April of 1982. Because it was not possible, taxes had to be structured as direct taxes, and they proved to be very, very complicated, although they yielded the necessary revenue.

We are pleased that this bill is coming forward. I have had an opportunity to look at it in some detail, although there are some aspects of it which are still being researched on my behalf. I believe that I can raise them all in the committee. And accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I will make no further comments on this stage of the bill at second reading, in the belief that all the matters which I wish to address, primarily matters as to how the new schedules will impact on the production of coal and potash – the coal schedule being in the bill, and the potash schedule being promised by the minister to be added at a future time – just how they will impact on the industry, and whether or not they will make any significant change, not only in the amount of gross revenues received, but also in the amount paid by individual taxpayers.



I gather from the remarks of the minister that he proposes a schedules of taxes which will not materially change the amount of money to be received by the Crown in respect of the mining of coal or the mining of potash from freehold land. That answers one of our concerns. The second concern is whether or not any individual taxpayer will be materially affected; that is, whether an individual taxpayer will pay much more or much less, even though the total amount might be the same. Those questions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are perhaps best addressed in committee, and accordingly, I will be supporting the bill, and will make no further remarks at this time.

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

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

### **Bill No. 2 – An Act respecting the Department of Science and Technology**

#### **Clause 1**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Is the minister prepared to introduce his officials?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my pleasure to introduce my deputy minister, Mr. Alex Guy, who is sitting to my left; and immediately behind him is Dale Botting, who is director with the planning division and Executive Council.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of comments, and ask a few questions of the minister. I am pleased to indicate that we will be supporting the establishment of the department of science and technology under the new act.

In your speech on second reading, Mr. Minister, you indicated that the centrepiece of the new strategy would in fact be the new department that you are creating. I guess what I want to ask you is: what process of consultation did you have prior to the establishment of the department of technology? In other words, did you have consultation with various groups? If you would indicate the area of consultation and when it was carried out. I would appreciate that.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member's question, yes, we have done considerable consultation over the . . . actually, over the past 18 months, during which time there was the office of science and technology. It was from the office of science and technology that the new department really began. And during this period of time there was the opportunity for consultation with people at the federal level. There was considerable consultation with the provinces, and visitations with the provinces to get the feeling concerning what direction they were heading. There was consultation with the Saskatchewan Research Council on an ongoing basis regarding the needs of technology. There was an ongoing constant consultation and very close co-operation with the two universities. And we have done considerable consultation with the high-technology industry through the science community, and through industries themselves.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to hear the minister detail the amount of consultation that went into this, and also the consultation with the Regina university. And also, in respect to other provinces, it seems to me that each and every province is involved in addressing this important question of new technology of the future, and I want to know whether . . . And as I look across the provinces, I find in British Columbia some of the high-technology thrusts that have been commenced, at least it's been reported, are running into some very serious problems – financial problems – and accordingly, what I am asking the minister: if you can indicate whether you have done a fairly thorough job in reviewing what thrusts are being implemented in the various provinces. Are we going into areas exactly the same in duplicating that form of technology and strategy which is already adopted by other provinces? In other words, what I'm asking you: have you done a detailed analysis in order to set

a strategy that the direction in which we're going will not be a head-on collision with where it has already been developed in other provinces? Do you follow me on that?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, yes, I'm pleased to say that we have done considerable study, particularly in the last three to four months, in regard to what the other provinces are doing and what directions they are heading. At the present time, there are two provinces — namely, Quebec and British Columbia — who have departments of science and technology. Alberta initiated a meeting with us and were very interested in what we were doing. They, themselves, were considering going in the same direction. We have met with individual provinces — namely, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia — and in all instances it seemed that they were envious of where we were going, in that they saw the need for bringing together the various players in this whole area of science and technology, and they saw that there was the possibility of many economies and many efficiencies being realized if this was to be followed.

So that as far as our own situation is concerned, I think what we were trying to read from the knowledge that we gained from the other provinces was to gain ideas and programs that could have application in Saskatchewan, keeping in mind what Saskatchewan's needs are and what Saskatchewan's resources are, and trying to take advantage of the things that we have as natural advantages, namely the primary resources that we have.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I've gone through your speech on second reading. You spoke to three bills. I just would like the minister's comment as to why he found it necessary, within that strategy that he's adopting for high-technology, to repeal The Science Council Act and the science council. It seems to me that there is a direction which is operating within this government, and any body which has been established and set up with some independence of operation . . . There seems to be a tendency of consolidation and emasculating of outside groups with any power and a total control being adopted by departments.

I think my learned friend, the member from Regina Centre, alluded to some of the directions this government has gone in really reducing the powers of citizens bodies and incorporating them directly under the purview of government control. I don't want to allude to all of them, but I note some. The legal aid — the local boards — were dissolved. I think of the science council here now being dissolved. I think of the university commission being dissolved and going into the department directly. There's a whole series.

So what I really ask the minister is: within your strategy of high-technology which you alluded to, why was it necessary at that time to single out and repeal The Science Council Act and disband the science council?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member, I can assure him, and I can also assure the hon. member from Regina Centre, that this was not, as he described it, another example of getting rid of another agency or body that had existed for years. There were very, very logical reasons for us so doing. I would like to take a moment or two to explain the reasoning that we used in disbanding the science council at this particular time.

First of all, the science council came into being, if memory serves me right, in 1974. At that time there was a science council set up, and along with it, a secretariat. The secretariat consisted of 10 people. For some reason your government decided to disband the secretariat, somewhere around the year 1979. At about the same time, the question was raised as to the meaningfulness, the worthwhileness, of the science council. The minister of the time, Mr. Doug McArthur, set up a consulting firm, or at least contacted a contracting firm, PAT contractors, or consultants I should say, to investigate the role and the mandate, the worthwhileness of the science council.

The recommendation that was given by the science council was to the effect that the science council itself should not be a policy-making body and so, keeping this in mind, and recognizing

that when we were setting up the new department of science and technology, which really was to be established with the idea of being the policy-making body, then it just seemed logical to us to eliminate what in effect would have been a conflict. There would be con compatibility between The Science Council Act and the new Department of Science and Technology Act, and it was for this reason – it was for a logical reason – that we decided that it made sense to do away with The Science Council Act at that particular time.

We see the need for an advisory role on the part of the science community and the general public, for which reason we are including that as a part of the act, and section 7 will enable the minister to set up an advisory committee to serve that purpose.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

### **Clause 5**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Just in respect to clause 5, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister . . . In respect to the staff of the department, can you at this stage give us any idea as to what size or component of staff that you will be looking at in the new department?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we've been looking very carefully at that, and what we have really looked at first and foremost is: what should this department be doing? What is the role and the mandate of this new department? And then trying to apply what our staffing requirements would be following that.

The department is still in the embryo or the growth stage and so, therefore, is our staffing requirement. However, I want to assure the hon. member that we will have sufficient funding in order to have adequate staff in order to be able to do the work of whatever the role of the new department of science and technology is given. And the route that we are going is to appoint people in key positions and using these people to add to the department's staffing as the requirement dictates, rather than going the other route of putting people in place and having more or less a bureaucracy where there would be the danger of having redundancy.

Clause 5 agreed to.

### **Clause 6**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — In respect to “the minister may engage the services of or retain any technical, professional or other advisors, specialists or consultants that he considers necessary,” I just wanted to ask the minister: have you any predisposition as to whether these will be private or will you be hiring advisors as members of the staff or will you be, in other words, contracting out to private organizations for your advice?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, we plan to hire the best consultants that we can get, but we do not plan on hiring a group of people and putting them within the department, but rather of contracting for their services.

Clause 6 agreed to.

### **Clause 7**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Just in respect to the advisory committees here, have you any idea as to the likely size of these advisory committees, or is that premature?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, yes, I guess in all honesty that would be a bit premature,

with the exception of fulfilling the role of what previously the science council had done. We would be thinking in terms of approximately the same size of a council, and we would be appointing task forces and/or committees as the need arose.

Clause 7 agreed to.

**Clause 8**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — In respect to the duties of the minister, I would like to ask him: to what extent will you indeed be co-ordinating the general areas which are otherwise in other departments? I think of higher technology in the resource industry. Under the potash corporation, for instance, they were spending a very . . . from 1 to 1.5 per cent of their budget which would be directed towards research. Now, what I'm asking you: is this going to be continued — that various department will be carrying on their aspects of research, or is there a consolidation of research within, for the government, the private, and the crown corporations, under your jurisdiction?

The reason I ask you that is that you have all responsibilities other than those assigned to another minister or department branch of government, and what I'm asking you, as my example illustrates in respect to the crown corporations, in the area of potash they have been carrying on a considerable amount of research, and what I'm asking you: will that now come under your jurisdiction, and will you be able to influence, if you were to take over, for instance, under your jurisdiction, your department, under crown corporations, whether you'd get the same enthusiasm of allocation of funds as if it were under its own jurisdiction of the crown corporation or CIC (crown investments corporation).

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, what we anticipate is that we will be playing the role of a co-ordinator and a facilitator, rather than directing departments and/or crown corporations, so that the departments will be doing their own research, and so will the crown corporations. The role that we will play will be that of bringing people together and trying to establish priorities and goals, and co-ordinating the research in such a way that there are economies and efficiencies realized as opposed to the possibility of there being duplication.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**Bill No. 3 – An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Department of Science and Technology Act**

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**Bill No. 4 – An Act to repeal The Science Council Act**

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**THIRD READINGS**

**Bill No. 2 – An Act respecting the Department of Science and Technology**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be read a third time and passed under its

title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 3 – An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Department of Science and Technology Act**

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 4 – An Act to repeal The Science Council Act**

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:27 p.m.