

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a number of petitions to present today. I will read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone consideration of The Health Districts Act so that communities may continue their efforts to organize their people and have a genuine impact on the process without intimidation or threat of arbitrary action by the government.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

These petitions, Mr. Speaker, come from Cabri, Abbey, Portreeve, Lancer, from Moose Jaw, from Hazenmore — across the province, Mr. Speaker, from Wolseley. I'd like to present these now.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have as well petitions to present today on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. I'll read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone consideration of The Health Districts Act so that communities may continue their efforts to organize their people and have a genuine impact on the process without intimidation or threat of arbitrary action by the government.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

From the communities of Invermay, Margo, all up in that area apparently on both of those sheets. And this one is from Rama, Buchanan, Wadena, up in that Antler area. Ituna is represented in here. And it sounds like most of the others on this sheet are from that area as well.

I'll present them now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to present some more presentations, lay them before the Assembly. And I'd like to read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone consideration of The Health Districts Act so that communities may continue their efforts to organize their people and have a genuine impact on the process without intimidation or threat of arbitrary action by the

government.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And, Mr. Speaker, these petitions are signed by individuals from the communities of Wawota, Maryfield, Kenosee Lake, Kelso, Fairlight, Moosomin, communities in that south-eastern part of the province. I so present them to the Assembly.

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Speaker, I as well have petitions with respect to health care in the province. Mr. Speaker, I won't read the prayer, but just read into the record some of the locations from people that have signed the petition. There's Eston, Plato, Brock, Eatonia, Laporte, Macklin. More from Macklin area, Primate, Kerrobert, Kindersley, Coleville. Mr. Speaker, all over the western side of the province of Saskatchewan. I present those now.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too want to present some petitions relating to the health care and the health care concerns about the districts in the province. They come from many people in my constituency, from Cabri, from Pennant, from Abbey, from Shackleton, from Hazlet. And I too want to make these petitions available to the Assembly today.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to read into the record this petition:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that the Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to do the following (and I shall just read the first of six):

1. Order SaskPower to facilitate the production of non-utility generated power in the areas of increased demand, namely Lloydminster and Meadow Lake. Several companies in this area have applied to generate power. Allowing non-utility generation of power in this area will make the construction of the power line and its attendant \$42 million expenditure unnecessary.

And the petitioners will ever pray.

From Alice Beach, several parts surrounding Regina — Dilke and so forth.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

The Clerk: — According to order, the following petitions have been reviewed and pursuant to rule 11(7) they are hereby read and received:

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone consideration of The Health Districts Act.

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable

Assembly may be pleased to urge the provincial government to provide proper funding to continue the operation of Souris Valley Regional Care Centre.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Harper: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to all the members of the House a couple of constituents and good friends of mine who are down here in Regina today. They are Art and Bev Halushka who are sitting up in the west gallery, Mr. Speaker.

They're down in Regina here today on a combination business trip and visiting some relatives of Bev's.

So I'd just like to call on all the members to offer them a warm welcome at the House here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you today to members of the Assembly a constituent who is president of the Saskatchewan Young New Democrats. She's seated in the west gallery — Stacey Scotten. She's just completed her university studies for the year and I'd like all members to warmly welcome her.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in the east gallery I'd like to introduce a gentleman who's taken time to come and visit the Assembly. He's the administrator of the RM (rural municipality) of Saltcoats, Mr. Ron Risling, and I'd like to welcome him to the Assembly and ask members to join me in welcoming him.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly Mr. George Bothwell who is in the west gallery. Mr. Bothwell is the chairman of the Provincial Library board and he's just recently received the Order of Canada, and I would like everyone to welcome Mr. Bothwell to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knezacek: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise and welcome Mr. Risling to the Assembly here this afternoon. Mr. Risling is from my home constituency of Saltcoats and I wish him well with his business ventures here and wish him a safe trip home. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy today to rise to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, sitting in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, Amy Manz and Vonda Kosloski, and company,

wearing the white ribbons. They're here to observe the proceedings of the House today. And I ask everybody to join with me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you to the House, I would like to introduce in the west gallery, Marilyn Klatt and her daughter from Steelman in my constituency. They're here to observe the proceedings of the House, and I would ask everyone to welcome them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Rural Hospital Closures

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. Madam Minister, yesterday a thousand Saskatchewan people came to Regina to tell them that they have real concerns about your plans. When they went away their questions were still unanswered and their concerns were not addressed.

Madam Minister, because their concerns weren't addressed, isn't that reason enough to postpone your plans to close their hospitals? Isn't that reason enough for you to realize that maybe your plans are infallible, that more homework needs to be done, and that more work needs to be done before you close out hospitals in these communities?

Madam Minister, in light of yesterday's events, will you postpone the closure of 52 hospitals until these people's questions have been answered?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the 800 people who were at the legislature yesterday, I did speak to many of their concerns, answered many of the issues that have been raised. They have been answered in this legislature on numerous occasions. However that doesn't mean that people aren't concerned about converting their hospital to some other health care purpose than acute care, in-patient beds. People will still be concerned about that; there's no question.

They are given six months to put alternate plans in place, to discuss this with their district planning committees, and the Department of Health will be meeting with them in order to help them move to the conversion. I will also be going into communities and talking to people about their concerns and dealing with many of their concerns out in the community.

So it isn't a question of these hospitals having to change their roles and convert to health centres overnight. There is time to do this, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, I remind you that I don't think you did answer their questions yesterday. You answered two questions, and then scurried off into the legislature before the people of that gathering yesterday were allowed an opportunity to ask you questions.

This is not an academic argument, Madam Minister. This is a question of people's lives we are talking about. Madam Minister, you and I can sit here and throw facts back and forth all afternoon, but the fact of the matter is, is people are concerned about the closure of their hospital in rural communities.

And if I'm wrong, I guess I'll pay the price in the next election. But if you're wrong, but, Madam Minister, if you're wrong, people's lives will be lost. If you're wrong, their lives will be in jeopardy in rural Saskatchewan.

If your plan is so correct, Madam Minister, why can you not allow the people of this province an opportunity to slow the process down to allow adequate consultation with the people of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite's false concern about people's lives, when what they have done is created a \$15 billion debt in this province that is crippling, crippling the province. It's crippling the province. And if there's anything that's affecting people's lives, it's what those members opposite did when they were in power.

They are the ones responsible for the fact that today we have to make hard decisions and we have to reduce funding. And now they stand up and talk about concern for people's lives. Where was their concern three years ago? Where was their concern five years ago as they continued to throw money all over the place that we didn't have to spend?

Now with respect to the member's opposite comments on health care, we have repeatedly assured people there will be access to emergency acute care. The arguments that they raise are reminiscent of the excesses of 1962. That's what they are — reminiscent of the excesses of 1962.

We're asking communities to work with us so as we change the roles of hospitals we can ensure proper and adequate health care services in their communities. So quit . . .

The Speaker: — Next question. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Minister, if you live in Saskatoon or Regina and your child has an accident or if your child takes a bad allergic reaction, you know that you are no more than 10 minutes away from an emergency room and a doctor and top-quality medical treatment. And

when every moment counts, that's pretty reassuring.

Madam Minister, that's something that has taken years to build in this province and that's something that we can all be proud of. Madam Minister, people of Regina and Saskatoon deserve that type of top-quality medical services. But, Madam Minister, so do the communities of Eston and Dodsland and Vanguard and Frontier and Oxbow and a whole host of other communities around this province.

Madam Minister, why are you telling people in these communities that their children's health is less important than a child living in Regina or Saskatoon? Why, Madam Minister, are you creating two classes of citizens when it comes to health care in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are famous for trying to divide people in this province. They're famous for it, and that's why they lost the election in 1991. And they're trying it again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — And the member there from Kindersley thinks he's going to win the leadership of the PC (Progressive Conservative) Party by trying to build this on this urban/rural split that he is trying to create. Well I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is absolutely reprehensible.

Rural residents will have access to high quality care. We will make sure that there are emergency services available. And with respect to the tertiary care centres in Saskatoon and Regina, 44 per cent of the use of those facilities — our base hospitals — are from rural residents. And they should use those hospitals.

Those are provincial facilities with specialists, high technology, to serve all of Saskatchewan, not just Regina and Saskatoon residents. And our residents throughout Saskatchewan use those facilities.

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, you keep accusing the opposition of spreading false fears among Saskatchewan people. Well, Madam Minister, there is fear being spread in Saskatchewan but that fear is being spread by the actions of you and your ministry. And unfortunately the fear is very, very real.

The other night, the other night, Madam Minister, in Kincaid, the doctor was late in showing up for the public meeting because a farmer had had an accident with an auger and had to have 66 stitches to sew up the wound. Madam Minister, that doctor will probably not remain in that community once that hospital closes.

Madam Minister, Madam Minister, will you tell that

farmer and his family that their fears are unfounded?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, on average 6 per cent of a doctor's income is in-patient acute care. I hardly think that doctor is going to leave the community because of 6 per cent. Do you think that doctor is going to leave the community because of 6 per cent?

That doctor will also have privileges in hospitals within a district because what we will be doing is creating group medical practices and encouraging physicians to work together within a district. And we will be asking for physicians to have privileges in all hospitals within the district so they can work together in a cooperative fashion. I do not think a doctor is going to leave their community because of a 6 per cent reduction in income.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Madam Minister, you may not believe he is going leave that hospital, but that doctor says that without proper facilities and diagnostic services, he will leave. That's what he says.

Madam Minister, last night on CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) there was a story about a family in Eston whose teenage daughter had suffered brain damage. Because she is able to stay in Eston hospital, her friends and family can visit her every day and provide volunteer help for her with her therapy. That won't be possible after October 1.

Madam Minister, would you tell that family that their fears are unfounded? Or instead, maybe you could tell that family that your government is listening, that you need more time to think this through. Maybe you could tell that family that you intend to postpone the closure of Eston hospital until you have had time to work with that community and to ensure that all questions are answered before you close that hospital.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, I've said on a number of occasions in this legislature that X-ray and diagnostic services will be available in the hospitals where we are going to convert them to different roles. The member opposite just said the doctor said he's going to leave if he doesn't have access to diagnostic services. I say it again: X-ray and diagnostic services will still remain available for the physicians.

Now with respect to the specific case the member may be talking about, my suggestion is we have six months to talk to this family . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. I've listened now for some time, and I haven't kept record of the interruptions from the member from Maple Creek, but it must be numerous. And I ask him to please give the minister the courtesy of answering the questions,

rather than repetitive interruptions.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — There will be time, Mr. Speaker, to talk to families who feel pressure about the conversion of hospitals. There will be time. There will be time for the family the member refers to in Eston and for other families across Saskatchewan. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Public Employees Dental Plan

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I find this really deplorable. And I find the minister being very hypocritical. Who was the individual who stood in this Assembly just about three or four short years ago and lamented the underfunding of health care while a four-year-old girl was transported from Assiniboia to Regina and died in transit. And that's what people on the steps were saying yesterday. People were . . . in fact they were lamenting the fact, where are they going to go when their hospital closes?

And you know what the other question was, Madam Minister? Madam Minister, they were asking about the dental plan. And they said if you can expand the dental plan to include the public sector, some 30,000 families in this province, Madam Minister, how many dollars is that going to put into covering dental children . . . or dental services to families across this province? How many dollars are going to be put into that expanded dental plan for children up to 25 years?

And, Madam Minister, if you looked at those dollars and took them, I believe you would be able to service health care throughout rural Saskatchewan and these small hospitals. How many dollars are you putting into that expanded dental plan?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, the dental plan the members opposite speak to is a dental plan put in by them for public servants. It's their dental plan. There's a clause in the plan that refers to services for children of public employees unless they're under the children's dental plan. So the clause that they put in becomes automatically operative, Mr. Speaker. It is their plan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Madam Minister, the question was how much is this expanded dental plan going to cost?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, there is no cost because it is a question of the plan already being in place and money there to fund it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Madam Minister, the people of Saskatchewan don't buy that. In yesterday's *Star-Phoenix*, Madam Minister, the Deputy Premier says, and I quote: "the change in coverage is automatic and won't cost the taxpayers any more

money.”

How is that possible? The old plan covered children from ages 5 to 13; the new plan extends this coverage to the children of 30,000 families. And it’s not going to cost any more money? That doesn’t make sense. People on the steps of the legislature don’t believe that.

Or is it that the government will break even by cancelling the old plan and replacing it with an enhanced plan for government employees. Isn’t that the fact, Madam Minister?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, it’s my understanding with respect to this plan that there . . . that the clause automatically comes into effect and that there’s no additional cost.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Madam Minister, I don’t know how you can bring . . . expand a plan, bring it into effect, and not add additional costs. What is that cost to the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the Minister of Health for letting me speak to this question. I spoke to it the other day.

The member should understand, since he was on the . . . this side of the House when this plan was introduced. I’m not sure whether he was yet elected or not, but he had plenty of time to become familiar with it. It was brought in in 1982 under the former Progressive Conservative government. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it was one of the few progressive things that that government ever did in that 10-year period of time.

And the member should know also that within the provisions of the policy that is provided, when there is a removal of things like the childrens’ dental plan, that automatically there is a coverage provided to cover that group of people that were covered by the childrens’ dental plan.

The briefing that I have received from officials is that there will not be incremental costs involved in that, because the plan is very well funded.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for trying to answer the question that the Minister of Health couldn’t answer, but we still would like to know what is the cost of the expanded plan to 30,000 families in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, the member should listen carefully to the answer, and then he won’t have to take the time of the House to re-ask the same question.

The reason that there is no additional incremental cost, Mr. Speaker, is because the plan is completely

solvent, and therefore the funds are available to provide the coverage which is going to be provided because of the extension within the policy which has always been there. There has been nothing new, contrary to reports by some of the media who I believe made an error in their original reporting because of the comments by the member from Rosthern.

But the plan is solvent, and therefore there is no additional cost that is incurred by the public purse.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, another question to the minister. Mr. Minister, a constituent phoned our office this morning and said he had phoned the NDP (New Democratic Party) caucus about this very subject. He was told by a woman in NDP caucus that 55 per cent of the cost of the dental program would be paid for by the employee, while the government picks up 45 per cent of the tab.

Again, Mr. Minister, if this is true, why is personnel and administrative services saying that the government is picking up all the costs? Which is of these statements is correct?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, let me just make it very clear for the member opposite that there is a joint funding of the plan by the employer and by the employees as there is in any plan of this kind, whether it’s in the private sector or a Crown corporation or in the government proper. But the amount of that funding has not changed. It remains the same as it was in 1982 or 1983, as determined by the policy which is signed by the deliverer, the insurer, and the Government of Saskatchewan on behalf of the public employees as is stated in the contract between the employees and the government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, another question to the minister. The minister just said that the cost is shared, and yet, Mr. Speaker, when we checked with personnel management, they tell us that the total cost is being picked up by the government, that nothing comes out of an employee’s cheque to pay for dental coverage presently, and nothing will be taken out. They say the government is paying the whole shot.

Which is it, Mr. Minister? Is the government paying the whole shot or is the employee putting something in? You can’t have it both ways. People want to know who’s paying for the shot.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I obviously don’t have all of the specific information with me, but I think the answer to the member’s question is that the cost of the plan is .45 per cent of the cost, and that is not a very big contribution. I think that is a credit to the plan as it is and the kind of contract that exists between the providers of the insurance and the people who negotiated with them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, to the minister, we've sat here this afternoon, we've asked the minister, we've asked the Minister of Health to give us what the cost would be to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. The taxpayers of Saskatchewan would really like to know what that cost is.

The minister says that it costs him nothing because it's already in there, but there still is a cost associated with the plan. And the people of Saskatchewan would know, the taxpayers would like to know because it's their tax dollars paying for it, and we're asking, what are those figures?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, since this is the last question the member will ask, let me put it very clearly to him so that there is no misunderstanding here. The cost of the plan is .45 per cent of salary. That is no different today, Mr. Speaker, than it was when the members opposite put the plan into place and set it up. That stays the same today as it was then and so that, as I have said at least three times now to the member from Moosomin, nothing has changed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Tendering Practices

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to a question that I took notice of on April 13 with respect to tendering for photocopier equipment. And I'm pleased to respond to the members opposite that the tender was publicly advertised and was open to all suppliers interested in bidding, that the bidders were invited to provide options for supplying the equipment.

And this was done because the government wanted to pursue purchase options, lease-purchase options, and outright lease arrangements, I indicate to the members opposite. There were about 2,500 options that were proposed and are being now considered by Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation.

And I just would like to table this response and pass it on to the members opposite along with the invitation to tender that was published in the papers in Saskatchewan and I would want to indicate to the general public, Mr. Speaker, that another example of misinformation and half-truths and outright . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hospital Bed Costs

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Health a question. I have some statistics from Statistics Canada that say that Saskatchewan in general, hospitals have the least cost per bed in Canada at \$320 per bed. The average in Canada is 416. Madam Minister, that is almost a hundred dollars

cheaper in Saskatchewan than it is in Canada. And it is first and the lowest cost per bed in Canada.

Would you provide to the Assembly the study that your department is doing on the utilization of hospital beds in the province of Saskatchewan. Will you release to the province of Saskatchewan that study that you have in hand?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan as usual is leading the rest of Canada with respect to health reform in attempting to contain health care costs, clearly.

The department is not doing a study on utilization. The health research and utilization commission is doing that study. It is an independent commission that's headed by Dr. Stewart McMillan. And I do not have a copy of his report because he's in the . . . he will be finishing it off in the next few days and weeks, and when he does it will be made public.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Madam Minister, has the commission provided that information to you as of today? The people in the province of Saskatchewan know this: that Saskatchewan is the lowest per-bed cost in Canada. And you were saying all over the country that we have the most health care costs of any province in Canada.

Madam Minister, we have \$320 per bed in the province of Saskatchewan; whereas the next one is significantly higher, and the highest is 966 in the Northwest Territories. Madam Minister, will you tell us whether the utilization study has been reported to you already?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, we have the highest number of beds per capita here in Saskatchewan. And we have amongst the highest number of hospitals, I think, next to any province except Ontario. So, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite of course, as usual, is misrepresenting what I'm saying to the people. But that's what I've come to expect from the members opposite.

Now with respect to the utilization commission's report, no, I have not received the utilization commission's report.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 52 — An Act respecting Culture and Recreation

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I move The Culture and Recreation Act, 1993 be now introduced and read the first time.

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

Bill No. 53 — An Act respecting Natural Resources

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill respecting Natural Resources be now introduced and read the first time.

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

A Bill to restore health care services to the community of Theodore

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move first reading of a Bill to restore health care services to the community of Theodore.

The division bells rang from 2:38 p.m. until 2:39 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Martens	D'Autremont
Boyd	Goohsen
Toth	Haverstock

Nays — 37

Wiens	Hamilton
Simard	Johnson
Tchorzewski	Trew
Lingenfelter	Draper
Shillington	Serby
Koskie	Roy
Solomon	Cline
Goulet	Scott
Kowalsky	McPherson
Carson	Wormsbecker
Mitchell	Crofford
Penner	Stanger
Cunningham	Knezacek
Upshall	Harper
Bradley	Keeping
Koenker	Carlson
Lautermilch	Langford
Calvert	Jess
Murray	

A Bill to restore health care services to the community of Rockglen

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move first reading of a Bill to restore health care services to the community of Rockglen.

The division bells rang from 2:41 p.m. until 2:42 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Martens	D'Autremont
Boyd	Goohsen

Toth

Haverstock

Nays — 34

Wiens	Johnson
Simard	Trew
Lingenfelter	Draper
Shillington	Serby
Solomon	Roy
Goulet	Cline
Kowalsky	Scott
Carson	McPherson
Mitchell	Wormsbecker
Penner	Crofford
Cunningham	Stanger
Bradley	Knezacek
Koenker	Harper
Lautermilch	Keeping
Calvert	Carlson
Murray	Langford
Hamilton	Jess

A Bill to restore health care services to the community of Lucky Lake

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move the first reading of a Bill to restore health care services to the community of Lucky Lake.

The division bells rang from 2:45 p.m. until 2:46 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Martens	D'Autremont
Boyd	Goohsen
Toth	Haverstock

Nays — 34

Wiens	Calvert
Simard	Murray
Tchorzewski	Hamilton
Lingenfelter	Johnson
Shillington	Trew
Solomon	Draper
Goulet	Serby
Kowalsky	Roy
Carson	Scott
Mitchell	Wormsbecker
Penner	Crofford
Cunningham	Knezacek
Upshall	Harper
Hagel	Keeping
Bradley	Carlson
Koenker	Langford
Lautermilch	Jess

A Bill to restore health care services to the community of Leoville

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to restore health care services to the community of Leoville.

The division bells rang from 2:47 p.m. until 2:48 p.m.

The Speaker: — I believe the Government House Leader should maybe just keep some of those remarks to himself. Order.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Martens	D’Autremont
Boyd	Goohsen
Toth	Haverstock

Nays — 28

Wiens	Hamilton
Lingenfelter	Johnson
Solomon	Trew
Goulet	Draper
Kowalsky	Serby
Carson	Roy
Mitchell	Scott
Penner	Wormsbecker
Cunningham	Crofford
Upshall	Harper
Koenker	Keeping
Lautermilch	Carlson
Calvert	Langford
Murray	Jess

A Bill to restore health care services to the community of Montmartre

Mr. D’Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move first reading of a Bill to restore health care services to the community of Montmartre.

The division bells rang from 2:50 p.m. until 2:51 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Martens	D’Autremont
Boyd	Goohsen
Toth	Haverstock

Nays — 24

Wiens	Lautermilch
Lingenfelter	Murray
Solomon	Johnson
Goulet	Trew
Kowalsky	Serby
Carson	Wormsbecker
Mitchell	Stanger
Penner	Harper
Cunningham	Keeping
Hagel	Carlson
Bradley	Langford
Koenker	Jess

A Bill to restore health care services to the community of Fillmore

Mr. D’Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move first reading of a Bill to restore health care services to the community of Fillmore.

The division bells rang from 2:53 p.m. until 2:54 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Martens	D’Autremont
Boyd	Goohsen
Toth	Haverstock

Nays — 23

Wiens	Murray
Lingenfelter	Johnson
Solomon	Trew
Goulet	Serby
Kowalsky	Wormsbecker
Carson	Stanger
Mitchell	Harper
Penner	Keeping
Cunningham	Carlson
Hagel	Langford
Bradley	Jess
Lautermilch	

A Bill to restore health care services to the community of Radville

Mr. D’Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move first reading of a Bill to restore health care services to the community of Radville.

The bells rang from 2:55 p.m. until 2:56 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Martens	D’Autremont
Boyd	Goohsen
Toth	Haverstock

Nays — 22

Wiens	Murray
Lingenfelter	Johnson
Solomon	Trew
Goulet	Serby
Kowalsky	Roy
Carson	Wormsbecker
Mitchell	Stanger
Penner	Keeping
Cunningham	Carlson
Lautermilch	Langford
Calvert	Jess

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Speaker: — What’s the member’s point of order?

Mr. Martens: — The point of order is that, the last few votes we've taken there have been people moving around while the vote is being taken. There have been people moving through the doors and sitting in the back, and then moving back to the front. I wonder if the Speaker would bring to the attention of the Assembly that that is not a part of the decorum of this House, nor is it a part of the rules. And I would like to point out to the Speaker that that is my point of order. And I believe it should be addressed by the people in the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think the member's point is very well taken.

And while I am on my feet, I must also remind all members that this constant running around when the votes are taken is very annoying. And it's contrary to the rules. But not only that, but the comments that are going across the floor is really . . . should be kept to a minimum. At least help the Clerks in taking the vote. So I think the member's point is very well taken, and I ask members to please abide by the rules that you yourself set down.

STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

Ruling on a Point of Order

The Speaker: — Before orders of the day, the other day I took a point of order from a member from Saskatoon Sutherland-University. In fact on Tuesday, April 20, 1993, the member for Saskatoon Sutherland-University raised a point of order in regard to references made to Bill 38 by the member for Estevan while introducing guests.

I have reviewed the record, and find the member for Estevan did refer to business before the Assembly in his introduction. I refer all members to rulings of the Chair dated July 31, 1989; August 3, 1989; May 15, 1991; May 30, 1991; May 31, 1991; and June 6, 1991, which state that members should not involve gallery guests in proceedings, nor should introductions provoke debate. Therefore I find the point of order well taken.

Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I ask leave of the Assembly to make a statement which will be of interest to all members.

Leave granted.

(1500)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Earth Day

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Earth Day is internationally recognized as a day to celebrate and encourage environmental

activity in all areas of human endeavour.

Here in Saskatchewan we can be proud of our relatively clean environment and abundant natural resources. Earth Day gives us the opportunity to reflect on the bounties of our land and on what we have accomplished to preserve it. It also gives us the opportunity to look ahead to find new ways to foster a healthy environment and preserve our precious natural resources.

To celebrate Earth Day, the Department of Environment and Resource Management is issuing five new brochures in its Helping the Environment series. These brochures will assist Saskatchewan people to do what they can to help our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of the Assembly to join with me to recognize today as Earth Day and to join with the residents of Saskatchewan in finding ways to maintain our environment and preserve it for the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to join with the minister in comments on Earth Day.

Earth Day is very significant to Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan are indeed products of the land and the water and the sun. And in this province we are still dependent upon those precious resources. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the largest megaproject in Saskatchewan is about to renew itself.

As the trees, flowers, and grasses come forth for another season, as the birds return and the animals shake off their hibernation, our farmers and gardeners are preparing the soil for spring planting.

We depend on agriculture for our number-one export of products. We depend on coal, sun, wind, and water to generate our electricity, Mr. Speaker. We depend upon this earth for our very survival.

Earth Day is a day to celebrate the people of Saskatchewan and to remind all of us how precious this world is to us. We cannot take our resources for granted. Instead, we must all do our part to ensure that Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada is kept clean; that our resources are protected and cherished and used judiciously.

After all, the steps we take today we are taking for our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren in the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today our globe celebrates Earth Day. And for many not blessed with the privileges that we enjoy in Canada and in Saskatchewan, issues of the environment rank

far down in their list of things of importance. For people facing starvation or the terrors of war, the environment is something one struggles against rather than protects.

Here under our clear Saskatchewan skies, we literally have unlimited horizons. We have a population which is relatively well-educated, and a population whose awareness of environmental issues is growing each year.

As individuals we are learning about the three R's of environmental responsibility — reduce, reuse, and recycle. With guidance from our local and provincial governments, as well as good corporate citizens, people are taking advantage of facilities which allow us to recycle hundreds of tonnes of glass, plastic, and newspaper each year.

And, Mr. Speaker, we can do much more. The ingenuity of Saskatchewan people has produced outstanding accomplishments in the fields of medicine and telecommunications and agriculture. That same ingenuity, Mr. Speaker, will continue to develop new inventions which will promote environmental responsibility in our province, innovations which can be shared with the rest of the world.

The policy decisions made in this Assembly, decisions in which we must all participate freely and openly, should reflect our obligation to preserve and protect our fragile environment for the future. And I stand today in this Assembly to congratulate all of us and all of those citizens of Saskatchewan who are doing their very best to ensure that we have an environment for the future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that question no. 110 be converted to motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — For return (debatable).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act.

The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act provides pension benefits to municipal employees, school board employees, and designated police officers and fire-fighters. One thousand employers

and 7,500 employees participate in the plan. A nine-member commission representing major employers and interest groups oversees the plan's operations.

The reasons for amending The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act is for housekeeping purposes. The amendments will ensure consistent application of the pension plan rules to all members of the plan. The commission has reviewed and approved the amendments. These changes will not result in any additional costs to the pension plan.

Mr. Speaker, therefore I take pleasure in moving the second reading of Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are many people across this province, especially municipal employees, who have been waiting for this Bill. I believe it just addresses a couple minor points in the Bill to address some inequities in the pension plan. And I believe as well that we would like to just take a moment to quickly peruse the Bill before we move to the committee. Therefore at this time I'll move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 46 — An Act to amend and repeal The Farm Purchase Program Act

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I'll move second reading of The Farm Purchase Program Amendment and Repeal Act, 1993.

I rise in the House today to describe changes to The Farm Purchase Program Act. Mr. Speaker, the farm purchase program was established in 1982 to assist young farmers who wished to buy land. The program provided an interest subsidy to farmers for the first 10 years if they could make their payments on the land they purchased.

For the first five years of a loan the farm purchase program paid interest rebates equal to the difference between payments at available interest rates and what payments would be at 8 per cent. During the last five years that the farmer is enrolled in the program rebate grants equal the difference between payments at available interest rates and 12 per cent. Total enrolment in the program from 1982 until present was 6,912 farmers were paid a total of \$106 million. The average semi-annual subsidy to farmers was about \$4,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, in retrospect this program encouraged farmers to purchase land at the wrong time. These same farmers, if they had been able to make the payments on the land they purchased, have seen their equity erode as land prices have fallen. In 1987 the previous government terminated new enrolments in the farm purchase program. In 1991-92 these interest subsidy payments cost the province \$4.4 million for about 3,700 farmers. Last year, 1992-93,

approximately 2,700 farmers received interest subsidy payments under the program.

Mr. Speaker, lower interest rates have reduced the number of farmers receiving benefits and have reduced the level of benefits being paid under the program. These two factors have lessened the need for the program. It has been calculated that the projected savings for the duration of the program, which would have been to July 31, 1997, the original termination date of the program, could be \$2.4 million.

Mr. Speaker, this government honoured all interest rebate participants who are still within the first five years of the program. All interest rebates earned to May 31, 1992, were paid to those farmers enrolled in the last five years of the program. This government has also provided time for all participants to prepare the necessary documentation to update files in order to be eligible for interest rebates earned to May 31, 1992. This documentation had to be submitted by October 31, 1992.

Mr. Speaker, all farmers enrolled in the farm purchase program were notified immediately after presentation of the May 7, 1992 budget that this program was to be concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of this House to support the amendments to the Act and I move second reading of The Farm Purchase Program Amendment and Repeal Act, 1993.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the remarks made by the minister, I'm well aware of the fact that over the past few years interest rates indeed have begun to come down, in fact are probably as low as they've ever been in a long period in time.

And the minister did allude to the high prices and the high interest rates of the early '80s and the difficulty the farm community was having at that time. And I'd like to mention to this Assembly that that difficulty in rural communities and in agriculture and the farm community certainly hasn't dissipated whatsoever. In fact it may have become worse as we look at the fact that the government themselves have looked at ways in which they can walk away from their responsibility.

The reason for the farm purchase program amendment in the first place, Mr. Speaker, was because we had a government in the 1970s who felt it was more important to borrow money and to go out and invest in land and invest in property, instead of helping individuals find a way in which they could make the purchase of property and have access to long-term monies at low interest rates, guaranteed interest rates.

And, Mr. Speaker, as we look back over the process that took place and we look back in the late '70s, and I can tell you in my area — and I think we're familiar with it across the province — that in many instances

the price of land increased substantially as the government was out there attempting to buy the property. In fact individuals who were looking at selling the land used the land bank as a ways and means of driving up the prices for their land.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as the prices of land increased, as the taxpayer indirectly was out there purchasing land, the young individual who was trying to get established on the farm found themselves in a situation which in 1978 and 1979 didn't look all that bad because the equity in your farm and your assets were increasing because of inflation. But by 1982, as the price of land had peaked, the interest rates had hit that 17, 18, and 22 per cent, young farmers, farm families, middle-aged families, all of a sudden found that this high-priced land that they had paid overly . . . or too many dollars for, that had paid probably three or four or five times as much as they should have actually paid for the property, and then the high interest rates on top of it, they found that it was impossible for them to maintain payments on that land.

Therefore the government of the day felt it imperative to at least utilize whatever funds they could come up with and try and subsidize this interest rate. And for many people subsidization of the interest rate made the difference between making payments and not making payments.

Now for the minister to disband the interest subsidy and through this amendment today, Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder how many individuals in Saskatchewan are indeed being helped or how many individuals are still going to be left with high interest rates which the products that they are producing just cannot afford to maintain.

And I wonder, has the government looked at a plan that would address maybe the individuals, because we all know people who have taken out loans, some loans were taken five years ago and maybe they took it out over a five-year period, and five, even three years ago, interest rates were still in that 12 and 14 per cent range. Whereas today they're down in that 7 per cent range.

Now a lending institution is not in a position where they're quite ready to write down interest rates if a person signed a note and if a person's making payments. And yet that payment, because of that high interest rate they're tied to, might make it difficult for them to continue to pay their bills, make the payments, so that at the end of the day they would own their property.

(1515)

So I would wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the government is indeed doing to address the individuals out there who are still stuck with high interest rates. I'm sure we'll hear ministers saying, well they can go and find money today at 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 per cent interest, refinance that property, and get on with life. But I think if you take a moment just to drive around

rural Saskatchewan, you will find that there are many people, as much as they would like to refinance, as much as they would like to find a better interest rate, are not in a position to glean or gain that better interest rate.

And so it would appear to me, Mr. Minister, that it would only be fair for the government to have an alternative and to give people that ability to finance their property. And we saw that for home-owners in Saskatchewan, and it was fine while we were there protecting home-owners. And then as interest rates lowered you encouraged home-owners to take advantage of lower interest rates and tie in long-term debt. And I think it's appropriate here as well.

But in the meantime, those individuals, the young farm families who may be still tied in with some 12 and 14 per cent interest rates, I think it would be appropriate if the government at least took the time and assisted them, whether or not the government makes the money available, but gives them some assistance and maybe through counselling assistance or through mediation to deal with the lending institutions out there to give them . . . make available lower interest loans over a period of time that would give everybody the same accessibility, would allow people to make their payments and indeed build for the future.

I think my colleague would have some more to say on this Bill as well, and therefore at this time I move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 47 — An Act to amend The Farm Financial Stability Act

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I will move second reading of The Farm Financial Stability Amendment Act, 1993.

It is my pleasure today to rise in the House to describe changes to The Farm Financial Stability Act. These changes affect part VI of the Act which deals with the production associations loan guarantee program for feeder and breeder cattle.

Mr. Speaker, production associations are composed of producers who wish to diversify or expand their operation by feeding cattle. Under the government program, members of production associations receive a significantly lower rate of interest on loans to purchase cattle. Association members are not required to provide any additional collateral other than a minimum deposit and the cattle.

The Government of Saskatchewan, in its effort to promote diversification of farm operations, assists members of associations by guaranteeing the loans. The government also views these loan guarantees as an option in helping to resolve the farm debt crisis. The loan guarantee gives producers access to funding that otherwise might not be available.

The production associations loan guarantee program is based on risk sharing between an association's members, the lender, and the government. When the association members sell their cattle, the loan is repaid to the financial institution.

Livestock producers are finding this program to be of a benefit to their operations. I feel the proof is in the increased number of associations formed last year. At the end of 1992 there were 110 breeder associations, an increase of 26, and there were 92 breeder associations, an increase of 32 compared to the 60 in 1991.

There are about 4,000 livestock producers who are members of production associations. Last year feeder association members financed over 90,000 head of feeder cattle with a value of \$54.6 million. As well, breeder association members purchased nearly 16,000 cows and 3,300 calves in 1992, with a value of \$15 million.

Since the program's introduction in 1984, total purchases of cattle for the program have amounted to about \$320 million.

Mr. Speaker, those involved in the program — producers, lenders, and government — have identified some administrative details which require changes. The amendments to part VI of the Act address these details and clarify the procedures to be followed. Some of the changes also streamline internal administrative procedures.

The changes to the legislation are intended to improve the program for association members and to increase safety to the program for the lenders and for the government guarantee. These changes will result in efficiencies in administration and will subsequently save time and money. The changes are as follows.

The procedure for issuing guarantees will be streamlined by eliminating the need for an order in council for each request for a guarantee. This change is positive for associations because the turnaround time for issuing guarantees will be reduced significantly.

Cabinet will be given the authority to establish a limit on the amount of loans which may be guaranteed during the fiscal year. This will establish the government's maximum annual liability and will help to improve the government's credit rating. In the past government guarantee was open-ended, and this has impacted negatively on Saskatchewan's credit rating.

Lenders have approached the government to ask what procedures they are to follow if they foresee a loss in relation to a loan. These procedures were not spelled out in the previous legislation. In this amendment the procedures and guidelines are clear. These guidelines will minimize risk and will ensure that the guarantee is not jeopardized by lack of action on the lender's part.

Under the legislation, lenders will be required to

provide information on security and account records for the association. In the event of a claim this provision will ensure that lenders have followed appropriate procedures. It also clarifies procedures lenders should follow to ensure the guarantee to the lender remains in place in the event of a loss. The amending legislation allows the lender to collect the shortfall on payments on a loan when it is in the public interest.

The amending legislation recognizes the practice of custom feed-lot operators carrying the feeding costs for their customers until the cattle are sold. To reduce the risk to the assurance fund and the government guarantee, the amendment ensures that liens cannot be placed on such cattle. This procedure also reduces the administrative cost to associations and government.

The amendments clarify existing provisions concerning the purchase of members' own cattle on their behalf, the release of equity when cattle are sold, and the conduct of licensed dealers involved in the program.

There is also a requirement that every feeder or breeder association which requests a guarantee be required to pay a fee. This will cover some of the administrative costs and is in keeping with government's concerns about budgetary restraint.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the members of this House to support the amendments to the Act, and I move second reading of The Farm Financial Stability Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as the minister stood to introduce or give second reading on The Farm Financial Stability Amendment Act and we saw this Act coming before us, we were first of all wondering if it was just elimination of another Act, another program of protection to help diversify the province of Saskatchewan.

And as I listened to the remarks by the minister, it appears to me that there is a fair bit of technical detail in this Bill that would be appropriate for my colleague, the minister responsible, to have a moment or some time to review.

And I think in light of a number of the changes and the increased feeding of livestock in this province, the support that has been given to rural communities and rural members and farmers and encouraging them to look at other ways and means of bettering themselves and bettering their communities and having a solid impact on the economic activity and viability of this province, that certainly this Act has gone a long way in creating the ability for producers to gain access to the funding needed to transform some of their operations from strictly grain, say, into livestock production.

And it's imperative, Mr. Speaker, that this province, with the number of cattle we have in the province, we look at not just shipping out a natural resource such as the calves to other provinces and allowing them to

feed and then ship back the finished and processed product, but I believe it's very important that we as well continue to support our industry and encourage them so that we indeed can provide an avenue of sale for the calves that are out there and many that are being born at this time in this period of year.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, would move adjournment of debate for further consideration.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Provincial Lands Act

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to rise to move second reading of the amendments to Act c.P-31, The Provincial Lands Act, 1974.

The purpose of these amendments is to update the Act to reflect the changes that have occurred over the last number of years in the administration of Crown agricultural lands.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to tell the House that we are moving forward on these long-overdue changes, and the passage of these important amendments will go a long way to help our government keep this important statute up to date and provide necessary authority for Agriculture and Food and the Department of Environment and Resource Management to operate in today's setting.

This Act clarifies the valuation of improvements for sale and a removal from leaseholds. It makes clear the province's indebtedness to the lessee upon termination of a lease for any improvements consented to by the department.

Mr. Speaker, a particularly important change is a provision for establishment of a trust condition for Crown land sales. It is common practice for the purchaser's solicitor to receive a transfer in trust to allow registration of mortgage documents. This legislation will allow the province to provide the same services on Crown land sale transactions.

This piece of housekeeping ensures these holders are treated fairly and with dispatch when purchasing their leaseholdings.

I'm also pleased to introduce changes that provide for expanded tax management on behalf of legally constituted local authorities. Irrigation districts have asked to be favoured with tax collection support under the lands Act similar to that provided to rural municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, the changes I am introducing provide the framework for this authority. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to give second reading of the amendment to c.P-31, The Provincial Lands Act.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, again as I was listening to

the minister I believe this Act is basically bringing up to date a number of changes in the Act, and bringing it up to date with the present requirements of our society and of agriculture and provincial land sales. And I don't think there are a lot of things that we as an opposition are really going to take a lot of time on.

But just to give us a chance to review the Act, I will move adjournment of debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 51 — An Act to amend The Wildlife Act

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of An Act to amend The Wildlife Act. This Bill is intended to ensure that Saskatchewan's unique and valuable wildlife resources are maintained and enhanced for the people of this province.

The highlights of the Bill include: changes to the definition of wildlife so both native and exotic species can be properly distinguished and regulated; the one-year suspension rule of hunting rights following an infraction; the regulations regarding Indian and non-Indian people hunting together; the authority of conservation officers to inspect facilities that house wildlife; the rules for possession of wildlife; and the province's ability to regulate captive wildlife.

To ensure Saskatchewan plays its part in the global aspects of wildlife conservation, the definition of wildlife is being changed so that both native and exotic wildlife are being regulated within the province. Wildlife everywhere is being threatened through trade in endangered species or parts of these animals. The change in definition also allows the Department of Environment and Resource Management to regulate exotic animals brought into the province. These animals may harm native species in their habitat, introduce unwanted diseases, or endanger people.

Mr. Speaker, amendments contained in this Bill will allow the one-year hunting suspension for minor violations of wildlife laws to be replaced with fines. I want to make it clear that our stance on wildlife violators has not softened and the loss of hunting privilege will still be invoked for violations that impact on our wildlife resource.

In the past, non-Indians have been restricted from hunting with Indian people to prevent non-Indians from abusing treaty Indians' special hunting privileges. This restriction meant, for instance, that a non-Indian father could not assist his Indian children who have a legal mandate to hunt and gather in this province. With this amendment, Indian and non-Indian family members may hunt together during the regular hunting season, provided the non-Indian is properly licensed and does not take animals for the Indian family members.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill that I have introduced will provide conservation officers with the authority to

inspect facilities and businesses that house wildlife or wildlife parts. These powers of inspection are consistent with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and will ensure compliance with the laws governing wildlife. Our conservation officers will now be able to properly enforce the legislation in areas where there is a growing trade in animal parts.

The Bill also addresses the rules under which people may possess wildlife and the powers to regulate the holding of captive wildlife in facilities such as zoos and mobile wildlife displays. I want to ensure that people have access to the province's wildlife resources, but also that wildlife is maintained in a humanitarian and lawful manner.

The amendments contained in this Bill reflect the government's commitment to provide people access to the province's wild resources while conserving and protecting them. Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of the Assembly to support this Bill as I now move second reading of The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1993.

(1530)

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the minister I can understand why the minister would want to pack the Act immediately, to protect wildlife in the province. But I would also like to make a comment regarding the Act, as I feel that there may be a few areas that are going to need some time and should be looked at.

One of the things that I believe the minister had indicated, the fact that resource officers are going to be given added responsibility or powers to inspect game farms. I just hope that the government has taken the time to converse with the game farm producers across this province. I know that a lot of the game farmers are very willing and more than open to work together with Resource Management to develop regulations that would protect their industry, because they're very cognizant of the effect that diseases brought in by animals brought into the province, exotic animals, can have on their industry.

In fact there are thousands of dollars tied up in the game-farming sector . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And the minister is telling me that this one really doesn't affect the game farmers. And that's fine. That's one question we won't really worry about on this specific Bill then, and I appreciate that.

The other thing, regarding hunting, and certainly that's a question that's been around, it's been a problem area for a number of years, especially when it comes to our indigenous peoples and their rights to hunt. And I think some of the indigenous communities that I've talked to certainly are in favour of regulations that they can abide with and controls on hunting so that indeed we protect the resource for future generations. And indeed the hunting community that we all represent out there want our . . . or have a very definite interest in protecting hunting and protecting wildlife into the future.

Another area that I think needs to be looked at and addressed is how we address the problem of damage to crops. And that again, I believe, is not specifically addressed in this area and in this Bill; it's in another area.

But I think it's a question that continually comes to the forefront that people are concerned, and it certainly isn't wrong to raise the question and ask the government and ask the departments what consultation process is taking place and what work is taking place at the present time to indeed compensate farmers for loss due to wildlife, as many farmers out there feel that wildlife are on their property and even in their crops. The hunting community of this province and indeed individuals who come to this province and the economic spin-off are a benefit of the property that they own and the crops that the wildlife indeed feed and salvage in.

So I think at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, what we're looking for is indeed an Act that recognizes the responsibility of individual hunters, that affirms their responsibility; that gives conservation officers the ability to administer the rules without giving them undue powers that many people may see as being abusive powers. And I think through consultation this process can be reached. And I would assume that once we enter into further debate and committee, that we can indeed address a number of those questions.

I therefore at this time move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 22

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Wiens that **Bill No. 22 — An Act respecting the Manufacture, Sale, Use, Consumption, Collection, Storage, Recycling and Disposal of Ozone-depleting Substances and Products** be now read a second time.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure for me to rise on this particular day and address Bill 22, an Act which deals with the ozone-depleting substances. It is a pleasure because today is Earth Day and this House is discussing a Bill which attempts to address one of the most serious abuses that we as human beings are inflicting on our home sphere — earth.

As the minister noted, this Bill follows from the Montreal Protocol of 1987. That international agreement was signed by 86 different countries around the world. It represents an important example of international cooperation to protect the earth and its environment, which we all must share and sustain if we are going to endure.

Through that agreement, the use and manufacture of ozone-depleting substances like CFCs (chlorofluorocarbons) and halons will be eliminated by the end of 1995. And as we've heard so many times, these substances destroy our ozone layer — the only thing protecting us from harmful ultraviolet rays that cause not only health problems to humans and animals, but significant crop damage as well. All of these things bring with them untold economic hardship and a general reduction in our quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, although not without fault, is a step in the right direction. It is our commitment as a province to uphold our responsibility within the nation. It is our contribution to upholding our duties as responsible international citizens. And last of all, Mr. Speaker, this Bill represents our coming through, our fulfilling part of our responsibility to our children and future generations.

Mr. Speaker, while this Bill is a step in the right direction, many of the people involved in the handling and sale of ozone-depleting substances have already taken the real leadership roles in eliminating CFCs from our environment. People who have graduated from our schools — places like the Kelsey institute — in the last five years are experienced in the handling of non-CFC refrigerants such as ammonia.

The fact that younger people are already trained to work in a world that does not have CFC refrigerants is a tribute to the foresight of these individuals, to their instructors, and the industry and firms which employ them. While government has a responsibility to provide leadership, it often finds itself humbled by the accomplishments of such people.

I am delighted that Saskatchewan is fulfilling its responsibilities to curb the use of ozone-depleting substances but I still have some concerns, Mr. Speaker.

Under this Bill, the government is proposing to ensure that all people handling, recycling, and disposing of ozone-depleting substances are certified. Most of those people are indeed certified and it is my knowledge that many people involved in the refrigeration industry have scurried to take their certification courses in anticipation of this Bill's very passage, in the last several months.

It is good that many people are already certified before this Act ever comes into place. I am concerned, however, that other people graduating on courses from farm mechanics and refrigeration and automotive mechanics are not receiving this training as part of their course load. And I would like the minister to clarify later with his counterpart responsible for Education, Training and Employment whether this certification course will become an integral part of their training.

The minister would probably agree that it makes much more sense for people to be trained automatically to receive this certification rather than having them go through the red tape in another course

to finally receive the rating they require. This is a small item, Mr. Speaker, but it would do much to ease confusion while allowing us to more readily achieve our aims of reducing use of ozone-depleting substances.

I am also concerned that this Act may not do all it could to curb abuses. While I recognize the need to allow people the freedom to handle ozone-depleting substances for personal uses in health, handling of animals, and other uses, there isn't any significant point within this Bill to curb abuse at that personal level. An example of this may be a person who has a car with an air-conditioner that is leaking. Instead of repairing it, they simply continue to add more CFC-based refrigerant. Others who deal with refrigerants through some unregulated sideline work may also handle these kinds of materials in a less than acceptable manner.

While I'm not suggesting that the potential for abuse at a personal level should be legislated in a Bill like this, there should be some means of encouraging the safe and proper use of these substances. I look forward to hearing from the minister and have him explain how the government intends to discourage this type of abuse, however minor.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also concerned with the economic impact that this Bill will have. By economic impact I am not talking about the cost of choosing alternatives to CFCs and Halons in industries like refrigeration, food services, and packaging. I'm talking about the economic opportunities that might arise from this, Mr. Speaker. And I know this change-over will cost a great deal of monies. I think the member from Souris-Cannington indicated in his address some days ago that this change will cost American business alone \$36 billion. I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that this will cost Saskatchewan people a significant sum as well.

This raises the question of what the members opposite are doing to capitalize on what can be seen as a significant opportunity. How does the Minister of the Environment . . . what has he done to encourage the development of additional business opportunities to create jobs through this conversion? What has the Minister of Economic Development done to help Saskatchewan firms gain a share of that \$36 billion in economic opportunities? And what has the minister done to ensure that Saskatchewan firms can create badly-needed jobs and revenues from the change-over in this province and others?

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to getting some answers to these questions at a later point. This Bill is good in principle. It is good because it helps fulfil our duties and responsibilities, not only to ourselves and our children, but international and national community as well. It is a pleasure to see us making progress, especially on this particular day, Earth Day, but we must remember that we have a very long way to go.

As a province we still need an improved environmental assessment process that is more

impartial and examines all the ramifications of a project. We must realize that we have a long way to go to make many other government programs environmentally sustainable, especially as they relate to agriculture in our province. This is progress however, and while we all long for more progress we must remain thankful for what we've accomplished. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to raising specific questions in Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 26

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Shillington that **Bill No. 26 — An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 33

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell that **Bill No. 33 — An Act respecting Security interests in Personal Property and making Consequential and Related Amendments to Certain Other Acts** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

(1545)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Wakamow Valley Authority Act

The Chair: — Order. I would ask the Associate Minister of Health to please introduce the officials that are here with him and ask other members to, if they're not participating, perhaps keep their voices down.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to have with me today Mr. John Edwards, who is director of municipal policy and legislative services of the Department of Municipal Government.

Clauses 1 to 5 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, by leave or agreement I would move that we would go to item no. 4, Bill No. 4, a local improvement Act, and then revert back to Bill No. 25, Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, at the completion of Bill 4.

Leave granted.

Bill No. 4 — An Act respecting Local Improvements in Urban and Northern Municipalities and to Effect Certain Consequential Changes

The Chair: — I would ask the Minister of Municipal Government to please introduce her officials.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Behind me and to my right is Marilyn Turanich from the Saskatchewan Municipal Board. And to my right is John Edwards, director of municipal policy and legislative services.

Clause 1

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the minister wouldn't mind explaining the purposes of this Bill and why it's been brought forward.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Very briefly, it's to streamline the process for allowing local improvements to go forward. It also provides flexibility in the financing, and also it provides more rights for the property owners.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Madam Minister. Who did you consult with in preparing this Bill?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Consultations were held with the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, the Urban Municipal Administrators' Association, the Canadian Bar, Association of Consulting Engineers, Saskatchewan Water Corporation, all the city commissioners and clerks, Saskatchewan Assessment Management Agency, the Saskatchewan Municipal Board, Saskatchewan Justice, railways, and Saskatchewan Rural Development, now part of our department.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Madam Minister. I wonder if you'd mind providing us with the dates and the people that you met with on those consultations.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — We don't have the specific dates. Many of these amendments go back two or three years, and they came forward as resolutions out of the various municipal associations. And we have obviously provided copies of the Bill as we developed it to the municipal associations. But as far as the meetings, they've gone on over the past three or four years.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, you referred in your initial comments to the rights of the property owners. I'd like to know what rights have been extended or improved for property owners through this Act.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — The procedural changes in the proposed new Act include requiring delivery and mailing notices to all affected owners as well as publication and notices; formally providing for owners to petition for a local improvement; clarifying the application process to the Saskatchewan

Municipal Board and what the report on local improvement is to cover; setting out criteria for the Saskatchewan Municipal Board's approval of an undertaking as a local improvement, which is not now in the Act; strengthening the period for petitioning against a local improvement from 14 to 21 days; requiring the notice to advise when a council will consider a proposed local improvement; setting out the content of the notice rather than the actual notice form itself; and making the Saskatchewan Municipal Board hearing mandatory for a local improvement initiated without the right for the owners to petition against it.

Mr. Goohsen: — Madam Minister, I wonder if other people are feeling a little misled, as I am here. You said that this Bill was generally intended to extend the rights of property owners, and yet one of the things that you include that I picked up on is the fact that petitions against improvements can now be allowed for 21 days instead of 14. Isn't that a bit of a contradiction of what you've said?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Not at all. What it says is an owner, instead of having 14 days to initiate a petition, now has that lengthened to 21 days if they want to petition out a local improvement. It gives them more time to look and consider if they want to petition it out.

Mr. Goohsen: — On page 10, section 12, the borderline comment is that the "Saskatchewan Municipal Board may override council." Would you explain that a little further.

It says the "Saskatchewan Municipal Board may override council." Would you explain that further.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, what that section intends to say is where a council has overridden the local property owner's right to petition it out, the Municipal Board now has the right to overturn that decision by the municipal council.

Mr. Goohsen: — I'm really not sure that I understand that, but I think we're going to let that go. As we go through section by section later, maybe we can sort our minds out a little more quickly on it.

Where the water and sewer works are involved, it says here:

(b) is eligible to be undertaken as a local improvement under this Act;

the work may be carried out as a local improvement pursuant to sections 11 and 12.

Could you explain that a bit further?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, what it says is where a water or sewer work is required and the local property owners have determined . . . where council has overridden the right, then section 12 will apply, and the Municipal Board can ask that the work be undertaken, that the Municipal Board can overrule the council's decision if the work has been required as

a local improvement.

Mr. Goohsen: — Who would make application for that overruling?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, the process is as follows. If the council decides to proceed with an improvement without the right of petition, then the local property owners can petition to the Saskatchewan Municipal Board, and the Municipal Board must hold a hearing.

Mr. Goohsen: — Would there be any costs involved for those individuals that ask for that process, and who would pay those costs?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — There are no costs to the property owner.

(1600)

Mr. Goohsen: — This board appeal process then operates under the jurisdiction of the provincial government and is paid for by the provincial government in full. Is that the case?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes, that's the mandate and the way the Municipal Board operates.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Madam Minister. I note that in your preliminary discussion you indicated that now that Rural Development has become part of your jurisdiction with the amalgamation of the two departments, my question then leads to, in what way will this Act be applicable to rural municipalities?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — The Rural Municipal Act permits the rural councils to use local improvements if they want, but it's not mandatory.

Mr. Goohsen: — In other words, they have the option of whether or not they use the material in this Act, and that option is their discretion, 100 per cent?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes it is.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Madam Minister. I think we'll allow you to go on through this section by section now.

The Chair: — Can the members agree that we proceed through this section by section as opposed to clause by clause?

An Hon. Member: — Agreed.

The Chair: — It's agreed.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 71 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank the minister and especially her officials for

being so cooperative. I'm sure that if there are questions arising, that the people in the country and in the towns will want to feel free to be able to contact you to clarify anything that's brought up in this rather lengthy document.

I think it's probably necessary to have changes because times changes the things that we need and do. But there will be problems with understanding and comprehension, I'm sure, of some of these changes and we hope that you will be cooperative in that regard. Thank you.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, I thank the members opposite for their cooperation in passing this Bill. The member opposite is right, that it is a comprehensive Bill and requires some dialogue and information and we're developing a manual to go out to all the municipalities so they will better understand it.

And I would like to thank the officials from the department and the Saskatchewan Municipal Board for being here this afternoon.

Bill No. 25 — An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act

The Chair: — Will the minister please introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The officials with me today are Scott Banda, sitting beside me, and Yvan Boutin, just immediately behind Scott.

Clause 1

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To start off with, I would like to welcome Mr. Yvan Boutin here today, who was a resident in my constituency for a good many years, lived just a few miles west of me.

I'd like to ask the minister: what's the purpose of this Bill? Why was it brought forward?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Mr. Chairman, I'll maybe give a little lengthy answer. I'll try and answer maybe a whole lot of things at once here for the member, sort of anticipating some of the questions he may ask.

But we're doing this basically for administrative efficiency. The CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) staff currently does all the work that SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) did before. We have no staff that is specifically assigned to the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation.

By repealing this Bill, we are eliminating duplicate annual reports. The report will be issued with the CIC report, so we're saving some money there by not having a second report especially for SMDC. We do not have to have special audits done for the SMDC because they will now be included in the CIC investments.

And finally, the reason we're doing this is the Crown Investments Corporation is the agency of government that handles all the government investments, and basically what we have here is just a shareholding in the Cameco, which is strictly a government investment in one corporation. And that's sort of probably the overriding reason why we're doing this, that we hold the investments for all the government investments, and this is . . . that's all this is at this point.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Since there will no longer be an annual report for SMDC, will we still be able to ask questions in Crown Corporations dealing with this corporation?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Yes. You'll have to ask the questions regarding these investments under the Crown Investments Corporation's period, not specifically with the SMDC.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I believe SMDC was the holder of the Cameco shares that were still retained by the government. Is that the case? And if so, what will happen with those shares?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — The answer to your first question is yes, SMDC held those shares. Those shares will now be held by Crown Investments Corporation.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, what's the status of those shares currently?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Mr. Chairman, currently CIC . . . or SMDC, I'll refer to that until we repeal the Bill. SMDC holds roughly 33 per cent of the Cameco shares, and then there's an additional 6 per cent which are special warrants which have not been exercised to date. So we hold that 6 per cent as well. But those special warrants may be exercised by the holders of those special warrants in the near future.

Mr. D'Autremont: — What would be the value of that investment, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Mr. Chairman, using the latest stock market value of those shares, they'd be somewhat in excess of \$300 million. We don't have the exact figure but it's somewhere in excess of 300 million.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Is that an increase or a decrease in value from the same time last year?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — I think to put this in perspective to answer the question, I need to go back to 1991. If you take the 1991 numbers and then compare them to 1992, the share values from '91 to '92 went down. The share values from '92 up to the present, we're using December numbers for each year, but the share values have been going up. And today the share values are higher than they were in December of 1992. And they are going up on a fairly regular basis.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Therefore the value of our investment within the old corporation of SMDC is becoming greater and of more value to the province of

Saskatchewan.

Does SMDC receive a dividend for those shares?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Yes, the dividend comes from Cameco, the Cameco Corporation, and it went to SMDC. When this Act is repealed, those dividends will simply flow into CIC, Crown Investments Corporation.

Mr. D'Autremont: — What happened with the dividend that was paid last year? What was the amount of it, and what happened to it?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — The dividends last year were around \$10 million, and those dividends went into CIC. They were paid back to Crown Investments Corporation; and Crown Investments Corporation's fund is used to pay down the debt of Crown Investments Corporation and also for the operations of the corporation.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. What effect would the liquidation of those shares have on the economy of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Mr. Chairman, the effect on the economy of Saskatchewan is not really measurable; it may not have any effect on the economy of Saskatchewan.

If you're asking what effect would it have on CIC's balance sheet, then the balance sheet of CIC would be up by whatever amount we sold them for, and this money would then be used to pay down some other debts that CIC has. So the effect would be not on the province *per se*, but more so on the balance sheet of Crown Investments Corporation.

(1615)

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, if those shares were sold for the \$300-plus million that you have valued them at, surely CIC would transfer that value over to the province as a dividend. And that, Mr. Minister, would pay off the deficit . . . not the deficit, the deficit for this year, yes — not the debt — the deficit for this year. So I think it would have a significant impact on the economy of this province because then there would not be the need for the continual increase in rates of the other CIC companies such as SaskPower and SaskTel, SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance), and all of those that are part of the CIC grouping that pay their dividends to CIC, which in turn hopefully is transferred to the provincial Consolidated Fund.

And I think that is one of the areas, Mr. Minister, that you should be investigating with those Cameco shares is to help decrease the deficit in this province by the liquidation of those debts. I believe that would have an important impact on this economy.

Hon. Mr. Penner: — While I appreciate the suggestions from the member from Souris-Cannington, however, the sale of the Cameco

shares would not flow directly into the Consolidated Fund or the general fund of the government. Those shares, or that money, would flow into the Crown Investments Corporation.

And I think it has to be understood that the Crown Investments Corporation carries a substantial debt of various projects and the total debt of the Crowns all put together is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5 billion. So that even a 300 million or 300-and-some-plus million cash injection into Crown Investments Corporation would go to liquidate some of that debt and would reduce the interest payments that we have to make. And obviously it would have an impact — a long-term impact — but I'm saying it wouldn't have an immediate short-term impact on the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, I believe it was Allan Blakeney who stated that the debts within the Crown corporations such as SaskPower, SaskTel, are self-liquidating debt, that those corporations generate their own income to pay off that debt.

If the shares of Cameco were sold, transferred to CIC — and I realize that it has to move through the CIC process — but CIC should be transferring dividends from their accounts to the province's Consolidated Fund. If they were to come into possession of \$300-plus million from the sale of Cameco shares, surely they would transfer that money on to the Consolidated Fund rather than paying off some debt within another Crown corporation . . . that's cross-subsidizing of the different corporations.

Is that what's happening within CIC? Is CIC taking the profits from SaskPower and paying off STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company)? That's not what it should be doing, Mr. Minister. It should be transferring that funds to the Consolidated Fund.

Hon. Mr. Penner: — I think in answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, let me just go through this process this way. If we sold the Cameco shares, there would be . . . pick whatever number you want, \$300 million just for the sake of a number, and the amount that we would gain over what the shares cost us originally to what we sold them, that would be considered as a dividend to CIC. And that could flow directly into the Consolidated Fund. That would be the gain on the sale. But we have to keep in mind that we have . . . this is an asset that has cost us some money and that asset has to be paid.

Now you were mentioning that we should not be using money from the sale of Cameco, if that were to happen, to pay down the debt of SaskPower and SaskTel. Those are not the ones I was referring to. The ones that we would have to be paying down, where we could save interest costs, would be loans that we have for NewGrade, for Saskferco, for Crown Life, for Bi-Provincial, for Millar Western. There's a whole host of them where we had to borrow money in order to get . . . the government borrowed money to get into these projects. And if we were to sell Cameco shares, we could use that money to pay down that debt and

consequently end up saving some interest.

But it's not the total amount that would be used as dividends; it's only the gain on the sale.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, you could also save interest payments by paying off some of the deficit.

I'm just wondering: how much debt is currently being carried by SMDC — SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation), I'm sorry — or SMDC?

The Chair: — Why is the member for Saskatoon Eastview-Haultain on his feet?

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to introduce a guest.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and members. It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to introduce to and through you to members of the Assembly, my son Darren . . . our son Darren, who's just finished university for the year. And he's an officer in the navy and we're very proud of him for that. He was down to Moose Jaw air base doing some business today and has just popped over to have dinner with me before he heads back to Saskatoon.

So I would invite all members to join with me in welcoming Darren here and see you in a few minutes.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 25 (continued)

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question from the member from Souris-Cannington, SMDC currently has an investment in Cameco valued at \$351 million.

An Hon. Member: — No, CIC has.

Hon. Mr. Penner: — I'm sorry. CIC has an investment in Cameco valued at \$351 million. So the sale of those shares would simply be put up against this investment, and if the sale of the shares was beyond that then that would be a gain on the investment and that would go into the Consolidated Fund.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to thank the minister and his officials for coming in today, and for answering our questions.

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the opposition for asking the questions and I trust that the answers were satisfactory and cleared up any problems they had. I'd also like to thank the officials for assisting me.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I would ask that we go to item no. 7, then back to 5, and then 6, and that we follow that order.

The Chair: — Is that agreed with the members? That's agreed. Proceed in that fashion.

Bill No. 9 — An Act to Amend The Emergency Planning Act

The Chair: — Would the Minister of Municipal Government please introduce her officials.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To my right is John Edwards, director of municipal policy and legislative services. Wayne Marr behind me is director of the EMO (Emergency Measures Organization). Jo-Anne Harrison, senior policy analyst, is on the far right; and Jill Carson, administrator of the provincial disaster assistance program.

Clause 1

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, I'd like to ask you: what's the purpose for this Bill? And particularly I'd like you to address the question of the name change. Why? When you change the names, it's just a matter of going through a whole bunch of paper shuffling and you throw out scads of paper and you bring in new paper with a different name on it. What's the purpose of it? Why change the name?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — It's a matter of organization. It had at one time been under . . . as a separate agency, separate. And then it was put into the Department of Environment. And now it has been rolled into our department, Municipal Government. So we had to make changes on the organizational structure and rename it under the Department of Municipal Government.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Madam Minister, surely even if the organization was moved from department to department within the government structure, surely the name Emergency Measures Organization could have remained in place rather than changing the name to Emergency Planning.

Everybody understood and knew what EMO was and did. You had all your letterhead made up with EMO. I don't know what it cost you in your department to have letterhead for this organization, but it's going to cost you a significant amount of money that could have been saved for the people of Saskatchewan by leaving the name remain as Emergency Measures Organization, EMO. Why did you have to change it?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a more distinct definition of what the organization actually does. It's the provincial planning, and that is what is done at the provincial level for emergencies. And at the local level it's to assist those people who are in the organization at trying to cope with disasters as they might occur at the municipal level. But what we do at provincial level is in the area of assisting and planning.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Madam Minister, I don't believe the function of the organization has really changed that much, but that you've changed the name of it. How much money will it cost to change all the letterhead, all the business cards, everything from EMO to whatever you will change it to now?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — There are no incremental costs. There are a number of housekeeping amendments to this Act and it does nothing as far as adding costs in any way to our operations.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Madam Minister, do you have letterhead with the name Emergency Measures Organization on it?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — No, we don't. Our letterhead is either . . . was Community Services; now it's Municipal Government.

Mr. D'Autremont: — So the Emergency Measures Organization had no letterhead whatsoever with its own name; there was no business cards with that name on it, there was nothing within government that used the name Emergency Measures Organization?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — The Emergency Measures Organization is a local organization under the municipal government. They still continue to use that. Under the provincial government, Emergency Planning falls under our department, and the letterhead and all the operations comes under Municipal Government.

(1630)

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, the costs my colleague was referring to, I think he didn't realize aren't at the provincial level but are at the municipal level, at both levels, rural and urban. How much money is it going to cost those governments to make these changes in all of the letterheads and changes that are necessary, with stamps and signatures and whatnot?

Now I have seen letters, Madam Minister, I have seen letters with "Emergency Measures Organization" on them sent to me by the local organization in my home town of Gull Lake. Now don't tell me that there's no place in this world that nobody uses the word "EMO" or the term "Emergency Measures Organization". And don't tell me that it's not going to cost any money to make these changes even if it's in the terms of confusion in the general public, not knowing who the heck is talking about what any more.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — What we want to do is differentiate between the local organization . . . The local organization under municipal government is called the EMO. That's under municipal government. It's still there, nothing has changed. But what we have done is redefine what we actually do, and it's called Emergency Planning. And that falls under our government department.

There are no changes in costs. There are no changes at the local level. The EMO continues to exist, as it has before. It is under the auspices of the local municipal government.

There will be no cost increases. And at that level all it does is make sure that people understand the local level is Emergency Measures Organization; at the provincial level, it's called Emergency Planning because that's what we do in our department.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the minister and her officials for coming in today and answering our questions and thank them for their cooperation.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the member of the opposition for those questions and for their cooperation, and I would like to thank the members from our department for their help today.

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act, 1983

The Chair: — Would the minister please introduce her officials.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Margaret Miller. She's the chief building official on building standards in the Department of Municipal Government.

Clause 1

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, and officials, I will try to ask a general question so that you can give to us your summation of the types of questions we'll be asking, and perhaps we can facilitate the shortening of time that way.

My question in general is, who will the Act affect and how will this Act affect them? — those kind of general questions. Now that departments have been amalgamated and rural municipalities are under the same ministry, will they be affected equally or differently, and how will all these things work?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, would the member opposite ask that question again? We aren't quite sure the nature of the question.

Mr. Goohsen: — Who will the Act affect and how will it affect them? Are rural municipalities also affected by this Act now that you are consolidating the two rural and urban municipal organizations under one ministry? Will they be affected equally or is this just for the planning and development within?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, which Bill are we on? I thought we had moved to the building accessibility Act. I thought we had switched the . . . oh, I'm sorry. I was under the impression we were moving to item 6, Bill No. 8.

Mr. Chairman, can I get my other officials in? We were working on the other Bill.

The Chair: — Would the minister then introduce her officials.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes. I'm very sorry about the mix-up, Mr. Chairman. We have John Wolfenberg — he's assistant director of planning for the Department of Municipal Government.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, welcome to your official. And I would like to ask you a general question, Madam Minister, with regards to this Act, so that we can facilitate the shortening of the time that it might take to ask individual questions. I'm sure that you have some perception of the types of things that people will want to know.

So I'd like you to, in a general way, outline to us those things that you think people need to know; and more specifically, who will this Bill affect and how will they be affected by it; and will urban and rural municipalities be affected equally under this Act now that the two are amalgamated under one ministry?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes. I thank the member opposite for the question. The proposed amendment deals with the following issues. Development levies to give municipalities authority to levy development charges for cost recovery on infrastructure expansion. There are minor variances to provide municipalities with minor variance authority in zoning by-laws. They are providing flexibility and administration.

There are some administration fees . . . will provide more authority for municipalities on establishing fees for administration of zoning by-laws and subdivisions. There are architectural control amendments here that municipalities will be able to use zoning to control the architectural details of buildings.

And under the amendment for the development of appeals board notice . . . to permit the board to use ordinary mail for serving public notice instead of registered or personal service. And under the amendment for a demolition of control districts, this will enable municipalities to control demolition of residential property as a means of maintaining housing.

And under the amendment for development caveats, this is to clarify and standardize caveats used during the subdivision of hazard land. The registration of a caveat on the property's title can now be challenged in the court. This will apply equally to people who are rural or urban. And I'm not sure — was there another part of that question I may have missed?

Mr. Goohsen: — You covered most of it, Madam Minister. But just to follow up on that, who did you consult with, and did they agree with the process?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes, thank you. There was lengthy consultation. The amendments that I read off were specifically requested by the city of Regina, the city of Weyburn, the city of Saskatoon, and the provincial planning directors, and SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) through their resolutions in the last three, four years.

Also in April of this year, we had consultations with SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) regarding this, as well as SUMA. We had meetings in April of last year with the Saskatchewan Construction Association and the Saskatchewan Home Builders' Association as well as the municipal planning directors.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister. I appreciate your candour in this Bill. I want to simply say that I hope that you will commit yourself to explaining the contents of the Bill to the people that are involved and to provide them with whatever information and materials that they will need to be able to facilitate the following of the rules that are set out. And I'm sure that you will do that and I'm sure your officials will.

And while I'm on my feet, I'll thank you and I'll thank your official for attending today.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I would like to, while I'm on my feet, thank the members opposite and assure them that we have seminars that we'll be holding around the province for municipal administrators and elected officials to explain the changes in this Act.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Uniform Building and Accessibility Standards Act and to make Related Amendments to Certain Other Acts

Clause 1

The Chair: — Would the minister please introduce her officials?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to my right Margaret Miller; she's the chief building official of building standards of the Department of

Municipal Government.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, the way that we handled the last Bill worked so well after we got everything straightened out as to who was answering what questions and what Bill we were on, that I'm going to try to approach this Bill in the same way so that we can facilitate our time in a better way.

So my question to begin with will be a general question allowing you to outline to the people and this Assembly who this Bill affects, how it affects them, and in what ways these changes are going to change the world that it's intended to change; what will people expect to have happen as a result of this Bill; who did you consult with; did they agree to the consultations; and all of those kind of general approaches to begin with.

(1645)

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, I think there are about four questions in that. Who it affects? There's no visible effect to the public by this Bill. What it does though is affects mainly urban municipalities, and the changes will clarify the process for submission of a by-law for approval.

The changes also now change building . . . ask building officials, or may be licensed. And it clarifies the process to the appeals board. It streamlines the whole process. Mainly these are housekeeping amendments to allow the function of the building inspector to do his work more effectively and more efficiently.

And the people that we consulted with, there's a long list of them. It's a whole page of it. I can send it over to you or I can read them out. We maybe could just table this, Mr. Chairman, and they can take a look at the list.

Mr. Goohsen: — Just send it over, Madam Minister. That'll be just fine.

There is one thing that I want to make a point of here. As you say, it's a very length Bill of explanation. I think the explanations alone are 24 pages on this thing, although an awful lot of it is somewhat repetitious because it deals with the urban municipal Act and then it also deals with The Northern Municipalities Act and there's a couple of pages of explanation on each one.

So while it is quite long, I'm sure that as I've read through this, that you are correct in saying that for the most part it is housekeeping. However, some of it may make us as politicians, I feel, look a little silly because it goes here on 3(d), on the first page of the explanatory notes it refers to the fact that we're going to change the title of chief inspector, from an inspector to a chief inspector, if I read that right and I'm remembering right. I read this a while back.

To do those kind of changes it seems to me that we live in a world where suddenly someone thinks they need

an increase in pay so they have to have a more glorious or prestigious title. And so we change people's titles in order to facilitate making them either feel good about themselves or to justify giving them a bigger pay cheque, and in reality we haven't changed their role or their job one little bit. And it's been done for years and years.

So some of it seems, you know, to me that we're being very artificial in the way that we approach life. The job hasn't changed, yet we're changing the title.

And what happens is that everybody down the road has to start thinking about let's call this guy something else, and every time he's introduced somewhere he has to say no, I'm not the inspector any more; I'm the chief inspector. And it goes without saying that we've done changes like this with a lot of things through the years.

I'll use the Department of Natural Resources as an example. Many years ago the Department of Natural Resources had its name changed and DNR (Department of Natural Resources) as an abbreviation no longer applied. To this very day my neighbours and friends refer to the conservation officer and the people involved with that process as the DNR. And so by changing the names, you really just confuse the public. They stick with it anyway.

So I don't think this is quite as important a thing because I don't think most of us are ever going to meet the chief inspector anyhow. But the reality is that it's confusing and it seems like such an awful waste of paper and time to be doing these kind of things. And I hope we won't get into the habit of, you know, spending our time in this Assembly making those kind of legislative changes.

Now I simply want to go through this page by page, Madam Minister, as we wind this down. And I will thank you and your assistants right now while I'm on my feet, and we'll go through it page by page.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, we wouldn't change the Act just to change the name. I respect what the member opposite said, that it wouldn't be appropriate just to go through all the expense and all the work to change an Act to change a minor name. But there are many important amendments in this Act that do relate to the functioning of the municipality and the safety of buildings, and they are of extreme importance.

Simply put though, I will clarify for you why we chose to change the name from inspector to building official. An inspector can be hired by many other people, banks or commercial people. Building official specifically means that this is an official who is under the operation and control of the municipal government. So what it does, it differentiates between those officials who may work for other agencies and those that work for the municipal government. And that is why we chose to have a name change at this point in time.

I don't know if there are other questions or not.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One question for the minister. Throughout the whole Bill there's a number of fees being charged, and deposits. Will those fees and deposits be refundable?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, the deposit to the appeal board is refundable. The deposit that is required . . . can be required by the municipal government is, if that deposit is to be refundable, it's something left to the option of the municipal government to decide. They may and they may not, but the one that is applied to the appeal board is refundable.

The Chair: — This is a Bill with 31 clauses over 14 pages. Are the members agreed we proceed page by page? Is that agreed? Agreed.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Pages 1 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

The committee reported progress.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Wakamow Valley Authority Act

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move the Bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 4 — An Act respecting Local Improvements in Urban and Northern Municipalities and to Effect Certain Consequential Changes

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move the Bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 25 — An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move this Bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Emergency Planning Act

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 9 now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed

under its title.

**Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Planning and
Development Act, 1983**

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 5
now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its
title.

**Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Uniform Building and
Accessibility Standards Act and to make Related
Amendments to Certain Other Acts**

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 8
now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its
title.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.