

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Sandberg: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you today, and to the members of the Legislative Assembly, two groups from my constituency of Saskatoon Centre.

First, in the west gallery, some 45 students and their teachers from Wilson School, which is on 7th Avenue, right in the heart of Saskatoon Centre. This is one of the fine older schools in one of the best districts in the city of Saskatoon, so it's a pleasure to have them here with us today visiting us. They will be going on a tour and meeting with me later for pictures and drinks.

So I would ask that the Assembly welcome them and their teachers, Warren Debert and John Brent, to the Assembly today, and hope that they have a truly educational experience.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sandberg: — And in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Speaker, from the Saskatoon Community College on 1st Avenue in downtown Saskatoon, some 33 people from the adult basic education course, and their teacher/chaperon, Robin Stonehouse, who's been here on many occasions before. So I'll be meeting with them later for questions as well. So would you please help me welcome the students from the Saskatoon Community College.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Caswell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce you, and through you to the House, 29 grade 5 students from Westmount School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Karen Shmon; a teacher associate, Mrs. Lucier; parents, Mr. Porter and Mrs. Siemans. I will be meeting with them at 3 o'clock. Enjoy your session in the Legislative Assembly. You will see democracy in action. However, I may warn you students that the actions of the hon. members in the House today are not in any way to be seen as a standard of behaviour for you in home and school - I expect more than that. So I will see you at 3 o'clock.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce a class of grade 8 students from Centennial School in north-west Regina, who are accompanied today by Mr. Bill Forrest. They are annual visitors to the Assembly. They are politically aware, and they realize it's a forum for debate. I will meet with you after question period, Mr. Forrest, and the rest of the class, and maybe we can discuss at that time some of the budget cut-backs that Centennial School has suffered this year. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Petersen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'd like to introduce to you and the Assembly, four members of the 2271 Pipestone Royal Canadian Army cadets who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. I have Cadet Lieutenant Barb Florness, Cadet Captain Trent Rowlett, and Captains Darryl and Doris Florness. Captain Florness is the commanding officer, and her husband, Darryl, is the training officer. I was at the annual inspection on Sunday at which Cadet Captain Trent Rowlett received the Armsworthy memorial trophy, as the top gold star in the Cadet in Saskatchewan. So that's quite an honour. Congratulations, Trent. Will all hon. members join me

in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Prosecution with Respect to Mr. Thatcher

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Justice, and it concerns the prosecution under way, the criminal prosecution with respect to Mr. Thatcher, and I am concerned about some of the reports which I saw in the paper. I will quote them briefly, from Mr. Thatcher's counsel:

One of the things that is causing me a great deal of difficulty is I can't get any information from the Crown prosecution on this matter. I think they are hiding something.

And then the counter-quote from Crown counsel, Mr. Kujawa:

We have a general policy of disclosure to the defence, and to date we have been following it.

My question to the Minister of Justice is this, and I don't wish to comment on the quotes, much less to comment on the case. I ask him: will he give the House the assurance that with respect to this particular prosecution, the accused and his counsel will receive no special privilege, and will receive all the same rights as any other accused in a similar position?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Yes.

Memo Concerning Western Earth Moving Ltd.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to address a question to the Minister of Labour, and I wish to ask the Minister of Labour about a memo that was dated July 11, '83, and was sent by the chief of staff of the Attorney General, or Minister of Justice, to the Minister of Labour.

The memo deals with a case or a situation referred to as Western Earth Moving Ltd., and the pertinent information in the memo indicates . . . and I want to quote just a portion of it to put the question before you. And this is from B. Patrick Carey, barrister and solicitor, chief of staff, to the Hon. Lorne McLaren . . . of the Chief Justice, rather, or the Justice Minister, to Hon. Lorne McLaren, Minister of Labour.

The memo goes on to indicate that Judge Culliton will, in fact, make a review of the situation and it will be on the following terms:

No witnesses will be called; that this is to be a review of a file material only, to see if any additional remedy might be pursued, or if there are some obvious miscarriages of justice, that additional funds might be offered.

And three, Mr. Lee cannot advise anyone, or the public at large, that he has received a new hearing from the government or, indeed, that he is receiving what he feels to be special circumstances.

I'd like to ask the minister: can the minister please explain the circumstances surrounding a situation where those involved cannot advise the public that a new hearing has been arranged or, indeed, that the individual is receiving special consideration?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, I will respond and give the answer to the hon. member. The situation that was brought to our attention by the individual involved was that he indicated that he hadn't been dealt with fairly on a previous dealing with the government. He had taken the matter to court and been unsuccessful, and been unsuccessful at the court of appeal level. Time for further appeal had passed.

There was some indication that evidence had not been brought forward which perhaps, if the individual's interpretation was correct, may or may not have made a difference at the trial level. With all the appeal time, and no other remedy, I felt it was proper that some independent person simply take a look at the file along those terms so that we, at least, could be satisfied, and the individual could be satisfied and his counsel be satisfied. His counsel, I might add, was very supportive of the procedure, and that's the appropriate procedure to be taken.

Mr. Koskie: — Supplemental to the Minister of Justice. In the quietness of the Minister of Labour, can you indicate why the proviso that the individual who is having the special hearing, that he be not allowed to advise the public that a new hearing was being held, and why he could not indicate that he was receiving special consideration? Why were those provisos put forward.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, it's . . . I think trying to deal fairly with an individual that maybe feel wronged by the government obviously can get out of hand, and it's not to be an everyday occurrence, an occurrence that becomes a matter of right. As I say, there was some indication that perhaps evidence had not been brought forward, that perhaps the individual was prejudiced, which is why we wanted the review, and we were simply trying to ask the individual involved to recognize that he was getting an extra check to make sure that his rights had not been dealt with unfairly; that his rights had been upheld and that he was, in fact, dealt with properly by the appropriate government department. So we were just simply trying to indicate that this is not an everyday occurrence, and that we were trying to assist that individual.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, a further supplemental to the minister. I'd like to ask you . . . You indicate that this was a special treatment in this particular instance. What were the circumstances in which you would provide to this particular individual's special circumstances, in view of the circumstances that you have indicated that he went through court, tried his remedies, and felt aggrieved yet? What were the special circumstances in respect to this particular case that you would, in fact, set up a special hearing? Certainly, if there's an entitlement, Mr. Minister of Justice, for one individual, why would that not be the case in respect to other individuals? Why wouldn't it be made public?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I'm frankly not of the view that it would be appropriate, but I am prepared to advise the hon. member of the reasons. If the hon. member at that point wishes to make them public, that will be his privilege. But I'm prepared to give you the reasons.

Mr. Koskie: — I'd like one further supplemental. I'd like to ask the minister if he could advise what were the results of the hearing, and were additional funds paid as a result of the hearing to this particular individual?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — My understanding is, no, no additional funds, and that we did ask a judge to take a look at it. There were some expenditures that the judge incurred, but other than that, no expenditures at all.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The memo in question quoted by my colleague from Quill Lakes is from your chief of staff, Mr. Carey, to the Hon. Lorne McLaren, Minister of Labour. And it says in part:

Should these terms be acceptable to yourself and Mr. Lee, I will proceed to deal with Judge Culliton.

Would you be good enough to advise the House what the involvement of the Minister of Labour was with respect to this inquiry into whether or not this citizen had been properly dealt with?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well the hon. minister had had representations from a constituent who had felt that he had been dealt with harshly by a government department over a period of some years — I believe it goes back to about 1976. As I say, the appeal time was over.

There was some indication that evidence had not been brought forward that would have been — if the individual's interpretation had've been put on it — would have been helpful to the individual. It had not been brought forward at any time. I'm prepared to give the reasons for that to the hon. member and the Leader of the Opposition. So it was, in my view, an appropriate procedure to take to make sure that the individual did, in fact, have fair and just treatment.

Closing of Assault Centre in Yorkton

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a to the Minister of Social Services. It has to do with the assault centre in Yorkton. The minister will be aware of the funding problems that not only this centre is having at the present time, but in total seven centres who have not been told by your department whether or not they will, in fact, receive funding this year. Mr. Minister, you will be aware of statements made by the Minister of Justice and yourself in terms of these kinds of centres being funded.

I wonder now, today, whether or not you can inform the Assembly and the centres across the province whether or not you will have money so that, as the director of the Yorkton centre tells me, that the doors of that centre will not be closed at the end of June.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reiterate to the Assembly that this year in our budget we have, in fact, allotted a substantial amount of money to increase services to deal with the family violence issue.

And I'm pleased to inform the Assembly, as well, that later this week or early next week, I believe, that myself and the Minister of Health and the Attorney General will, in fact, be meeting with a large group of individuals from across the province who will be consulting with us regarding the issue of family violence and violence against women. It will be a day-long seminar to determine where best can we utilize the funds which we have allocated to address the issue of family violence and violence against women.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a supplement to the minister. Mr. Minister, I asked you whether or not you had plans to fund these seven centres, and I will push that point. Can you announce today whether or not in the budget that you have announced several months ago, is there money there for the funding of these assault centres in seven different centres in the province?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the funding of these particular centres that the member opposite has referred to will be considered in the overall context of the priorities of this government, and certainly will be an issue that I expect will come up at the one-day seminar that I just mentioned.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, a new question. Can you inform me when you became aware of, and when the proposals for the funding of these seven centres came to you? When did these groups get together and meet with you to ask for funding? How long ago would that meeting have taken place?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, I, myself, have not met with a particular group that the member opposite is referring to. I believe my department officials have had contact with these individuals.

They were initially funded by the federal government for a period of time. And we are always concerned, of course, that the federal government continue to fund those programs which they initiate. And we will be interested to see whether or not the federal government will, in fact, continue to meet its obligations to these programs that it has initiated.

That is one factor that we need to take into consideration when we make determinations about where our funding for family violence will go.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I find it difficult to believe that this long after the budget is out you still have not made up your mind whether or not these centres will be funded. And I would like to ask you one more time, so that when we call these centres back, who have, in fact, called the Minister of Labour in Yorkton about this issue, have called your office and dealt with your director, to not get an answer, so that we can inform them that either yes or no, they will be getting funding. So they can either make arrangements to lay off their staff or whatever they have to do.

I would like you to very clearly state whether or not you intend to fund these seven centres, so that we can get back to them because, apparently, yourself for the Minister of Labour have not been getting back to them.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to reiterate again that this government considers the provision of essential services for those people that are suffering in family violence kinds of situations to be very important. We have allotted \$800,000, I believe, in the budget this year to enhance those services.

We will be taking a look very seriously at those particular centres that the member opposite has referred to. They are an important concern of ours. We will be looking at them closely during this particular seminar discussion, and I expect that funding decisions will be made shortly.

Out-of-Province Training of Occupational Therapists

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and my question deals with your government's announced plan to more than double the out-of-province training of Saskatchewan young people as occupational therapists.

The question deals with occupational therapy and with the reported signing of an agreement between yourself and British Columbia for a five-year period to train Saskatchewan people, indeed up until 1990, to train Saskatchewan young people as occupational therapists — this in addition to the training spaces you have acquired in Manitoba and Alberta.

By my calculation, the B.C. contract will cost somewhere between 500,000 and 700,000, excluding all the bursary costs which are involved. The bill will be well over \$1 million. University of Saskatchewan estimates that it cost them just over \$1 million to set up an occupational therapy unit in Saskatoon.

My question to you is this: are you considering spending the money in Saskatchewan to build a training program based in Saskatoon to serve all of these young people from Saskatchewan who are now training in Manitoba, Alberta, and British Columbia? Have you considered the establishment of an occupational training program in Saskatoon?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, what I would like to point out to the hon. member is that last week when I answered the same question and talked about three options, one thing I neglected to mention was that the occupational therapists society — I believe it's called SOT — had, in fact, stated that their position is unalterable on this, and they will not waver, that they are

only looking at one alternative, which is capital construction in Saskatoon.

We have said that that for the moment is not the most economically viable option available to us. The B.C. proposal — the member correctly identifies as being 12 students — we believe is in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars for training costs.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, you will know that the need for occupational therapists is not something which is likely to reduce in the future. The occupational therapists are needed to deal with elderly people, and their number grows.

The society to which you referred, the Saskatchewan Society of Occupational Therapists, refer to your plan as a stopgap measure. My question to you is this, sir: in view of the fact that you are entering into long-term agreements with British Columbia, in view of the fact that you propose to continue to have agreements over a longer period of time with Alberta and with Manitoba, and in view of the fact that we're going to need more occupational therapists into the foreseeable future, isn't it sensible, isn't it sensible to set up a program in Saskatchewan, using Saskatchewan instructors, training Saskatchewan people, to have a specific program dealing, at least in part, with specific Saskatchewan problems, such as agricultural injuries?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well, Mr. Speaker, while I do not disagree with the basic premise being proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to point out that the Saskatoon proposal is not for \$1 million. It is for a minimal amount of \$2.8 million, and that is merely capital. That does not include instructional costs, if indeed such qualified people are currently available within the province. So that's the first point I'd like to make.

The proposal that is currently being worked up by University of Regina is in consultation with the new rehabilitation centre as announced by my colleague, the Minister of Health, this morning which, of course, may have prompted the Leader of the Opposition's question.

This morning, officials from the SOT (Society of Occupational Therapists) did, in fact, meet with officials from my department, and we once again had kicked this problem around. Perhaps, in the long term, to deal with the inherited problem we have with seniors and old people for whom the previous government made little or no allowance in their future planning, perhaps in that circumstance the long-term solution, as economic conditions permit, would, in fact, to be looking at some type of capital structure within Saskatchewan where we will train occupational therapists. For the moment, most of our energies have been directed through the auspices of my colleague, the Minister of Health, towards the construction of level 3 and 4 care homes to pick up the backlog which was so sadly neglected by the previous government.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, you will know that the estimate that you use of two point some million is quite different than what the University of Saskatchewan is telling us. In fact, in the *Star-Phoenix*, the University of Saskatchewan is quoting an estimate of the operating and capital estimates to cost \$1.2 million to \$1.5 million for the period from 1984 to 1989.

I wonder, Mr. Minister: are you accurate in your number of saying, "over \$2 million for capital construction," or is the University of Saskatchewan accurate when they say 1.2 for operating in capital?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the figures I am using are accurate. If they are not accurate, then I'll certainly undertake to have them checked, and I'll certainly provide you with the most accurate and up-to-date information which my officials have at their disposal.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, if the University of Saskatchewan is accurate at 1.2 million — and I don't know why they wouldn't be when they're on the scene in promoting the studies, 50 per cent of the classes which are already in place — Mr. Minister, will you then look at not wasting the 700,000 you now plan to ship out of the

province and use the money that they are talking about (1.2 million) to set up a program and to put it in place at the earliest conveniences of your department?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Once again, I would reiterate: I think that the figures we are using are accurate because they take into consideration certain other factors of which the member may or may not be aware right now, including the main factor, and that is, that it is not a priority to the University of Saskatchewan, and it is not a priority to the faculty of medicine, and the president has indicated that if \$2.8 million extra over and above the money which is being made available to university this year — if it were to be made available to him, he would gladly consider a school of occupational therapy. And I don't believe it is 50 per cent of the class is currently being offered there. I think it's something less than 50 per cent.

Cost of Media Relations Advertising

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Premier's estimates it came to light that this media relations staff spend in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 a month getting the message out to the people of Saskatchewan.

I've done some research, and it appears that across the country it far exceeds, it far exceeds the expenditures of any other province in Canada. I would just like to ask the Premier if he could please outline the responsibilities of these personnel in his office, these media relations people, and outline to the people of Saskatchewan why the excessive costs to get the message out to the people, when we have the press people who are present in the gallery every day, and all the other media people who, in fact, cover the legislature on an every day basis.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, as I explained in estimates yesterday, we want to make sure that we don't make the same mistakes that other governments have, particularly the federal government or the previous administration, and we have people who advise not only the ministers, but co-ordinate the media activities and the public programs and the education programs of departments and Crown corporations. We have something like 30,000 employees. I will admit that we have fewer employees, something like 3,000 fewer people than the previous administration, so we're cutting it back on a daily basis, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sveinson: — Supplementary. These people are obviously very political in nature. I would ask you why the province of Ontario, which has approximately 6 million people, requires only two press officers, and the province of Saskatchewan either has four, five, or six of the same people?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I would doubt if the hon. member has his research done accurately or his information is accurate; I would think that there are several ministerial assistants and advisers to the Premier with respect to media relations and communications in the province of Ontario. And the people is a lot higher than 6 million; I believe it's closer to 8 million people. And when you look at the success of the administration there, I would believe that they do have significant advisers.

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Speaker, the debate wasn't the population of Ontario. It was the expenditure of this government on political material it decides to disseminate to the press. And I suggest that \$20,000 a month is far in excess of the expenditures in Ontario. I spoke with the Premier's office this morning in Ontario, and they indicated to me that there are two people on staff in the Premier's office who are responsible for media relations. I ask you again, Mr. Premier. Qualify a \$20,000 a month expenditure in the light of cuts in social services, in the light of the fact that some of these people may be on staff that have other part-time jobs, as one Mr. Leddy did, obviously. I would ask you to qualify the \$20,000 a month expenditure of your media people to the satisfaction of the people of Saskatchewan. I don't believe you've done that.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will have to judge if they like

the welfare program, like the educational programs, or the health care programs and so forth. We have new programs, for example, with respect to Lights On — Saskatchewan. We have new programs with respect to agriculture on saving lives, on all kinds of programs that are the first in the country. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the communication people in our administration are doing a very good job, and from what I see in response to the public reaction, they are very satisfied with it.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 84 — An Act to amend The Heritage Property Act

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Heritage Property Act.

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

Bill No. 85 — An Act to establish the Northern Affairs Secretariat

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to establish the Northern Affairs Secretariat.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 86 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Education and Health Tax Act.

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

Bill No. 87 — An Act respecting Loan Guarantees for Feeder Associations

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting Loan Guarantees for Feeder Associations.

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

MOTIONS

Withdrawal of Bill from Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, prior to orders of the day, I would move, and ask:

That Bill No. 78, An Act respecting Crop Insurance, be withdrawn from the standing committee on non-controversial bills, and placed on the orders of the day for second reading.

The reason for this is, perhaps, an area that we could be looking at, and if we are to change our standing orders, is that when bills are referred to the standing committee on non-controversial bills, you cannot move a House amendment. So we have to move it back to get the House amendment.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move:

That the Assembly move directly to, with leave, to government orders, starting on page 29 of the blues.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 81 — An Act respecting the Protection and Management of Crown Lands Critical for the maintenance of Wildlife Populations

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to protect critically important wildlife habitat on Crown land administered by the Department of Agriculture.

Although this government will continue to sell agricultural Crown lands for agricultural purposes, lands providing critical wildlife cover and food will be exempted from sale. Some lands that are designated as critical wildlife habitat lands may continue to be leased as natural grazing areas, but development which is harmful to wildlife on these lands will be prohibited.

Mr. Speaker, this government recognizes the importance of wildlife to Saskatchewan, to the Saskatchewan people and, in turn, the relatively high importance of agricultural Crown lands to the maintenance of wildlife.

Hunter demand for most big game exceeds the supply, and is increasing by 2 per cent annually, and already far exceeds the supply of most species. White-tailed deer provide 70 per cent of Saskatchewan's big game hunting, yet populations have declined by 50 per cent over the past 20 years due to tree and brush clearing. Rapid habitat loss continues on private land due to agricultural economic pressures.

It is also important that we recognize Saskatchewan supports several rare or endangered wildlife species. Many game birds and other wildlife species have been, or could be, seriously reduced by any further loss of habitat.

Mr. Speaker, certain provincial agricultural Crown lands are of strategic importance to wildlife in Saskatchewan. These parcels form only a small percentage of the land in southern Saskatchewan, yet provide one-third of the critical wildlife habitat. The figure rises to 50 per cent or greater in several parts of the south-western ranching country. The government recognizes that any further loss of this critical wildlife habitat would have disastrous effects on bird and animal populations in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that wildlife habitat will be saved without having any significant negative impact on farming. This government's commitment to make agricultural Crown land available for sale to the farming community is not affected, as the majority of the Crown land administered by the Department of Agriculture will still be available for sale.

Mr. Speaker, the Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act ensures that both wildlife and agricultural interests will be protected for the benefit of present and future generations. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker. That to our knowledge this is the first time any jurisdiction has gone this far to protect critical habitat.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to give second reading of Bill 81, The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill introduced by the minister. The act is a bare bones act. By and large listing the lands which are going to be put into this category, the act prohibits the Crown from selling that land but not from otherwise disposing of it. It can dispose of an interest in the critical wildlife habitat even though it is so designated, and it will be important that the Crown exercises great care in the leasing or other disposition of such land, so as not to destroy its designation and its effectiveness as a habitat for wildlife.

I am told that the schedule, while it appears to be extensive, involves a good many fewer acres of land than has been mentioned from time to time. And I think that we will want to ask in committee whether that is, in fact, the case.

There is provision in the legislation, as I read it, for the addition of land, and it may well be that the minister has in mind further additions to the schedule of protected lands, if I may call them that, in the immediate future.

I will raise one other small point. The section 10 is a curious provision since it appears to say that regulations made under this act will override not only regulations made under other acts, but other acts themselves, which is a rather surprising provision, but perhaps will do no great deal of harm. I propose, as is indicated, to support the bill, and I know my colleagues will be supporting the bill.

I want to make one further comment, and it is that the minister might pursue the idea of getting a further category of land, and that would be private lands where the private holder would be willing to enter into a contract with the Crown for a given number of years to leave the land in a somewhat undeveloped state as a wildlife habitat. And the member indicates that this has been done. And in a sense, of course, it has been done.

But my point, and well am I aware of it since it was done under our administration, I would like to think it was formalized so that we could — and perhaps under this legislation or appropriate legislation — so that we could increase to the greatest degree possible, the critical wildlife habitat; and so that it could be increased without the necessity of the Crown necessarily acquiring title, since there are a good number of private owners out there who are willing to leave or quarter or a half in an undeveloped state. It may be slough land; it may have a good number of put-holes — they may not wish to develop it. And a fair number of them are simply lovers of wildlife.

And those people who are prepared to enter into those arrangements should be encouraged so to do. As the member has indicated, that wouldn't be a new program, but it might be more formally structured, and I would commend that to the minister. I will be supporting the bill.

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

Bill No. 82 — An Act respecting Intensive Livestock Operations

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, the first Pollution (by Live Stock) Control Act came into effect on April 2, 1971. The legislation reflected an attempt to address a number of environmental concerns that had evolved as a result of the settlement patterns and practices adopted by our innovative pioneers. As you know, it was not uncommon in the early days to find small poultry, hog, or dairy operations in the residential areas of most urban centres. Similarly, it made a lot of sense to a livestock producers to construct corrals and feedlots in the shelter of trees and a protected coulee, alongside a lake or a stream that could be used as a water source.

As our cities and towns grew, and as society in general became more demanding with respect to air and water pollution standards, it became apparent that the agriculture industry should assume a positive role in dealing with these issues. It was no longer deemed acceptable to have new livestock enterprises being established within, or adjacent to urban centres, thereby creating both pollution and sanitation hazards.

The public would no longer tolerate the flushing of livestock waste into streams and lakes whose waters were used for domestic purposes or recreation. The purpose of the original legislation, Mr. Speaker, was to develop a regulatory process that would ensure that new intensive livestock operations were not established in locations deemed to be undesirable from an environmental viewpoint.

To ensure that the concerns of other interested agencies were addressed, in 1971 legislation provided that the minister of agriculture could not issue a permit authorizing the construction of a new intensive livestock facility without the approval of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, the minister of public health, and the minister of natural resources. Although the names have changed, the process remains the same. This mandatory referral process has proven to be very cumbersome, leading to lengthy delays in processing applications and some overlap in undertaking the various reviews and inspections involved in assessing each proposal.

We are, therefore, proposing to replace the mandatory referral process by identifying three specific areas of concern, all of which will be addressed by Saskatchewan Agriculture, rather than referring them to other agencies as was previously the case. It will be noted that we are not totally discarding the referral process, since provision is still made to seek advice and opinion of other agencies in instances where it would appear useful to do so.

Since we now have 13 years of experience in administering this legislation, we do not believe that the deletion of the mandatory referral will, in any practical sense, weaken the inspection standards which we have established. The environmental impact of livestock operations is now well understood, and inspection procedures now in use will effectively identify potentially undesirable development proposals.

The act is also being broadened in scope to include goats and horses. While we do not have large numbers of either species in the province, there have been instances reported, particularly on smallholdings, where these animals are being housed in close proximity to neighbours and urban centres. It would therefore seem appropriate to make them subject to the same legislation that applies to other more common farm animals.

While it will be noted that the format of this bill reflects some rearrangement and rewording of the context of the previous act, I believe it is fair to say — and I would underscore this, Mr. Speaker — I believe it is fair to say that the spirit and intent of the legislation remains unchanged. We believe that our farmers will be served by substantially reducing the time involved in processing applications for permits. We believe, too, that significant savings will be effected in administering the legislation by reducing the number of actors involved in the review process.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to move second reading of Bill No. 82, an Act respecting Intensive Livestock Operations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've looked at the act, and the minister describes what the one provision that's different in this act from the original act, and that is that the mandatory referral has been removed, and that the Department of Agriculture will decide whether that needs to be referred. And I believe section 4 actually says that:

The minister may refer an application for a permit, together with any associated

reports and plans and other related information . . .

We feel that the general thrust of this bill remains the same as the original one was, and therefore our caucus will be supporting this slight revision of the original act.

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

Bill No. 83 — An Act to provide for the Making of Grants to Certain Senior Citizens to assist them in making Repairs to their Homes

Hon. Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Speaker, late in 1983, the Minister of Social Services and myself attended a forum put on by the senior citizens' groups, and this was in Saskatoon. And during that conference we were told that a closer consultation was required between seniors and government, and the seniors expressed to us that over the years things had not been satisfactory to them. And over the years, even though I'm not a senior, I recognize the lack of communication that takes place between seniors and governments.

And unfortunately over the years, because seniors are quieter than other groups, they don't seem to receive the same type of attention, and with this government I'm proud to say that that has changed.

The bill before us is a reflection of that change. The seniors indicated to us that they wanted us to consider a new bill for home repair programming, and while they talked to us, they indicated certain deficiencies in the former program of a similar nature. Therefore, we structured a task force which travelled the province through 10 centres, and we had good representations from seniors and young people who intend to become seniors. And in that process they indicated that they wanted some program to assist seniors to repair their homes so they could live in the homes longer, and some way of delivering on the program while we cut the red tape.

They indicate that under the previous program they had problems. It took time. It was a winter works program, which doesn't make too much sense in light of the fact that seniors don't particularly like their windows taken out in February. So, therefore, we looked at making some changes. They complained about the level of assistance - \$650 per repaired home was not adequate, and we agreed with that. They suggested \$1,000. They also suggested changes in the eligibility levels, and we looked at that.

I am pleased to say that the new bill reflects what the seniors' wishes are in this province, and the seniors have expressed pleasure in the announcement that we've made, and they expressed one other concern. They indicated that they enjoyed dealing with us in this bill, and the production of this bill, and wanted us to continue that close communication. And I think today we want to give the seniors of this province that assurance that communication links will never be broken, because we believe strongly that the people that build this province are a priority in this government.

Therefore the new bill, it is a maximum of \$1,000 in assistance, and it could be any level under that — whatever is required by the seniors. The eligibility level is increased to \$16,500 per annum, and we've cut the red tape. The system is simplified.

Therefore it gives me great pleasure to move second reading of a bill to provide for the making of grants to senior citizens to assist them in making repairs to their homes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it interesting that the minister would be attempting to claim this as a new and exciting program in Saskatchewan when this is the government that, in fact, cancelled the home repair program that had been in place for a good number of years in Saskatchewan — a program that not only assisted many senior citizens, along

with the home care program, which was also implemented by a previous government, in attempting to keep or to allow senior citizens to stay in their own home.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the public of Saskatchewan, and the many senior citizens who would have wanted to do home repairs last winter and were not able to, and the many people who were unemployed last winter and could have been working on programs such as home repair, would have wanted to government to do this earlier, to implement this program earlier, or to continue on the program that was in place when they took over office.

I think the hypocritical nature of the minister to stand in this Assembly today and claim that he is the creator of a program like this would make people wonder about the sincerity of this government in dealing with the senior citizens.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I look at the bill, Bill 83, which we have before us, and I listen to the member talk about a \$1,000 limit and talk about the income level. And I look at the bill, and I see none of that in it. And I wonder what bill the minister is talking about because, in introducing the bill, there's no mention of the amount of money seniors will be able to get. There's no mention of the income limits. And I think the seniors will have to watch to see whether or not behind the closed doors of cabinet these things really happen because we have often heard announcements by this government about employment-creating programs and other such announcements, but yet when the reality hits, when we see 64,000 people on welfare, record numbers of unemployed, then the hollowness of programs that have been announced about job creating and that sort of thing leave people wondering.

This Bill 83, which we are dealing with today, I must say to the minister that I welcome the reintroduction of a New Democratic program which was in place when he took office. I allow him the privilege of admitting his mistake, and the mistake that was made by the government, and the reimplementation of a program, which I believe can be and should be a worthwhile program in allowing seniors to stay in their own home.

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. 42 — An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan League of Educational Administrations, Directors and Superintendents

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Yes, at this point I'm acting as the back-up minister to the Minister of Education. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce her staff. To my right is the deputy minister of Education, Mr. Ray Clayton; to my left is Mr. Bill Wells, who is the school administration consultant.

Clause 1

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Acting Minister. I would like, first of all, to ask you rather — I know the minister has alluded to it — but can you indicate to what extent consultation has been undertaken in respect to the drafting of the bill and the extent of that consultation, and the degree of unanimity among the individuals or groups that you indeed contacted in respect to the introduction of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member from the Quill Lakes, I recall during the time that I was Minister of Education that it was my experience that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, yes, very, very good days. I can remember that there was a strong lobby

from the members of LEADS themselves. They were very anxious for this legislation to be introduced. This was supported by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, as well as by the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association. And I feel that I can speak for the present Minister of Education. I'm sure that those were her findings and that is why she has introduced this legislation.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I note, Mr. Minister, that this is indeed a professional bill, I suppose professional in the sense that it could be perhaps compared to The Legal Profession Act, or to the College of Physicians and Surgeons — The Medical Profession Act, or other professional groups. And what I'm interested in here . . . I know in respect to The Legal Profession Act there's over 1,000 individuals who would be involved in that profession practising in Saskatchewan.

Since you are setting up here a special act, The League of Education Administrators, Directors and Superintendents, which indeed will cover that group of individuals — the administrators, directors and superintendents — I'm wondering whether you can give me an estimate of how many individuals will, in fact, form the corps of the membership?

I know that when we come to section 8 of the membership that it varies as to who qualifies, but certainly it deals specifically with the, as I said, the administrators, directors and superintendents. And I was wondering how many of those it will apply to?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the administrators, directors and superintendents, I would estimate it to be approximately 180.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3

Mr. Chairman: — Amend section 3 of the printed bill by repealing subsection (2) and substituting the following:

(2) The league consists of those persons who are members of the league on the day when this Act comes into force and any other persons who become registered as members pursuant to this Act.

(3) The present executive and officers of the league are hereby continued in office until their successors are appointed in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the bylaws, and the existing bylaws of the league are continued until they are repealed, amended or varied pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

Clause 3 as amendment agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 8

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to ask the minister, Section 8 deals with the membership, and section 8, subsection (1), deals with all individuals who:

(a) have a professional teaching certificate;

(b) are employed by a board of education as supervisory or administrative personnel pursuant to section 106 . . .; and

(c) have been designated by The Educational Relations Board pursuant to section 261 . . .

They are required to be members.

But then it goes on in subsection (2), and it says: the following are required to be members of the league, and you have the superintendent and you have the regional directors. And then (c) you have:

any individual whose application for membership is approved by the membership of the league at its annual meeting.

I was wondering why you need such a broad clause (c). Is there any particular intent to broaden the membership of the league beyond the superintendents and the administrators and directors? Is it an intention of the government in the future to take out of the STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation), out of the bargaining unit of the teachers, in other words, the principals and vice-principals? I'm wondering whether there is any intention that eventually it may be leave the door open, and what you will have is principals and vice-principals throughout the education system being allowed to join and be a part of this association.

And I was wondering whether the minister could contact . . . Because certainly it has been the position of the Saskatchewan school trustees, way back when I was teaching, there was a desire to exclude the principals and vice-principals and put them into the administration category. And I'm wondering why, if you don't have any other particular people that you want to join and become members, why clause (c)? And, more particularly, has the government any intention of perhaps excluding principals and vice-principals, making them administrative, not a part of the collective bargaining unit of the STF, being strictly administration, and whether this is a loophole for that purpose?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, no, I don't consider that this is a loophole, nor was it the intent to allow it to include principals and vice-principals. As a matter of fact, it would take added amendments in The Education Act to make that possible.

Actually I would like to quote . . . I wasn't involved with the specifics of this, and from the information that I have I would like to quote from the brief submitted by the organization of LEADS (League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents). And this is what their request was, and it's just a very brief quote:

That other persons (this is in the (c) part there) whose applications for membership have been approved by the membership of the league at its annual meeting . . .

So this is word for word from the request that was made by the LEADS organization, and the government has no intent, nor has the LEADS organization. I suppose it would apply to people like Mr. Bill Wells or Mr. Ray Clayton who applied to be designated in this category, but it does not apply to people such as principals and vice-principals who are out-of-scope.

Mr. Koskie: — Then can you more clearly indicate why the provision (c)? I mean, you have the various groups included — the directors and the superintendents and those designated as under section 106 of The Education Act and, similarly, under 261. There must be a rationale. Who are they thinking that they haven't covered under the previous section 8(1) and section 8(2)(a) and (b)? What other people are they thinking of including as members of the association?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, looking at it in the way that the LEADS request has designated it, I would feel that they would be referring to such people as a past director of education, a retired director of education, people who belong to the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, people who could be designated in this category and who would qualify.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I would think that that is somewhat covered under those persons that would be qualified for associate membership, if I'm not mistaken — former members of the league and its predecessors, superintendents of education employed by the Government of Canada, and . . . Well, the point that I make here anyway, Mr. Minister, is that I just don't know why, in respect to those that are required to have memberships, that indeed they were not spelled out in the act. It tends to leave a very, very broad power unless you can assure me that there are serious limitations to that power by virtue of The Education Act. Can you assure me of that?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, yes, I honestly feel that I can assure the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, of that. First of all, it applies to those people who make application, but, more importantly, I feel pretty confident that it would not broaden out to include people who are out-of-scope, such as vice-principals and principals, because this was very carefully worked out in consultation with the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. And certainly I feel very certain that they would have been sure about the intent of what the meaning was for this clause.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 43 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 6(1)

Mr. Chairman: — Proposed House amendment to second section 6 of the printed bill:

Second section 6 of the printed bill be amendment by renumbering it as section 7.

Clause 6(1) as amended agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend The Education Act

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 4

Mr. Chairman: — Proposed House amendment, section 4 of the printed bill, amend clause 4(2)(b) of the printed bill by striking out "other book and print material" in the first line and substituting:

other books and print material.

Clause 4 as amended agreed to.

Clause 5

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to clause 5, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you what particular problem that you are addressing in respect to the . . . in particular to the 5(2), I guess, on the second page of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, I think that it's fair to say that this amendment simply restates what has appeared in statute over a period of almost 80 years and has been confirmed in every court, including the Privy Council, England, so that it really does not represent a change.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I was under the impression that it addressed the particular problem that we had in the city of Saskatoon in respect to, say, an individual taxpayer paying, say, to the separate school as a taxpayers, and allowing their children to go to that school.

And the problem, as I understand it, that arose is whether or not these individuals who designated, say, their taxes to the separate school and attended — whether they then could, in fact, run for office and be a part of the board of the separate school, and as a result would they clearly represent the Christian conscience of the separate school system?

Is that the particular problem that you're addressing here? That was the impression we had.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, yes, that is true. It does refer to that particular incident except that the place was in Moose Jaw, and The Local Government Elections Act dealt with that particular issue — just last week, I think it was passed.

Mr. Koskie: — Did you have specific representation to introduction this amendment?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Yes, we had representation from the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association.

Mr. Koskie: — And . . . well I'll leave it at that.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6

Mr. Koskie: — You know, I'd like a further explanation beyond what the minister has indicated in respect to the amendments that are taking place in section 125, and also in section 8 there's the repeal of section 126. And she goes on to say in her particular explanation that:

In view of this the new clause 125(e.1) will give the boards of education authority over the posting of requirements. This will allow some simplification.

With the amendment to clause 125(c) which provides for single member sub-districts, section 135 becomes redundant. Then she goes on:

Section 127 is to be amended to remove reference to 126, and section 126 repealed will result in the election of school district members on an identical basis as the school division members at large or a single member ward.

In amending section 125, and checking The Education Act, clause (c), really all you are taking out is a portion of that section's clause (c): "the number of members of board of trustees to be elected in each sub-district."

Well, let me start by asking you this: why are you deleting from 125(c) "and the number of members of the board of trustees to be elected in each sub-district"? I don't understand the rationale, even from reading the minister's . . . for deleting that portion of it.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, first of all I would point out that the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association asked for simplified election procedures; 125(c) and 126 eliminate the

multimember sub-districts.

Clause 125(e.1) gives the board of education more authority over board of education elections as far as the postings are concerned. This was at the request of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association.

Mr. Koskie: — So what you're saying then is that section (c) then eliminates completely the multiple member sub-districts. Okay.

Then section 126 — yes, in 126, the old act says:

In a school district that is divided into sub-districts, one or more members of the board of trustees, as the case may require, shall be elected by the electors in each sub-district (and then it says) that is not divided into sub-districts.

What I want to ask you: will there be districts established, or can they be elected at large where there are no sub-districts? The method that we are establishing here, are there going to be sub-districts in all of the school districts?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, yes, they have a choice, either single member or at large.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 19

Mr. Koskie: — I just wonder if the minister can explain why this particular subsection is being repealed.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, the reason for its repeal is because it exists in The Department of Education Act which was repealed last year. Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, it was introduced last year.

Clause 19 agreed to.

Clause 20 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 64 — An Act to provide for the establishment and Maintenance of Public Libraries

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — Can the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, once again I'm acting as back-up minister to the Hon. Minister of Education, and I would like to introduce her officials. We have the acting provincial librarian here to assist and his name is Mr. Stan Skrzyszewski.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could advise me whether you feel that, in view of the fact that a new act has been put together containing much of what was in the previous, but do you feel that you have in fact given adequate time for those in the library association an opportunity, in fact, to properly review it, and to come forward with any amendments or any concerns in which they may perceive or may misunderstand within the act?

What I'm asking you particularly is: since the bill has been given first reading and second reading, have you had the opportunity — or the department — of sitting down with the members of the trustee association of the library to discuss any of the concerns in respect to the bill?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member from the Quill Lakes, the review of the legislation for the provincial libraries began, as I recall, somewhere in 1981. I can't speak for the ministers who were responsible for the libraries at that time, but there were some concerns expressed by the library community, from my understanding, and so they addressed themselves to this issue and tried to get input from the library community.

Shortly after I became minister responsible for libraries, I was made aware of the fact that there were still some concerns that were being expressed by the library community. And I met with people from the trustees' association, as well as from the Saskatchewan Library Association, as well as from the development board, and with members from city council where there was concern expressed about the levy that was assessed to the smaller cities, as well as with representatives from the big cities, Regina and Saskatoon library boards.

They indicated that there was need for us to move fairly quickly. And particularly the feeling was expressed by the representatives from the smaller cities that some legislation that was satisfactory should be introduced, and it was important in order to preserve the whole regional system of libraries of which everyone was justly proud.

And so it was my intent, while I was minister, to have the legislation introduced last fall. But due to the realignment and the changing of ministerial responsibilities, the minister responsible for libraries decided that she wanted to take more time, and this gave more opportunity for consultation, which she did, along with her officials. So that I really do feel that there has been ample opportunity for input from the different parts of the library community and that this legislation will represent the thinking of all of these people and should prove satisfactory to the majority of the people in that community.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, I understand there was a fair deal of consultation leading up to it and looking at the various issues that were a concern to the trustees, the Saskatchewan Library Trustees Association. But what I am more particularly . . . I've had the opportunity of meeting with representatives of the Saskatchewan Library Trustees Association. They have expressed general satisfaction on a quick perusal of the act. They tend to feel that a little more time would have been of assistance to them in perhaps going through it in more detail. But what I'm asking you is: did you provide a draft copy of the act prior to its introduction to the trustees' association, the Saskatchewan Library Trustees Association, for their perusal and comments in the actual drafting of it? Or is it the first time that the association has seen it, the act in this version, since it has been introduced into the legislature?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, no, a draft copy of the legislation was not circulated to the library community. The design team, last year, prepared a white paper which was circulated to those with vested interests. Following that, much discussion was held about the specifics of what was going to be contained in the legislation with the different groups such as the library trustees' association.

But a direct answer to that question — no, a draft copy of this legislation was not submitted to those different groups of people, but rather it was felt that there had been so much consultation that they had to get on with the job and introduce it in terms of the legislation.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to bring a possible concern as expressed by the Saskatchewan Library Trustees Association, and that is in respect to clause 4. They are a little concerned here because it refers to: “the minister may, on behalf of the Saskatchewan library, acquire, and purchase, and dispose by sale . . .” They are a little leery of that provision. They feel that these duties would be more appropriately — should be the responsibility of the Provincial Librarian rather than the minister, and it is their contention that a professional librarian rather than the minister should do the selecting of the books. I did explain to them that the minister probably would, in fact, get some advice, but they feel somewhat uncomfortable with that provision.

The general policy of regional libraries, I’m advised, and the Regina/Saskatoon libraries regarding the purchase of books and materials is that the book purchases are the responsibility of the librarians within the guide-lines set forth by the Canadian library trustees association. And so there is a bit of a concern expressed providing this particular power to the minister. I would like the minister to comment on that particular concern.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — I think that the problem there, Mr. Chairman, is a legal one, and it’s not considered that the provincial librarian or the provincial library is a legal entity. And the legal advice was given in drawing up the legislation dictated that the authority should be given to the minister, but it is not the intent that the minister would become involved in the purchase of books and/or anything else.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 9 agreed to.

Clause 10

Mr. Koskie: — In clause 10, Mr. Minister, there is a provision also re the resolution of disputes, and there is concern with section (d) because it says that:

. . . the Saskatchewan Library Board may:

(d) assist in the resolution of disputes arising out of the interpretation and performance of agreements entered into pursuant to section 48 or 51 in a manner prescribed by the regulations;

And the Saskatchewan Library Trustees Association feels that it has consistently, and they have consistently, taken the position that the resolution of disputes which arise in a regional library system should, in fact, be settled as a result of negotiation at the regional level rather than the involving of a provincial board. And so they are concerned that what may be happening here is a slight interference with the regional board’s local autonomy, and I was wondering . . . They indicate here that one of the major arguments regarding changes in the act is that local autonomy has been strengthened, and, as I say, they are concerned here that what you’re saying is that the Saskatchewan Library Board may now, in fact, intervene according to clause 10(b). May I have your comments?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, this has been something that has been discussed, and is still being discussed, with the trustees’ association, and will be implemented in terms of regulation for the settling of disputes, and where the regional boards . . . and where the region itself can work out, and has worked out — as many have — the proper process or mechanism for the resolution of disputes, they would be permitted to do so. Where they’re not able to do so, then this would be provided for in terms of regulations, so that there is a process for the settling of disputes.

In a few instances, there was a considerable amount of confrontation, and there was no

mechanism provided for the resolution of disputes, so that this was brought to our attention as something that should be corrected in terms of legislation.

Clause 10 agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 69 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 70

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Minister, in clause 70, subsection (3), what you have done here in the act is introduce basically a new provision, I think, that was not there before. A provision which, in effect, gives a participating municipality which contributes more than 25 per cent of the annual municipal grants . . . that no increase in levy may be instituted unless that particular municipality agrees.

It seems to me here that what you do, by putting that provision in, is that you could, in fact, put a very substantial amount of control in one given municipality which may be contributing the 25 per cent. This is a major concern. I wonder if the minister, first of all, could indicate how many of the regional library areas . . . In how many of them are there municipalities that are paying 25 per cent of the grant or more to start with?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, there are five of those.

Mr. Koskie: — There is a concern, as I say, by the Saskatchewan Library Trustees Association, with this provision. They feel that what it does is that it takes away, really, the local autonomy of all of the participating members in there to work out a contract which is reasonable. I am advised that Moose Jaw is one of the areas where it provides a substantial amount of the funding in that region. But what they have done in the regional library area with their board is to work out a consideration for the Moose Jaw without having this particular provision in here. It is the feeling of the trustees, at least, that this is a retrograde step. And I was wondering whether you have received any representation in respect to that, and whether you feel that it's absolutely necessary to have that in there?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. hon. member, yes, there was representation received from the trustees when the hon. member and the hon. minister representing the provincial libraries met with the trustees' association some time last week. They did raise this issue.

Personally, I'm aware of this issue because it seemed to be the key issue that was causing a rift in the regional library system, and there were some small communities — I'm sorry — some small cities who were proclaiming that they were going to withdraw from the regional system as a result of the inequity as far as the levy was concerned.

And so it . . . I think that the closest I can get to the truth of the matter is that this is a solution that was arrived at by the design team, which consisted of representation from the different people in the library community with vested interests. And it was as close as they could come to finding a solution that satisfied the majority, or most of the people, in regard to that very, very key, key issue. And it was an attempt to not put the small communities in a position where the regional library could unilaterally decide that the levy was going to be 10 per cent or 20 per cent or 25 per cent.

Mr. Koskie: — But, Mr. Minister, don't you get yourself with this provision into the other situation that . . . take Swift Current or Moose Jaw — I think those are two of them — regional library districts. What really happens here is that if the board representing all of the participating municipalities want to increase the amount of levy that you have, really what you have done is to set up a veto for those who pay 25 per cent of the annual municipal grants, because it says:

The board shall not determine any increase in the amount of the grant unless the municipality has agreed to it.

And so, if you have a particular city, say, Swift Current — and I believe that's an example of one of them, and I know they've had problems over in Swift Current, because Swift Current was wanting to drop out of the . . . to opt out — do you not exacerbate the problem now?

Previously, you had it with the local autonomy, with the board of the regional deciding what the levy is going to be, and now what you have done is to the biggest participant, you have given them the veto power to raise any . . . to increase any of the levy.

And it seems to me what you've done here is try to really accommodate a very, very . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . five, you indicate, and it seems to me what you have done is really taken the control of the operation out of that regional library board and have given it to those higher participating members and, at least, a veto power to the higher participating municipalities within the region.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the negotiating clause only affects those five — just the five regions that I've mentioned. And from what I understand, four of them have been working this levy out on the basis of negotiation to this date, so it will not apply right across the board to all of the regions. It will just be those five and, as I recall, those five would be Moose Jaw, Swift Current, North Battleford, Lloydminster, and Yorkton.

Mr. Koskie: — Well that's precisely, Mr. Minister, what I was saying. What you have done is to put in a provision — or what the minister, or the department has done is to put in a provision to satisfy the requests of Swift Current. And let's be honest. And that's where the minister represents.

In four out of the five where you have a city which is a participating member, they have been able to work out agreements, and here you have the minister coming along against the wishes of the trustees of the library association, and specifically putting a provision in to solve her political problem in Swift Current. Now isn't that accurate? Isn't the problem with Swift Current?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, no, I don't think that that's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I really sincerely don't believe that that is a true assessment. And the reason that I can honestly say that is that I personally had a lot of experience sitting down with the smaller cities, and I met with representatives from somewhere between 10 and 15. And they were complaining about the fact that the smaller cities were not being equitably treated as far as the levy was concerned, and particularly with regard to the control that they had in the regional system, that when you consider it on the basis of population, representation by population, they just didn't, they didn't have equitable kinds of treatment as far as control was concerned. So this was, unquestionably, a key issue.

Now what the right solution is, I'm not sure. Quite frankly, I was tempted myself, as minister responsible for libraries, at one point to ask God if he had a proper solution for these people, because, you know, they were just bound and determined to break something apart which your government played a very important role in putting together. But I'm not going to give you all of the bouquets because it was the people of Saskatchewan who wanted and put into place one of the best regional library systems that we have in Canada, and they wanted to maintain this thing.

But you know, people have the happy faculty every once in a while of self-destructing, and that's what I saw was taking place. And virtually no one could come up with an answer as an outsider. So our answer was: "Look it, boys. Get together. You have your chance to say what you want to say, and you have your chance to say what you want to say. And together, put something in terms of legislation that we will be prepared to take into the Legislative Assembly." And that's what was done. And that's why the design team was set up. And this, by and large,

had the confidence of all of the library community. And I think the hon. member will agree with that because I think that he has conversed quite a bit with the trustees' association and has a good understanding of the library system. So that I really feel, I really feel that the present minister responsible for libraries has done, you know, what is the best thing for the regional library system in this province. And I concur with her and support her to the hilt.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, thank you for your compliments, but flattery will get you nowhere, Mr. Minister. Not on this issue. I want to indicate to you what you have done. Essentially what you have done is undermined your trust in the integrity and the direction that the board will give, because under section 70, subsection (2) it says,

Subject to subsection (3) (that's the clause that should be eliminated) and to the terms of an agreement entered into pursuant to this Part for the establishment and operation of regional library, the board shall determine the amount of annual grants to be made by each municipality participating in the regional library.

And so what I'm saying to you here, by putting in clause 70, subsection (3), what you have said is that board which has been operating well, which has had no problem in dealing with getting an agreement with other cities — four out of five — you are saying because the minister has a problem down in Swift Current where there's a crisis on and the city of Swift Current wants to pull out unless they have a veto power, that you are saying that justifies undermining the functioning of the board which has operated very well. Because that's the only conclusion you come to. You come to the conclusion that those who are elected will not be reasonable because you are saying that those who are participating with 25 per cent of the grants have a veto. And then you get up and say, "Well, we don't really have a problem with this, but we only need it in one case."

And I ask you: is the one case . . . You can't deny it. It's Swift Current. The others have worked out agreements. So why wouldn't you continue to have some respect for the work of the board in the past and not adhere, on a political basis, to satisfy the problem that is presented to the minister, and that is being pushed by a Tory candidate down in city council in Swift Current, asking to opt out because they're paying more than 50, and they don't want to participate any further? And this is all this provision is. What it does is undermine the functioning of the regional boards. It gives a veto power to solve a political problem of the minister down in Swift Current. And I don't think you can deny that.

And this certainly is not well-received, this provision, by the trustees of the library association. And I don't know why you wouldn't respect those who are elected representing all of the municipalities. Why not the option that if you have a participating municipality as an option, you could have had, where a city participates, pays more than 25 per cent of the amount of the annual levy? Why wouldn't a more suitable option, rather than a veto of providing that they may, in fact, have further representation on the board, and weigh it, to some extent, that way?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, in all honesty I don't know how to give an answer to a question where you've got confrontation that has been going on for some period of time. You like to make it become a political kind of an issue. Quite frankly, I don't look upon it as that. I was more interested in seeing to it that the Chinook region would have library services in the same way as every other community would.

In addition, when I did meet with the smaller cities, it was not just the representative from Swift Current who was adamant in his stand that they did not have representation according to population, and that they did not have equity. He was supported by many of the others.

Whether they were in the same predicament or not, I'm not certain. But it was strictly done on the basis of trying to preserve, for the Chinook region, that which was best for them, and not on the basis of any political motive.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, Mr. Minister, some may believe you. I wish the minister who is introducing this particular revision to satisfy her own political motives was here today. And since you are merely subbing for her, I think that what you have put forth is the best face that could be put forward, and accordingly, I'll proceed on with the next section.

Clause 70 agreed to.

Clauses 71 to 94 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 48 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister please . . .

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, I'd be pleased to introduce my officials, Mr. Chairman.

Sitting beside me to the left is Mr. Don Philippon, the director of research; to my right, Mrs. Sharon Russell from the research department, and directly behind me, Mrs. Val Cloarec, from vital statistics.

Clause 1

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of questions. As I understand, this is a bill that we dealt with last year, I believe, and it was on the order paper, and we are dealing with it again now. I was going to ask the minister whether he was trying to sneak anything by us, abolish marriage or something like that. But, as I understand it, one of the main changes is changing the director of vital statistics to director, and I wonder why you are choosing to do that. Maybe I don't have that accurate, but can you give me a little description of what you're doing in that section?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The main reason . . . And you're correct, the bill was introduced in the last session and now we're going to be passing it, today I would hope. Really it's to shift the whole issue of marriages over into the Department of Justice, to my seat-mate's department. And of course if we're going to have that, the director of vital statistics is employed in my department and not in the Attorney General's department, so when we talk about director, that could indicate an officials within the Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, when I'm looking at the explanatory notes, it says the reason is so that any director can be called upon. I wonder why, if it's being shifted to the Department of Justice, that isn't specifically put in there.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That's so that when it goes into Justice they can designate whoever they are rather than us at this time saying it's got to be this individual, or so on, in the Department of Justice. We're moving it over there and then they can designate who they feel would be the appropriate person to be the director.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The other item that I notice, and I don't have any question about it but I would like a little further explanation, is the physical examination. I think it has been the practice that in order to get a marriage licence you have to have the physical examination done in the province by a practitioner of the province. I think that's being expanded to other provinces. And if you'll just outline how that will work in reality as opposed to what is written in the bill, which I think is a bit confusing.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Actually, I think this is going to be a service to people because I

remember a specific case of a constituent of mine some time ago who was being married in Saskatchewan but working in Alberta and had to come back here to have the examination. What this will do is allow any licenced physician in Canada to perform that examination, so that people who might be working in British Columbia and coming back home to Saskatchewan to get married and established here, as so many are doing, they could have their examination there.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm glad you're doing it, because there are so many young people moving to Manitoba that many of them are saying that when they get to Winnipeg to get married, they've done their physical in Saskatchewan, they're wanting to know whether or not they will have to have another physical.

But what you're saying is not, so that will help those young people, the 20 per cent who are now unemployed and having to look to Manitoba to get a job. And I'm glad you're making that adjustment. And I'm sorry that it's necessary, I'm sorry that it's necessary that we have to do that.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think that helping out those young people who are having to leave the province in great numbers — and the outflow numbers in the first quarter of the year would indicate that the outflow is 2,000 more than the inflow — and I suppose this is one of the reasons that this amendment is taking place.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, we could argue about the migration of people in Saskatchewan, but I don't think that is really the point of the bill.

I would want to say though, certainly we are facilitating the examinations for marriage in other provinces, for people coming here. I think that's very progressive.

And in regard to people moving to Manitoba, they may require some other type of medical examination, but that isn't covered in this act.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 56 — An Act respecting Medical Radiation Technologists

Clause 1

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, this bill as I understand it is similar to other bills that are passed on a . . . not a routine basis, but after consultation, like The Credit Union Act and others where we have some consultation and, I believe, relatively good consultation with the group.

In checking with them I find that they say that most of the amendments that are being made in this, what appears to be a relatively lengthy bill, are in order, and they are not displeased with it. So we will be voting in favour of it, and I don't think we have any great amount of problem with the bill.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, thank you very much, Mr. Member. I appreciate the comment that there was good consultation took place. I believe that is the case. I think the people in the profession are satisfied with the bill that addresses issues that they brought forward. So I appreciate your contacting them, and your compliance with moving rather quickly, I suppose then, through the bill, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — Would it be agreeable to both sides to go page by page?

Pages 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 72 — An Act respecting the Practice of Physical Therapy

Mr. Chairman: — The next item for consideration is Bill No. 72 — An Act respecting the Practice of Physical Therapy. This act may be cited as The Physical Therapists Act, 1984, it's short title.

Clause 1

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, while the last bill we did, Bill 56, I think the minister listened very closely to the people he was working with. As I understand Bill 72, the physical therapists who have contacted the minister and badly wanted to be the first contact with people, for example in senior citizens' homes or in other circumstances, as I understand the bill the SMA (Saskatchewan Medical Association), the medical association in the province, got to the minister and this is not being allowed. At least not in the bill it's not clear.

I would like you, Mr. Minister, to inform the Assembly exactly what changes are taking place. As I understand . . . As I mentioned, the therapists who had wanted to have their role expanded are not getting it and are not totally pleased with what you are doing in this bill.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, there has been some discussions between the College of Physicians and the physiotherapists and the Saskatchewan Medical Association.

Actually I think this would expand their ability to perform their services to what it was previously. Previously they had to work under the direction of a physician. This way they must have a referral from a physician before they do any assessment or treatment. Also, there is a phrase in the act here, a part of the act, if you noticed, where the minister can allow them to do certain things that will be spelled out in the regulations. They have agreed to sit down with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the SMA to work out those regulations. That regulation would be in agreements with both groups before it would be developed or enacted.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, the therapists that I have talked to, and I have talked to a couple, are concerned about what you're talking about right now, where you don't very specifically list it out in the bill, but are talking about doing it in regulation. Because somehow the results of doing it behind the closed doors of cabinet, as opposed to here where we can debate it, often don't get the same results.

Mr. Minister, I have referred this to you before, where we seemed to see the first line of contact where the dental nurses in the past had an expanding role, where the nurses in the hospitals — the differentiation between doctors and nurses — the gap in wages is becoming greater rather than less. Here again we see the needs of the therapists not being met.

And I believe, Mr. Minister, you are coming on-line very well, totally in line with the doctors' wishes, and I think that that's unfortunate. Because I think in many areas, particularly in the areas of therapists and nurses, we're going in the wrong direction, especially in the area of preventative health. Because I believe in the province of Saskatchewan, as in many other jurisdictions, the preventative medicine is not being done and is not being carried out.

I think we're missing a bet by not using people like the nurses and therapists in this method of

preventing health care problems as opposing to treating it where the doctors will have a very vested interest. I think that they are part of the preventative program — that is true. But on the other hand, I think nurses and therapists have a very great role to play.

And when I watch what is happening in the home care program, for example, with cut-backs in funding, where I see the gap between the salaries or the income of doctors and nurses increasing, and where I see the dental nurse's role being lessened instead of increased, it bothers me a great deal. Because I think that you, Mr. Minister, are not listening equally to those who would promote preventative health care and those who are involved in curing the health problems in this province.

Mr. Minister, I will not be spending a great deal of time on this bill, but I wish that you would seriously consider what I'm saying because I think there are other people in the health care profession who are being overlooked in the role that they could play in preventing health problems in the province.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, I think this bill actually indicates that that's the direction we're going. This bill will allow changes to the practice as the practice of physical therapy develops and changes in the province. And the very fact that regulations can be worked out in concert, in concert with other health professionals, I think, indicates the progressive nature of this bill, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — The members have asked to go page by page. Is that agreed?

Pages 1 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Embury: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My official is Don Koop, who is executive director of financial services.

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, does this act do anything else but provide the 7 per cent increase for '83-84 and the 5 per cent increase for '84-85 in the revenue-sharing pool?

Hon. Mr. Embury: — No, Mr. Chairman, that's all it does.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Because of the . . . I note it's retroactive to '83, and that is because of the inadvertence in proclamation — I will phrase it that way. Is that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . or the incompetence of the previous minister, or whatever . . .

However, there was a slip, and that's why. Is that accurate?

Hon. Mr. Embury: — I'm not going to go out on a limb and agree with all you said. But basically, yes, there was a little confusion last year on proclamation or day of assent, and that's why it's retroactive.

Clause 2 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, would the minister comment on the contents of this bill? There are many provisions. Aside from increasing the corporate tax rate from 14 to 16 per cent with accompanying provisions, and providing for a deduction from tax pursuant to the Venture Capital Tax Credit, the Livestock Investment Tax Credit, does it do anything else?

Mr. Chairman: — During the minister's response would he introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Don Rowlatt, Kirk McGregor.

And in response to it, I think the other point the hon. member was perhaps looking for is the elimination of the small business corporate tax on manufacturing, along with venture capital, along with the increasing in the taxes of larger corporations from 14 to 16 per cent.

The only other thing done in the bill, I believe, is to . . . is when the federal government, through their taxing authority, make the adjustments or changing from the federal budget, then we have to make corresponding adjustments in the provincial income tax to cover that because of the join collection agreement between the provinces and the federal government.

So it did those three main things from the budget, plus the technical amendments by according with the federal budget.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 8

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, what is the significance of the change, the change in 14(1)(a)? That's the very first two sentences of section 8 of the bill — paying salary or wages or other remuneration — Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I should clear that up by saying: why did you knock out the words "to an officer or an employee"?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised that it covers the following situation. In the event that an individual is garnisheed, as an example, or a judgement against an individual and his salary is attached, the first priority would be the withholding of his income tax so that they wouldn't simply attach his salary, not withhold the tax and he finds himself at the end of the year owing a fair amount of income tax. So that would take priority over the garnishment.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 13

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, on clause 13, is this a new provision — making directors liable when there is a failure to deduct tax at source?

Mr. Chairman, when I say directors I mean directors of corporations where the taxpayers and the employee of that corporation in the corporation has a legal obligation to deduct taxes at source.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That is correct, subject to the, or according to the following conditions. And I might read those out to you, of the conditions, if you would so desire. The conditions are, (a):

where a certificate in respect of corporation's liability has been registered in the Court of Queen's Bench and execution is returned unsatisfactory by the corporation;

(2) where the corporation has been dissolved or is in the process of dissolution, and the directors have been deemed liable for debts outstanding within six months of the commencement of dissolution;

where the corporation has filed for bankruptcy and the directors have been deemed liable for the debts outstanding within six months from the date of bankruptcy;

(4) where the director has not shown a reasonable degree of care, diligence, and skill in preventing the corporation from not making due tax debt, and where the director has been involved as a director for a period of less than two years prior to the commencement of proceedings.

This amendment also ensures that a director who satisfies a claim for payment of a corporation's withholding becomes entitled to contributions from other directors who are also liable, he also becomes a secured creditor similar to the Crown upon dissolution for bankruptcy of the corporation.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — You tell me he has the right to contribution and he's subrogated to the Crown's positions if he pays the Crown's debt. I have no quarrel with that. I just think we should probably try to advise the legal profession of this.

There are an increasing number of cases where directors can find themselves liable. We've got them studded through the labour statutes where you can find yourself liable for wages. Here's one where you can find yourself liable for taxes. And I think people sometimes take on a directorship of a corporation rather lightly, and we should perhaps continue to remind them that with the alleged honour goes a fair amount of responsibility.

And here's another one: the possibility of being liable for income tax if the company fails to deduct from the employees' wages and remit. When companies get in trouble, they frequently deduct all right, but they don't remit. And this is a fairly common provision, and the directors should know that they're liable.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I suppose the only comment is that we have to bear in mind, as well, that this is a corresponding legislation to a federal program; that they brought this in and, while I don't mind co-operating with the federal government in advertising some programs, I'm not sure I'd want to get in with Revenue Canada too badly at this point in time to try to convince people that what they're doing is a good idea.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I think we should not name departments with the name "revenue/" They all seem to get into difficulty.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clauses 14 and 15 agreed to.

Clause 16

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, may I ask a question? With respect to clause 16 and those many dates for coming into force, do any of them have a relation to . . . are any of them relevant to the two main features of this bill? Thus, the increase in the corporate tax, and I suppose that's January 1, '84, and the tax credits, the Saskatchewan tax credit, made up of any one of those three — and that is effective when?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Both of those are effective January 1, 1984, except for the livestock tax credit which, of course, cannot be earned prior to budget night. It was announced on budget night that it had to be at midnight that night, and from thereon afterwards, not before.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — You can't earn the credit, but if you earned the income in January it could be offset to that income in January. So that, in one sense of the word, is retroactive to January, and all the others are with respect to the technical amendments. Thank you.

Clause 16 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Constitutional Questions Act

Mr. Chairman: — Does the minister have officials to introduce?

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'll ask a couple of questions on this bill. Under this bill you appear to be changing the rule with respect to giving notice to the Attorney General. As I read the old act, you gave notice to either the Attorney General of Saskatchewan or the Attorney General of Canada. But now you have to give notice to both.

What is the reason for the change in . . . I don't think you are prohibited from giving notice to both, but you're only required to give notice to one. And as I now read it, you have to give notice to both, and I'm wondering why this change is being made.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — That, frankly, is a good question. You're correct — the previous notice was one or the other. I can't think, quite frankly, of a reason why both need be notified. Certainly, I can see where it would be mandatory that the provincial Attorney General be notified, because we're dealing primarily with provincial legislation.

I suppose I would be prepared to entertain an amendment, if you wish to propose it, excluding. But I don't see an advantage to that. I can see an appropriate time where perhaps the Attorney General of Canada should be notified.

And I suppose that would be the thinking for my officials, that rather than knowing that in all cases that the act applies to — we want to apply to the provincial AG — whether we should be in the process of excluding the federal AG. And that would be the only rationale that I could propose.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I don't think there's anything particularly wrong with serving both if it isn't inconvenient, if it isn't a hassle to serve someone in Ottawa. And I don't know how you serve the Attorney General of Canada. I frankly don't know. There may be a way to serve him in Saskatchewan, for all I know.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — The notice can simply be forwarded to the Attorney General of Canada, so it's quite a routine procedure.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, there are a couple of other things that this subsection (4) of the new section 8(1), new section 8, lengthens the notice you have to give to the attorney general from six to 14 days. Was there a particular reason for lengthening the period? Were problems arising with the six days?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — No, but we felt that with the broadening of the scope of the act, that it would be of ease to counsel or the public that, in fact, they do have more in time. We concede during after the passage of the bill from time and time, inadvertently it may be missed, so we did give that extended time as a courtesy. There was no problem brought to my attention with the six days.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, subsection (3) surprised me a bit. What it does, as I read it, is say that where someone is challenging the validity of an order in council, a proclamation or regulation, you have to give notice. And I think people would be surprised to find that here because you are not challenging the constitutional validity of any act, but perhaps not even the constitutional validity in the normal sense of the word of the order in council. You just think the order in council maybe an excessive jurisdiction; the act doesn't authorize that OC. You're acting on the OC; you have to give notice to the Attorney General. And I was not aware of any similar provision before, although it may have been there.

I don't profess to be up on my rules of practice, and I think we'll need to advise the bar of that because, as I say, it wouldn't be the place I would look for it. I would think: is this act unconstitutional? If the answer is no, then I wouldn't think to look here, I don't think, if what was being dealt with was an excess of jurisdiction of an OC.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — You're quite correct. We could have brought in an amendment to the act, or a new act changing the title. We had proposed to notify the bar as to the amendment. Obviously the subsection is brought in because of the extent of the charter. The charter, of course, applies to subordinate legislation and to governmental practices, and that was the intent, to draft it so that notice would be forwarded in those cases.

Now, as I say, I quite agree with your concern, and the bar will be notified as to the amendments.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Mr. Chairman: — There's an amendment by the minister to read: Amend subsection 8(2) of the act as being enacted by section 2 of the printed bill by striking out "in Saskatchewan" in the first line and substituting:

of Saskatchewan.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

Bill No. 68 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act

Mr. Chairman: — Minister of Revenue, do you have any officials to introduce?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, my deputy minister, Mr. Paul Robinson; assistant, Mr. Keith Laxdal.

Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

Mr. Chairman: — There is an amendment before the committee on subsection 4 of the printed bill. And we are having a difficult time ascertaining if there is actually any change in the amendment.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, we had a look at the amendment and are wondering, as well, there's a little tiny mark there beside the 27 cents, but I'm not sure if it would require an amendment, Mr. Minister, to put that little mark in there.

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, we're having the same problem. I don't know why the amendment is like that.

Mr. Chairman: — Is there an amendment before the committee?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, yes.

Mr. Chairman: — The proposed amendment of section 4 of the printed bill: Amend clause 3(1)(c) as being enacted by section 4 of the printed bill by striking out "27¢" in the second line, and substituting:

27 cents.

Clause 4 as amended agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 69 — An Act to amend The Liquor Consumption Tax Act

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 67 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Water Corporation Act

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — Is the minister ready to introduce his officials?

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

Mr. Chairman: — There is an amendment to section 4 of the printed bill. To strike out subsections 4(2) to (4) of the printed bill, and substitute the following:

Section 2 amended

(2) Clause 2(a) is repealed and the following substituted: “applicant”

- (a) applicant includes a person who is authorized to, pursuant to The Water Power Act, to the regulations made pursuant to that act, to take and use any land required to carry out any undertaking and any areas authority that is authorized pursuant to The Conservation and Development Act, or the regulations made under that act, to take land required for the works of the area authority.

To amend section 2, clause 3.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, is the amendment before us?

Mr. Chairman: — I was reading the amendment to section 4 of the printed bill, and I noticed that there are several amended sections. Does the committee wish me to read all of the amendments? There are four pages.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, I think you should read some of the amendments. Some of these shouldn't be in this bill, if I may put it that way, because they're really not consequential amendments. There're amendments to the bill, and fair enough, when you're reviewing the bill next time, I think you should lift them out and clean them up because some of these are in no sense consequential but appear to . . .

You're putting in a definition of applicant, for example, in the one that's before us, and that's an odd thing to have in a consequential bill because it was meant to be in the main bill. No one is fussing about it, but I think that, where we're changing the main bill by amendment, I think we should read them.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into a heated argument. I think we're amending it in the . . . We have two options, I suppose: we can take your word for it, go ahead and deal with it later, or we can call 5 o'clock and I can bring people in tonight after, at 7, and go through them — whichever is your pleasure.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.