

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills

Clerk: — Mr. Thompson, as chair of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills, presents the fourth report of the said committee which is as follows:

Your committee has considered the following Bills and has agreed to report the same without amendment:

Bill No. 01 — An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Aldersgate College

Bill No. 02 — An Act to incorporate the Bethany Bible Institute and to amend An Act to incorporate Mennonite Brethren Church of Saskatchewan

Your committee recommends, under the provision of rule 61, that fees be remitted less the cost of printing with respect to Bill Nos. 01 and 02.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Wilkie:

That the second report of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you, I'd like to introduce you to a group of students from Westberry Elementary School in Kindersley. They're seated in the east gallery. They're 43 grade 7 students, and they are accompanied by their teacher, Candace Friesen and Doug Klassen as well as Mr. Krahn.

I will be meeting, Mr. Speaker, with them after the proceedings this afternoon to visit with them for a little while. So would all members of the legislature please join with me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to other members of the Assembly a group seated in your gallery, a group of 16 United Kingdom exchange participants and their 13 Saskatchewan hosts.

The United Kingdom visitors are participants in the Commonwealth Council on Education Administration Study Exchange and are returning a

visit made earlier to the U.K. by education administrators from Saskatchewan. They have spent the past week visiting schools, comparing administrative and teaching practises, and reviewing legal and financial frameworks for the administration of education.

I'll be meeting with our visitors following question period and ask all members of the Assembly to join me in welcoming them to our legislature today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The opposition would like to join with the Minister of Education in welcoming the guests from the United Kingdom. We hope that they have a fruitful visit here and enjoy Saskatchewan's hospitality. Welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seated in the west gallery are 55 students from Vincent Massey School in my riding in Saskatoon, and they're accompanied by their teachers, Tad Cherkewich and Morris Sulatyski, and some parent volunteers. They've seen some of the sights in Regina and will be touring this building. I'll be meeting with them, and I'd like all members to join with me in welcoming the students from Vincent Massey to the legislature today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have guests in the east gallery today, Mr. Speaker. They are my family, and I want to introduce them.

My father had nine brothers and two sisters. Of those nine, two of them were twins, and they are today seated in your gallery. They're both 71 years old, and they are Edgar and Ruth Martens, and the other brother is Art and Leona Martens. I want to have the Assembly acknowledge that. And there were three pastors in that family, too, Mr. Speaker. My father was one, and these two men are also a part of that elite group. And I want to say to the Assembly that I'm proud of these men and proud of what they've done for Saskatchewan.

My Uncle Art is from Surrey, British Columbia, and my Uncle Ed is from Regina. I don't think . . . just on a partisan nature, he lives in the north-west part of Regina, and I don't think he voted NDP (New Democratic Party) either.

I'd like to have the Assembly join me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join with the member from Morse in welcoming his uncle, Mr. Martens, who lives in the north-west part of the city of Regina. I'm very pleased to see him here visiting and I look forward to someday perhaps having

a long chat with him about future considerations.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll be especially good; I feel like I have holiness looking on over my shoulder here today.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the rest of the members of the Assembly on behalf of the hon. member from Rosetown-Elrose, seated in your west gallery, Mr. Speaker, 30 grade 8 students from Rosetown Central High. I'm not sure in what part of the gallery they're seated, but I know they're over there.

And also with them are their teachers, Elwood Fleming and Mr. Wayne Bright, and also their bus driver, Mr. Dennis McGonigal. I'll be meeting with them later for discussions and questions I'm sure that will arise as a result of the presentations here today and also for a photo later.

So if you'll join with me in welcoming them, I'd be pleased. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Firing and Rehiring of Government Official

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I direct my first question this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Mr. Premier, can you confirm that as part of your government's political house cleaning an individual by the name of Ian Laidlaw was fired from SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) without cause. And can you also confirm that as a result of this dismissal, the government was forced to pay \$110,000 in severance to Mr. Laidlaw. Can you confirm that, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I can confirm for the member that Mr. Laidlaw is no longer with Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. I will attempt to get the details of his departure from the corporation and will send them over to the member opposite when I have the details.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — In addition — Mr. Speaker, thank you — again to the Premier or his . . . their election, I guess, of answering the question to the SPMC minister then.

Mr. Minister, \$110,000 severance pay to Mr. Laidlaw, you will confirm that. And also at the same time, Mr. Minister, will you commit to giving me the answer: how much are you currently paying Mr. Laidlaw?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, the member knows I have taken notice of the question. And when I have the details, I will forward the details of his question to him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the Premier. Mr. Premier, can you confirm that Ian Laidlaw, after being fired by your government and receiving \$110,000 severance package, is now working in the Premier's office in the policy and planning secretariat? Can you confirm that, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of that question.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, we have a strange turn of events where the minister responsible for SPMC is now answering for the Premier and the Premier's secretariat. I was not asking for that. I was asking the Premier's office. The Premier is in charge of the policy and planning secretariat. Is this gentleman now working for you, Mr. Premier, was the question.

After having been given \$110,000 severance package, fired without cause, and then you rehire him after you've put in \$110,000 into his jeans. Now I have no problem with Mr. Laidlaw. I want to know why are you spending an extra \$110,000 of taxpayers' money just like you did for the Deputy Premier when you gave him \$800,000 in order to do your political running of the election coming up, Mr. Premier, wasting money.

And at the same time the Minister of Health is closing hospitals.

We want an answer to that question, Mr. Premier. And I want your commitment that we will be getting full information and confirmation of the facts the way they stand. Will you make that commitment, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated to the member opposite, I am not aware of the details of Mr. Laidlaw's departure from Property Management Corporation nor the separation pay that may have happened.

I have taken notice of the question and we will forward the appropriate information to the member I would assume later this day or tomorrow.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Purchase of Video Lottery Terminals

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for gaming. Mr. Minister, can you tell this Assembly if the position of communications officer for the Gaming Commission was open to the

public? And can you tell us when the position was advertised and how many applications were received for the position please?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I can answer that by saying that I am aware that there was an internal review within government of people who would be qualified for this position. Mr. Nystuen, after his internal review, chose this particular person to put under his employment.

I would want to say to the member from Morse that I am aware that Mr. Nystuen is very satisfied with the choice he has made and I happen to agree that he has, after the internal review, made the right choice.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister. Why are you trying to load up the Gaming Commission with NDP supporters? First it was the chief NDP fund-raiser appointed to the chief position at the Gaming Commission. Now the chief communications position is given to another NDP supporter.

The commission is supposed to be an independent, impartial commission, and that's not what it appears to be, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, I ask you, for what purpose are you stacking the Gaming Commission with loyal party supporters? Could you tell us that, please?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to the member's question. I'd like to respond with respect to Mr. Nystuen in the first place, in the first. I believe that he is a very appropriate choice in that, as you will know, we are going through a consolidation process with the Gaming Commission and the Liquor Licensing Commission. Mr. Nystuen has worked on the reorganization of government for many months; and for that, amongst other reasons, I felt he was a very qualified choice.

I want to say as well to the member from Morse that the Gaming Commission has many employees, many good employees who are qualified and who are serving the government in their capacities as employees of the Gaming Commission. And I want to say as well to the member for Morse that I have no idea of the political affiliations that the majority of those employees have. But I want to say this: in 1991, Mr. Member from Morse, 50 per cent of the people of this province voted New Democrat, so I think it would only stand to reason that there would be a few New Democrats . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Next question.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister . . . Mr. Speaker, Mr.

Minister, it's my belief that you've been stacking this commission with partisans for very, very specific reasons. For several months we have been trying to get your government to come clean on this issue, Mr. Minister. We've seen a lot of smoke, but so far we have been successful . . . you have been successful in concealing the flames.

Today, Mr. Minister, we have been afforded a peek at that fire by an anonymous source, and I ask these questions — will you note very carefully how you answer them. Mr. Minister, is it not true that the former minister of Gaming, the Minister of Finance, ordered a security check for GTECH and VLT (Video Lottery Technologies Inc.) before they were selected? Would you provide that answer for us this afternoon, please?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say, and I want to begin by saying that I think the member has got a scratch in his record, and the needle is skipping. We've gone through his question time after time after time. He knows full well that there has been a security check done on these companies; he knows that. I've answered that in the legislature many, many times.

And I want to say to the member from Morse the answer is the same as I have offered it many times in this legislature. The answer is the same today, and it will be the same tomorrow. There have been in-depth security checks done, and the information received at that time was what we chose to base our decision on. The answer hasn't changed, and I say to the member from Morse, the answer won't change. So why don't you get off of this . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, is it not true that the former minister of gaming, the current Minister of Finance, ordered the security check after GTECH and VLT were assigned that they were going to get the contract? Isn't that the truth?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is very simple and very straightforward and the answer is no.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, it is obvious to everyone but you that security checks should have been completed before these companies were selected, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, would you provide us with this, with this . . . Mr. Minister, you have said that you have not read the report — an appalling admission of irresponsibility, Mr. Minister. I'm sure you don't want to read it because we have been told that there is very

little in that report, Mr. Minister. We have been told that you couldn't get any cooperation from other jurisdictions to provide a security check for those two companies.

Mr. Minister, if not you, who in your cabinet took the responsibility to read that report? Did the Minister of Finance read the report? Please answer that question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to correct the member on a number of issues. First of all I want to say that the report is the property of the Gaming Commission. He knows that that is a quasi-judicial body and is remaining in that fashion, and that's how we treat it.

And I want to say that he might want to make a phone call to his cousins in Alberta and ask them if in fact they have shared information that they have with respect to procurement of VLTs (video lottery terminal). These companies they are dealing with as well. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, just in closing, that this is a broken record.

And I want to just read into the record a letter, an open letter to the member from Morse, the Hon. Harold Martens, with respect to his performance in this legislature and as a member of the legislature. And I'm just going to quote the last paragraph. And it says:

I'm disappointed to see an elected member of our government (misrepresent) information (and for what purpose?). Shouldn't you, Mr. Martens, be encouraging all citizens to work together to alleviate the financial conditions of our province, rather than, through misinformation, incite citizens to be at each other's throats?.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, I wish the member who's responsible for the Gaming Commission would have read with the same diligence the report that was issued. And in fact it's our information that we have that the report in fact did this. I ask you this question, Mr. Minister: can you confirm that the report recommended that GTECH should not be dealt with? Did that report indicate that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, let me say this again to the member from Morse. The report that we got indicated that these were the two people short-listed after the security check, the in-depth security check was done, and that's the information that was passed on to me.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we followed that procedure. We believe that it was a similar procedure to what your cousins in Alberta used who are dealing with these companies.

So I ask you, Mr. Member, if you're so concerned about process and if you're so concerned about these corporations, maybe you should phone your cousins in Alberta and ask them what kind of information they received and what they passed on to their minister when he made the decision to start dealing with them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, I'd like to know whether you read the report, whether you could provide that information to this Assembly. But also can you tell this Assembly whether any Saskatchewan Gaming Commission officials had an opportunity to attend a meeting held in Reno, Nevada, in the past two weeks? Would you tell us that please?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I can say that members of the Gaming Commission were in the United States on a trip and met with officials and with people involved in the industry down there. I can confirm that, yes I can, Mr. Member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, did members from the economic branch of the Department of Economic Development, through the member from Regina Elphinstone, did they go down to that same meeting — would you tell us that — in Reno?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Minister, it is my belief that someone from the Department of Economic Development was as well at that meeting. But I can't confirm the name. I don't know that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — And now, Mr. Speaker, would the minister confirm that also at that meeting were VLC (Video Lottery Consultants) people from the company supplying video lottery terminals to the province of Saskatchewan? Were they also at that same meeting? Would you confirm that, please.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that because I don't believe that to be the case. As I indicated, they were there to meet with government officials and with people involved in the industry, but I cannot confirm that they had met with people from VLC.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Minister, would you also confirm that the Gaming Commission were involved in a conference in Whitefish, Montana, at a gaming commission dealing with video lottery terminals? Will you confirm that also?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly can confirm that. They, as part of their responsibility, would want to know the goings-on of the industry. And in order to do that, I think it's important that they meet with other people involved and knowledgeable in the industry. And I think it's most appropriate that they took a van and away they went down and had this meeting.

And I want to say that I commend the member. He has been very diligent in terms of following the calendars and the itineraries of the employees of the Gaming Commission, and I certainly commend him for being on top of these things.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister. What was the purpose of the meeting in Reno, Nevada? Was it to discuss the video lottery terminals that VLC was going to provide? And after that, when you came home and discovered that they had been involved in charges being laid by the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation), were you aware of that at the time? And is that why you sent them down there, to check that out? Were you aware that they were being brought before the U.S. (United States) courts by the Federal Bureau of Investigation? Were you aware of it at the time that you sent your people down to Reno? Were you aware of that, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member has got a very, very vivid imagination and I commend him for that as well. I want to say that he knows full well that we are intending to open casinos in this province in partnership with aboriginal people and with exhibition associations. And I think to do that, Mr. Member, it's probably appropriate that they talk with other officials involved in gaming, and that they look at other operations that are functioning throughout this province.

I want to say that the purpose of the trip to Reno was to have a look at casinos, and I think that's very important. I want to say what's more, I may as a matter of fact just offer to the member to inform him prior to the departure on any other trips that they may make, the times that they're going, the places that they're going, and the number of people that there were going, so that he can be more satisfied that we are in fact doing our job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Job Creation Strategies

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in the press release of November 3, 1992, with respect to the Partnership for Renewal document that was unveiled that day, it was stated and I quote:

... the document lists 23 objectives and 31 strategies, each with a target date for action.

Could you tell us, sir, how many of those target dates have passed and how many of the objectives have been met to date, and I'm looking for specific numbers of jobs and measurable increases in economic activity in the province, because I've already read your April glossy progress report, and its ambiguity equals that of the original document.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for that question. The answer is that PACE, the Provincial Action Committee on the Economy, has as one of its mandates, the task of monitoring the timetables and the objectives set out in the partnership paper.

When you say your glossy, it's a glossy which is based on the monitoring by PACE, and on the Department of Economic Development. If the numbers are insufficiently clear or there's some additional information which is required, I will ask the Minister of Economic Development as a consequence of your question to dig up the additional information and provide it in due course.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, it's become obvious that the results reported from the undertakings to date appear to be simply no more than consultations, more studies, more policy, and more expenditures for the bureaucracy. But certainly no new jobs for the private sector.

And I ask again, what new jobs have been created as a direct result of your economic strategy? And will you publish a list of those jobs, along with your explicit targets for job creation for the remainder of the year?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the targets for the remainder of the year, I cannot answer this specifically. I don't know what the Minister of Economic Development has in mind.

But I would remind the hon. member that what we have here is a blueprint which requires diligent pursuit by the business community working in concert with the trade union community, and others, over a period of time in pursuit of jobs. We've had some successes, some such as Sears as an example. We've had a number of successes in smaller operations right across the province of Saskatchewan. I don't have the list in front of me. SED Systems is another one which the member will be aware of. There are some fairly good examples of job creation.

How much of this is exactly due to the blueprint, how much of this is due to other circumstances, I don't know. But I do say to the hon. member that what is important is that the blueprint, which I think she endorsed herself, be followed diligently and those objectives and timetables be pursued diligently and met as best as possible.

That's what the minister is trying to do, that's what the government is trying to do, and that's what PACE is

trying to do in its assisting of us and in its monitoring of our objectives.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, there have been several occasions now when your government has taken credit for projects with which it has had nothing to do. And while that's going on, there are 44,000 people in our province, many of whom are just graduating from our universities and post-secondary institutions, who are waiting for very specific parts of your job creation strategy that's going to put them to work.

Now this is important not only to them, but to you as government, as your revenue predictions for this year's budget are contingent upon an increase of 16,000 jobs in the economy. Now again I ask, how do you intend to deliver on this strategy to meet your targets and to stop the horrendous outflow of talent from this province?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would again invite the hon. member to assist the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I think she is quoted as saying that she has and will have an idea a week about the provision of new jobs; she said this several weeks ago. So we are still awaiting for the idea. And I would invite you to submit — you don't have to do it in any public statement — a letter, however you want. Put it to PACE. We look forward to your ideas a week and I'm sure there'll be 52 new ones by the time the end of the year is over.

But the other aspect of the question is, how do we intend to pursue it? Well there is no way of pursuing it other than the way that we have been pursuing it. You roll up your sleeves; you've identified the blueprint in the partnership program; you go after the businesses and try to encourage them to get on with the job.

And we have successes, whether it's Spar, whether it's the Hitachi expansion, Norquay Alfalfa Processors, Babcock & Wilcox, AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) — you are a supporter of that — Sears Canada, Hudson Bay Mining, TRIS, Mercury Graphics. I've been invited to an opening of Mercury Graphics. And the list goes on.

Now the member may say that's not enough. I agree with her. It's not enough; there needs to be more. But there is progress. And this is a very hard job and what it requires is the support of all of us and we look forward to your idea each and every week.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect, Mr. Premier, your government wouldn't know a good idea if it were handed one — and several have been — to it. In the same release, Mr. Premier, it was indicated that you would be, and I quote: "... (reviewing) taxation to ensure productive investment is encouraged ..."

Can you tell us which of your taxation measures you anticipated would ensure this "productive investment." Would it be the increased tax on ethanol, the increased tax on retail sales, or perhaps the decision not to reduce the tax on the locomotive fuel tax to a competitive level which ended up costing this province 300 jobs at the CP (Canadian Pacific) rail centre in Moose Jaw?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I again welcome the question from the hon. member. She invites me to indicate what taxes are an incentive to business, and I will say that we have offered \$31 million in this one year in tax incentives: the tax investment credit; the reduction of the small business tax corporation rate; the input factors with respect to the sales component on manufacturing, and a number of other incentives which are listed in the budget. We have given \$31 million by way of those incentives, which the hon. member conveniently of course ignores and gives us no credit for. I guess she's entitled to do that.

Instead she indicates the tax increases which had to be put on by virtue of the huge debt which her friends to the right of her have burdened this province.

But she can't have it both ways. She can't say that we should tackle the deficit but not increase taxes and not cut back in programs. Because if that isn't a prescription for voodoo Liberal economics, I don't know what is.

So while we may not see a good idea if it hits us in the face, try us — try us with one idea on a good economic project. And you might begin by trying us and the people of Saskatchewan with just one good, logical, consistent, economic policy from the Liberal Party — just one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, I think one of the things that perhaps you need reminding of is you indeed are the government and you indeed are in charge of economic development for this province, and I am not. Although that may be reversed far sooner than you would care to imagine.

Mr. Premier, on page 19 of the partnership document, you commit, and I quote, to: "Provide new sources of business start-up and expansion capital" for the province by developing "a new provincial economic development institution."

I would like you to update us, please, Mr. Premier, on what progress has been made. Have detailed plans for an economic development bank been presented to the business community? And when can small business expect to have access to this new source of funding?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the specific question of the economic development bank is very much under consideration by the government. I must

tell the hon. member that it is not as easy a concept, although I think it has a lot of merit, in structuring as perhaps she would think or perhaps even as I would have thought initially.

We are, as part of this package however, encumbered by the fact that in the 1980s SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), which has been the bank of last resort in this context for small business, has been virtually brought to the edge of bankruptcy as a result of a variety of deals made by the Conservative opposition, whether it's GigaText or the various other deals — the let's-make-a-deal mentality that took place.

So we have to look at this very carefully to make sure that what we provide to the business community is doable; that it is based on sound economics and good fiscal policy. And that is one area where, in the pursuit of the timetable, we may or may not be exactly on. But it requires careful examination. So we are in favour of this.

In the meantime, SEDCO is available. In the meantime SEDCO, we hope, will be providing business opportunities on a more economic basis.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Neudorf: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as you will recall, we entered into some consideration into conditions which the Speaker would consider points of order. At that time in interest of decorum within this Assembly, I deferred and said I would bring it up at a later date, and I'm doing exactly that now, Mr. Speaker.

The point of order relates to the Speaker's refusal to hear points of order after two have been made. And Mr. Speaker indicated that he had heard two points of order and that he felt that one was not well taken, and therefore you stated, sir, that it was a matter of judgement call whether or not further points would be heard.

Mr. Speaker also made a statement that was particularly disturbing and I will quote yesterday's *Hansard*, page 1638:

I did take two points of order from the member, one which I felt was not a valid point of order. And I have listened to the member in the past raising points of order which, on a number of times, were not valid points of order. And I felt that the member had raised his point of order . . .

And there are several things in the words that I would suggest are contrary to the rules and practices of the Assembly.

Firstly, the record clearly shows that the point of order I was seeking to raise had not in fact been raised. So a

feeling by the Speaker that the point had been raised is an unreliable basis upon which to determine whether or not to hear a point.

Secondly, the reference to the fact that I have raised points of order in the past, some of which you have not found well taken, is at best a mysterious comment. The central issue however and the critical issue for every member and the integrity of the Assembly is the right of a member to raise points of order and the substance of the rules of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it has been consistently ruled that a Speaker may not prejudge a point of order. And even in those extremes where points are being raised for dilatory purposes, the Speaker must first hear the point so that he may determine whether or not the point is in fact dilatory.

Now I haven't gone back to get the exact references, sir, but I invite you to check your own previous rulings on similar issues. And if memory does serve me correctly, you will find that you have ruled that you are obliged to hear a point before you can know whether it is dilatory, whether it is well taken, or whether it is argumentative. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, that is the existing practice in every Assembly in Canada.

Now in the interests of time, Mr. Speaker, I will not cite the extensive references. But in general we can review the various filibusters in this Assembly, the GST (goods and services tax) debate in the House of Commons, the free trade debate in the House of Commons, and various similar debates in other legislatures. In all cases that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker, Speakers have consistently ruled that they are bound to hear a point of order. To have it otherwise, prejudices what a member has to say.

In your remarks yesterday, sir, you made reference to the fact that I had already raised two points of order and other points of order in the past, and that you thought some of them not well taken. I submit that you thereby clearly prejudged my point, which as circumstances proved, was an inaccurate prejudgement.

The second part of your explanation for refusing to hear my point was that the House was in a state of disorder and not amenable to hearing points of order. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the rules are clear on what course of action the Chair is to follow when in its judgement there is a grave disorder in the House. The Chair is not to bend or amend or reinterpret the rules in the case of disorder. Rather the rules and practices clearly state that if in the Speaker's judgement the disorder is sufficient to cause concern, the Speaker may, and I quote, "adjourn the House."

My complete point of order, then is this — just a couple of short points — (1) there is no provision for a Speaker to use a judgement call to determine whether or not he will hear a point of order; (2) a point of order must be heard by the Speaker who only then may dismiss it, and if the Speaker finds a member is

persistently challenging the Chair, the Speaker has clear avenues of discipline available to him, none of which include refusing to hear a point of order.

If the Speaker finds the disorder in the House to be extreme, the avenue open to him is to adjourn the House for grave disorder, and refusing to hear a point of order is not in fact an open . . . an avenue open to him.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that while the Speaker does have a wide latitude in some matters, you have recently ruled that discretion only extends to situations where rules and practices themselves are not clear. And on that I refer you to your own ruling of April 14, 1993 which in part said the Speaker can only intervene "in circumstances where the rules do not exist or did not apply."

And that is not the case in this instance. And, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to rule accordingly. Thank you for the time.

The Speaker: — Is the Acting House Leader, is he wanting to speak to the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Well I'd like to speak just briefly to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if you would, or unless you're . . .

The Speaker: — The member may proceed.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I have some appreciation for the member's point of order. But viewing what happened in the House yesterday, the House was getting a little unruly and I think that the Hon. House Leader opposite uses his case to the extreme in making his point of order with you today.

The House not only operates, as you'd well know, Mr. Speaker, on the rules of the Assembly, it also operates by the precedents and the rules set down in Erskine May and Beauchesne's. And over the years, over the years there are circumstances where Speakers not only in this Assembly but in the British House of Commons and the Parliament of Canada have made rulings that differ somewhat from the tradition. The tradition is also a very important part of how we set the practices of this House.

And although the Hon. House Leader of the opposition points out that you had the ultimate authority to adjourn the Assembly, I think that would be a truly unusual circumstance. And we viewed it on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that you're making every attempt to conduct the good business of this Assembly rather than make the decision to adjourn the House.

And so I think, although I have some appreciation for what the member opposite says, I think he's taking his case to the extreme and we should get on with the business of the House today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — First of all I want to thank the member from Rosthern for his point of order. It was a very lengthy point of order and I'm not critical of that at this particular time, but I do want to have a look at his point of order, and I thank the Acting House Leader for his comments. And I will bring a decision back to the House at a later time.

An Hon. Member: — And I know you will do a good job.

The Speaker: — Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 72 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.

Mr. Speaker, The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act applies to all public sector pension plans. The major reason for amending the legislation at this time is to provide an additional qualification for the restricted retirement option. Employees of government departments and the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation whose positions are abolished and whose age plus years of service are greater to or equal to 80 now qualify for the restricted retirement option. This is in addition to the existing provision of age plus years of service greater to or equal to 75 with age greater than 55 years.

(1445)

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I just would like to comment that I think the Bill is straightforward, and we don't have a lot of problems with it. But it would be appropriate to at least review it before we move further, and so I move adjournment of debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks, I'll move second reading of Bill No. 73, an amendment to The Crop Insurance Act.

I rise in the House today to describe the changes to The Crop Insurance Act. These changes, Mr. Speaker, are in keeping with the government's goal to reduce spending, to ultimately reduce this province's deficit

through improved efficiencies. Mr. Speaker, the existing legislation requires the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance board to consist of not less than six nor more than eight persons with a minimum of four members to constitute a quorum. The Saskatchewan Crop Insurance board was one of the several boards restructured or eliminated as part of the March 1993 budgetary reduction process.

The proposed amendments to the Act will provide flexibility in the provision of a board for the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, those proposed amendments will mean that the board will consist of those persons appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council with two members constituting a quorum. By amending the Act to allow the board of directors of Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation to operate with a quorum of two members, government spending will be reduced without sacrificing producers' opportunities to have input into crop insurance programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of this House to support the amendments to the Act, and I move second reading of Bill No. 73 amending The Crop Insurance Act, 1993.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if I understand it correctly, I believe the minister has indicated that this Bill is going to reorganize or do away with the board or to make changes to the Crop Insurance board.

And I can certainly appreciate the move by the government to try and cut on funding. But at the time when agriculture is having significant problems, one would wonder why we would significantly look at changing the format for producers and at least their voice on the Crop Insurance . . . or involved in Crop Insurance.

But we would like to have a closer view of the Bill and review it a little closer as well before we move further, and therefore I move adjournment of debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 75 — An Act to amend The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise in the Assembly today to move second reading of The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Amendment Act, 1993.

The Act being amended establishes the authority of the imposition of a tax on non-Crown oil and gas production in the province. The amendments to the Act are being made to update the legislation and to achieve a greater consistency between the fiscal rules applicable to Crown and freehold oil and gas production.

Mr. Speaker, the investigation powers of the minister under the Act are being amended to avoid any

violation of the search and seizure provisions of the Charter. The investigation powers currently defined are considered too broad as they purport to allow the minister to, I quote:

At any time . . . enter upon any premises for the purposes of making enquiries . . .

Such provisions could arguably exceed a person's reasonable expectations of privacy. Accordingly, the scope of these provisions has been narrowed.

Furthermore, a new appeal section is being added to the Act, Mr. Speaker, to provide greater consistency with the provisions of The Crown Minerals Act. Under the new appeal section, a taxpayer will be able to appeal certain determinations made by the minister to the Board of Revenue Commissioners. The appeals to be allowed will be limited to those determinations which may apply to a specific taxpayer.

For example, a taxpayer could appeal a determination involving the expenditures to be allowed in calculating the tax applicable to a specific enhanced oil recovery project. However a taxpayer would not be able to appeal the general tax rate which is to apply to all freehold enhanced recovery oil produced within the province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, variations . . . various regulations-making powers are being added to the Act to clarify and strengthen the province's authority to tax freehold oil and gas production. Among other things, these new provisions will allow regulations to be made that prescribe formulas, determine tax rates and amounts of tax, authorizing average prices used in tax formulas to be set by minister's order, and prescribing the manner in which certain notifications are made, and providing for the determination of prices to be used in calculating taxes payable.

I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have consulted with the industry associations on the specific amendments being proposed. As a result of that consultative process, certain changes were made to accommodate concerns that were expressed. The industry associations are therefore in agreement with the Bill as it is presented here.

With those brief comments, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Amendment Act, 1993.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After listening to the minister, the minister made a number of comments regarding what the Bill was attempting to do. And it would seem to me that it would be appropriate for the opposition to take a little more time to peruse comments and review the Bill, and therefore I move adjournment of debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Oil and Gas

Conservation Act

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of The Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1993. This legislation ends the oil and gas revolving fund and associated well levy effective March 31, 1993.

The elimination of the oil and gas revolving fund is part of an ongoing government review of special funds to provide more complete disclosure of the province's revenues and expenditures. Under current legislation certain costs of regulating and providing services to the oil and natural gas industry, including the services of the Oil and Gas Conservation Board, were assigned to this fund.

Revenues to the fund come from two equal sources: one source was a contribution from the budget of the Department of Energy and Mines; the other source was the proceeds of a levy on each well operated by the oil and gas industry.

As with all such funds, the revenues and expenditures of the revolving fund were not subject to the scrutiny of the Legislative Assembly as they should be. With the elimination of the oil and gas revolving fund, the costs of all these services will be included in the budget of the Department of Energy and Mines, as was the case prior to 1991-92 when the fund was first introduced. The well levy fee was eliminated as part of a broader package of revenue initiatives in 1993-94 budget, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation also provides standard transitional provisions to wind up the revolving fund. The assets and liabilities of the fund as of March 31, 1993 will be transferred to the General Revenue Fund. Also after March 31, 1993, any further activity relating to the wind-up of the fund will occur in the General Revenue Fund.

The legislation also ensures that the financial statements for the year ending March 31, 1993 will be audited by the Provincial Auditor and tabled in the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, eliminating the oil and gas revolving fund will provide greater disclosure of revenue and expenditures to this Legislative Assembly. This initiative is in keeping with the recommendations of the Gass Commission to improve public accountability.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1993.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for just filling us in a little more on some of the details and the information regarding Bill No. 76. And the minister I believe indicated that it's a way of being more comfortable and more open and presenting the facts as they are

perceived in a more accountable way to the legislature through the Provincial Auditor.

There are a few other areas that I think we should review a little further before we move to Committee of the Whole, and therefore I move adjournment of debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Chair: — I will ask the Minister of Finance to introduce her official and make any comments she may like to make.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce Brian Smith who's executive director of the Public Employees Benefits Agency.

Clause 1

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, and Madam Minister, would you be able to just give me an overview of the purpose of the Bill and deal with that. I think we'll move fairly quickly if you explain what it is. I believe it's to do with the retirement packages for police officers and firemen and that sort of thing. So if you'd identify that, we'd like to hear that.

(1500)

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, yes I'd be pleased to do that. The municipal employees' superannuation plan provides pension benefits to municipal employees, to school board employees and designated police officers and fire-fighters. One thousand employers and 7,500 employees participate in the plan. There's a commission, a nine-member commission, representing major employers and interest groups, and they oversee the plan's operation.

The reason for amending The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act is basically for housekeeping purposes. The amendments will ensure consistent application of the pension plan rules to all members of the plan.

I think what's key is that the commission that oversees the plan has reviewed and approved of these amendments. These changes will not result in any additional costs to the plan.

Mr. Martens: — Madam Minister, on the 7,000 that are in the plan — so I understand it accurately — they're not presently receiving benefits. Those are the people who are . . . total who are under the plan. Is that correct?

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, that's correct. They're the contributors to the plan.

Mr. Martens: — The thousand different agencies across the province who are a part of the employers, do they provide the same amount of benefit to the plan as the employee provides to the plan? Do they equal or match the contribution that is made by the employee?

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, yes, the contributions are equal.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

The Chair: — I would simply ask then that the minister thank the official for his assistance with the committee's consideration.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the official and I'd like to thank the opposition for moving the Bill through quickly.

Bill No. 35 — An Act to amend The Certified Nursing Assistants Act

The Chair: — I'll ask the Associate Minister of Health to introduce his official.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to have with me this afternoon Lorraine Hill who is the senior associate deputy minister of the Department of Health. We may be joined by one or two others through the course of the examination of the Bill.

Clause 1

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's been a long time since I've been called that, but I appreciate that.

Mr. Minister, the Act that we have before us is the Act to amend The Certified Nursing Assistants Act which involved essentially changing the name of the health professionals known as the certified nursing assistants to licensed practical nurses.

And in your opening comments on the second reading, you said that you felt that this would better reflect their present role in the health system as such. And I'm going to give you an opportunity now to explain to this committee exactly how you envision that happening. Could you enlighten us, please?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think as the member will know, the professionals we have up until now called CNAs or certified nursing assistants, over the years have seen some evolution and change in the role they play in our health care system. And I think it's accurate to say that that role has been expanding. There has been some expansion, for instance, in the provisions that have allowed CNAs to be sharing in the dispensation of medicines and so on.

I want to remind the member also that the CNAs, or now as a result of this legislation, the licensed practical nurses — LPNs, will still continue to work under the direction of registered nurses or psych nurses and physicians.

It's also I think important to note that what we're doing here brings the profession in Saskatchewan into line consistent with now the provinces of B.C. (British Columbia), Alberta, Manitoba, and Ontario. And I understand the name change is also being pursued in the Maritimes.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, for that explanation. Further on in the legislation and so on, it becomes obvious that there is going to be a fairly lengthy period of time allowed for this change-over — as long as three years, as I understand it.

Do you feel that there is going to be any kind of confusion, misunderstanding — who's an LPN, who's a CNA, and it goes on and on. What impact do you foresee this having not only with the nurses themselves and perhaps even doctors, but the general hospital population as such, with this change-over and the long period of time that you're going to take to implement that?

Could you delve into that issue?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — I think that's a good question, Mr. Member. It is important, because it's been a long-standing title, the CNA title. And it will take some time, I think, in both the professional community and in the public mind to understand the name change. The three years given to effect the name change, during this period of time the professionals under question here — CNAs or LPNs — will be able to use either term, and their association, their professional association, has planned and will conduct a thorough program of education and public education so that over the course of the three years we can become used to the new title.

Mr. Neudorf: — I don't know. I can't suggest a better way of doing it, but all I'm suggesting to you is that with the possibility of being called a CNA or an LPN, and both synonymous at the same time, I just submit to you that that is going to create a certain amount of confusion and perhaps in sometimes in the eyes of the patient, him or herself, who doesn't quite know what calibre of treatment that they are getting.

I have two further series of questions, I guess, and that is that while this name change was being contemplated, who did you consult with and what was the reaction from particularly the interested groups on this?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — In the course of the preparation of this legislation — and I know this discussion has gone on not just very recently, but for some time — understandably the certified nursing assistants' association were certainly consulted and discussed with, and of course are fully supportive of the change. Other professional associations that have been

involved in the discussions would include the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses — SUN, SRNA (Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association), the professional association representing nurses, the psych nurses, and the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

I know from my own discussions with the SRNA and SUN there was some concern about the use of the title "nurse", so that there could be some confusion. And so it is clear I think in the legislation and in intention of the application of the legislation that the title be licensed practical nurse and that it will always be described as a licensed practical nurse. So it is clear that this is another area of health care professionals separate and apart from those we now commonly describe as nurses.

Mr. Neudorf: — Yes, Mr. Minister, I was aware that there was some concern from SUN and SRNA and the registered nurses. What is their impression of it now? You said that they had some concern, that you switched it over so that it would be very evident that they are licensed practical nurses. So what I'm asking you is: what is their position today?

The Chair: — If I can just add to the question of the critic from the opposition, if the minister would also, while he is answering, introduce the official who joined him as well.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I apologize for not introducing my other official who has joined us since the proceedings began. To my left is Mr. Drew Johnston who is a senior analyst with health planning and policy development from the Department of Health.

I think to be fair, point number one, the other organizations I believe are aware that this legislation is before the House. There's no sense that they're being surprised here. I think to be fair, there may still be some concern, particularly over the use of the title "nurse." We believe we have addressed that with the insistence that the title be "licensed practical nurse."

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, and welcome to Mr. Johnston as well. I don't want you to interpret my next question as being facetious or flippant, but I will ask you this in all sincerity. Are we on a trend here, or is this a one-shot deal? In other words, I guess how I could phrase this next question is: does this mean now that will registered nurses soon be asking for a name change, let's say, to licensed practical doctors?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — No. The answer I think shortly put is no. There's been no suggestion of any other professional name change made by any other group of health care professionals, that I'm aware of. So I don't think we need to be concerned that somehow the now registered nurses would be coming forward asking for a licensed practical physician, or anything like that.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(1515)

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Registered Nurses Act, 1988

Clause 1

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, could you confirm for me that my interpretation of what this Act intends to do is correct, and that is that it will allow the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association, the SRNA, who has had a member whose disciplinary action . . . the disciplinary committee has taken action in disciplining the member before it could take that to the Queen's Bench, but that was the end of it. So what this Bill will now do is allow that member then to appeal that decision. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, yes, it would allow either the member or the SRNA, both would have then the right of further appeal.

Mr. Neudorf: — And this appeal would only be justified on the basis and the facts of law?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — That is correct.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Minister, how does this relate to other professionals and other organizations? Is this going to be unique or is this something that is kind of standard throughout different professions?

I know that you may not know too much about, let's say, the STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation) or College of Physicians and Surgeons, but certainly you must have done some research along this line, whether it's compatible with existing other professions.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — It is a provision available in some professional legislation. The one I am familiar with, it is part of the professional legislation that governs physicians. I think also it's part of that which governs the profession of law. But I'm certain it's part of that which governs physicians.

It's not entirely . . . it's not in every professional piece of legislation, but at least for physicians it is there.

The Chair: — I will ask as well — the minister has been joined by another official — to have the official introduced to the committee.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, I'm now pleased to welcome Wilmer Berg who is here, who is director of vital stats and will be helping us out with The Vital Statistics Amendment Act.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wasn't aware that my questions were creating such a flurry in officialdom over there. But I don't think we

have too much of a problem with this, Mr. Minister. It's just that I want to understand thoroughly and completely what you're trying to accomplish.

So my understanding is that this was the major issue involved in this amending of this Act on the registered nurses. But there's another point as well. Could you clarify that one for me?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Yes. There is one small amendment within the Act. The current Act is actually in error. It defines . . . it uses the term "council" as describing the body that makes the decision on disciplinary matters, and it is actually the discipline committee that makes those decisions. So it's simply a small amendment to correct that error.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act

Clause 1

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister. My understanding of this Bill is that essentially what you're doing is removing the marital status of the newborn in terms of naming that newborn. Is that correct?

The way I understood it, before, parents had the option of either taking dad's last name; they had the option of taking mom's last name; they had the option of taking mom and dad's last name hyphenated. But that was about the extent of the options that were available.

Under this legislation, the way I understand it, mom and dad don't have to choose any of those names, but can choose whatever suits and fits their fancy. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I think the member's description of the Bill describes one part of the Bill. Another I think which is perhaps the most significant part of the Bill will now ensure that both parents — father and mother, whether married or unmarried — will have their particulars recorded in the birth information with vital statistics. That's not currently the case.

Mr. Neudorf: — Okay. I hadn't caught on to that one, Mr. Minister, and I thank you for that information.

In the case of a dispute, mom and dad and they can't decide, what happens under a situation like that?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — I thank the member for his question. It's a question I had not asked of the officials or of the Bill. And I'm glad he's brought the question forward.

The response and the indication that I have is that if

the parents are married and share the same surname, then that will become the name for the child. If there is a dispute, then the child would be given the hyphenated combination of the two surnames in alphabetical order.

Mr. Neudorf: — All right. I guess that's the wisdom of Solomon coming out there. So it seems fairly reasonable. What prompted, Mr. Minister, you to come forward with this type of an amendment? Was there a demand for it? And if so, by whom?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — In essence, Mr. Chairman, this Bill is in response to the Unified Law Conference of Canada, which is endeavouring to bring consistency to laws that exist in each and every provincial jurisdiction that we know will be shared by each and every provincial jurisdiction. And so the Act before us essentially reflects the recommendations of the Unified Law Conference of Canada.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Minister, has there been any change in the definition and how you handle stillbirth?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, this was . . . Yes, that is part of this Act and it was upon the recommendation of the College of Physicians and Surgeons that the definition of stillbirth has now been clarified and simplified on the recommendation of the college.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much. Regarding my limited knowledge on the topic, could you give me the simplified version of that and perhaps I could understand? Or is that what we find in the Act itself, the definition as is stated there?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — It is the definition which applies in the Act itself.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 62 — An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act, 1981

Clause 1

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act. Could you, for the benefit of the committee, explain why this amendment was brought forward. What are your major intentions in it?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Essentially, Mr. Chairman, the Act is intended now to clarify in legislation what is in fact the current practice of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and the college has encouraged this legislative change to take place.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman, could you give me then the reaction then of the SMA, the Saskatchewan

Medical Association, and your consultation with them.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, the two, I think, the two primary concerns that the SMA have raised is that the non-publication order in this Act is not by the Act extended to physicians. In this Act, Mr. Chair, we are endeavouring to provide . . . I'll just say that little bit again.

I think there are two concerns that the SMA have. One is in essence that the non-publication provision which is being legislated here is not extended to physicians. What we are doing in this Act is providing a protection, that would have to be achieved through a court, to prevent the publication of someone who may have raised a complaint or someone who may have served as a witness in the situation of a complaint. If the court allows, their names will not then be published. And we think this is important, particularly in the situation if it's sexual misconduct or harassment and that sort of thing. Now it's my understanding that in fact the physicians' names are not published as a part of the disciplinary process.

Now the second, I think, issue that the SMA is raising has to do with some of the costs that are set out here in the legislation. It has been somehow . . . more through legal precedent, I think, than anything else that some of these costs are now being assigned. And so we're simply recognizing that in the legislation.

(1530)

Mr. Neudorf: — You're right, Mr. Minister, that is a concern that the SMA has raised with us, particularly section 47.8(1) where it provides that in the case of disciplinary hearing:

. . . the identity of any person and any information that could disclose the identity of that person or persons shall not be published in any document or broadcast in any way.

Yet doctors do not receive the same treatment. And yet I understood you to say that the names of physicians are not published, and here's the concern being expressed by the SMA. Could you clarify that for me please?

Because the information that we're getting is that doctors feel that it is important to disclose the names of a doctor only if he is found guilty, because we know what the media can do with accusation and reports the name and details of the doctors that have been accused but have not been found guilty yet.

So in many instances, doctors are telling me that they have been found innocent later on, yet still they can lose their practices or their practices can certainly take a beating because of the negative media impact that that can have. So I'd like to have your reaction on that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I do want to be clear and I'm afraid I was not clear in my first

response.

The Bill before us does not change what currently exists. And in fact the member is right, that in the current circumstance these disciplinary matters are public and therefore the physician's name can be made known.

The protection being offered through this piece of legislation is to those who may launch an action or who may serve as a witness. But again I remind the member that this protection is only available after application to the court. It's not something automatically granted.

It is felt that this kind of protection is needed for those who may launch a complaint or those who may serve as a witness. But this protection through this legislation is not being offered to the physicians.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Minister, does that mean then that you also feel that the names of doctors who are for example suspected of sexual abuse, that their names must be published as a protection to potential patients?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — It's not a situation where anyone's name must be published, but it is the situation that the media or the public are available to attend the disciplinary hearings. And so there is no change proposed in the legislation to that current practice.

Mr. Neudorf: — But is it not true, by the way this process has been set up, that we are going to be potentially destroying legitimate doctors with a legitimate practice, and because of the publicity that is going to result, of the sensationalism or whatever of the hearing itself, that this is going to impugn negatively on the doctor's practice? Is this not a consideration?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — It certainly was a consideration I know in the discussions leading up to this legislation. I think maybe make one or two points. Overall we believe it is fundamentally in the public interest that there be sort of the public accountability and so on. I note that no other citizens or professions that I'm aware of in our society would be offered that kind of protection. The protection that we're offering here though is to the applicant or to a witness, but again I remind you it's not an automatic thing. It would have to be decided by a court, by a judge if that protection was to be allowed.

Mr. Neudorf: — You mention public accountability, Mr. Minister, that this could perhaps be one of the reasons why you would be prepared to let an accused name be circulated in public, because of some perceived threat that might potentially be there. But that I don't think should be a reason for you to allow this publishing to go on just to protect the lives of innocent children or in case of sexual abuse of women or whatever the case happens to be.

Because the way I understand it there is by the

disciplinary committee itself an opportunity for the doctors' disciplinary committee to revoke temporarily the licence of any doctor that is a potential threat until such time as the hearing has taken place. And subsequent to the hearing, appropriate action can be taken upon the guilt or innocence of that particular doctor without his name being splashed over the newspapers and so on.

Or there are other options that doctors could use such as having an appropriate chaperon present, that the doctor could still be carrying on his practice, because I think we're still operating under the assumption that we're innocent until proven guilty.

If there are alternate methods by which safety of patients can be assured, surely we can follow those alternate methods as opposed to taking the drastic measure of making this whole thing public and splashing it all over the place. By making that kind of a change would that not only be putting doctors on the same plane as members of the Law Society. I don't think there would be much of a difference there. My understanding is that that would put doctors on equal footing with them.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I recognize the point I think that the member is making, and it certainly was considered. Originally I believe in the discussions with the college, this protection was being recommended by the college and discussions were held around some similar . . . or some sort of protection for the physicians.

Through the course of the discussions and the debate and the formation of the legislation it was decided that we would move at this time with the protection which the college has requested for either the person who has brought forward the complaint or witnesses, to move forward in legislation at this time. And I'm prepared to say here today we will continue the discussions with the college in the future regarding the role of doctors in this equation.

I do note that when any one of us is subjected to the public court system, of course this is the risk. If any one of us is charged, then there is a risk that we are presumed guilty before proven guilty. And I think we understand that as a difficulty, particularly in these days of heightened media exposure. But it is true I think for all of us in the public court system.

But I say again, and I've consulted here with the officials, that we will continue this discussion then with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the SMA.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well, Mr. Minister, that's exactly . . . your additives there at the end, and the SMA as an afterthought, I think that's where the problem is arising here.

The college may be saying one thing, but my understanding is that the SMA, the fraternal organization of the doctors, the Saskatchewan Medical Association, are the ones that are not happy.

The majority of doctors in this province, by far, if the SMA is representative of the doctors of this province and I think you would agree that they are, they are the ones that are expressing these concerns to me and they want them addressed.

So I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, if you would be amenable to an amendment that will address the concerns that the SMA has. And I think you have a copy of the amendment that I'll be proposing when we get into that clause — clause 11 I believe it is, Mr. Minister. And you have the amendment before you.

But maybe the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, would be to discuss that particular issue when we come to it on a clause-by-clause study.

But I just reiterate, Mr. Minister, it is the concern of the SMA, Saskatchewan Medical Association, that is asking you to have some consideration to the impact that it's going to have on the lives and the practice of potentially many, many doctors in this province.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Well there is no change in regard to what has been the practice over the last many number of years. There is no change in that regard. It's my information this has not been to date a significant problem or a significant . . . there are not significant numbers of examples where this has been a problem. So I don't think we should leave the impression that somehow we're changing something here by the legislation that will make the current system or the current situation different.

In fact the current situation, in terms of the doctors, will continue just as it is. This does add protection though to those who may launch an action or who may serve as a witness. But again I say, only after having the approval of the court.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Minister, I can only reiterate what I've said on a couple of occasions. This is the feeling of the majority of the doctors in this province, that it's going to potentially do harm to those individuals. And this is a concern that they have expressed to me and I've relayed to you, and I will be making an amendment in a little while to accommodate those concerns, and then you can react as you see appropriate under that condition.

Mr. Minister, there's one other section that I would like to raise. A further concern from the SMA, and that regards section 54 of the main Bill. And that is regarding paying for the investigation costs, court costs, etc., and so on, where there's a statement saying that all other costs related to the investigation and hearing — I'll repeat that — all other costs related to the investigation and hearing.

And I don't have to be a doctor or anyone else to appreciate the potential implications of a statement like that that's wide open and giving a blanket opportunity for the organization to pass on whatever costs may seem suitable, which in fact might not be.

And this is a concern that the SMA has that this statement is much too wide open and can easily be misinterpreted, could easily be exaggerated so that there are undue costs and burdens associated with any kind of hearings. And quite frankly, the SMA would like to see that terminology, those words deleted, namely, all other costs related to the investigation and hearing.

I would like to hear and be interested in your response.

(1545)

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, we have had the legal folks look this over and look over legal decisions that have been made in the courts regarding the payments of costs. And we believe it does clarify it sufficiently and appropriately.

I look at the existing provision under The Medical Profession Act, and it . . . I could just read the current provision: direct the person to pay the costs of and incidental to the investigation including fees payable to solicitors, counsel, and witnesses or any part of those costs.

And so the current situation is not significantly different or there is not a great broadening here in my view. The provision now would have: “. . . and all other costs related to the investigation and hearing, or any part of these costs.” And it’s my understanding that this provision is being put now into the legislation simply as a result of legal decisions, court decisions, that have been made, and now the legislation will more closely or adequately reflect those decisions which are in fact reality now.

Mr. Neudorf: — But surely, Mr. Minister, you would agree that if there’s going to be a statement saying all other costs, that it’s completely open-ended. That’s the wording that I have here: all other costs related to the investigation. And this, in their opinion, is too wide open. That’s all that they’re asking.

This, Mr. Minister, just a supplement question to that comment, this legal opinion that you were referring to, has this legal opinion been transmitted directly to the SMA?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — I’m told, Mr. Chairman, that yes, in fact . . . I’m not sure if they were formal legal opinions, but certainly the legal discussions through Justice and the college and so on were shared with the SMA, that that discussion has taken place.

Number two, I would want to point out to the committee that whatever costs we’re discussing here are those costs which are awarded by the courts. And therefore, number three, there is the avenue of appeal, that if one feels that the costs are inappropriate, one in fact can appeal those costs and have them each appealed individually, and I’m told that in fact has happened on occasion.

Mr. Neudorf: — Are you also, by implication,

indicating that the SMA agreed with you and with that opinion?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — No I’m not, by implication, suggesting that the SMA agrees entirely with the provision here. And I think you’re aware of that and I’m aware of that. But we are confident that it does reflect . . . that it has the support of the College of Physicians and Surgeons and in fact does reflect what is practice and reality now and is an appropriate legislative description.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 11

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a House amendment I would like to make at this time on clause 11 of the printed Bill. And the amendment reads as follows:

Amend clause 11 of the printed Bill by deleting subsection 47.8(2) as being enacted therein.

And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you have a copy of that amendment.

Amendment negated.

Clause 11 agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 18

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Pursuant to the discussion that we have had on this clause as well, I will move:

That clause 18 of the printed Bill be amended by striking out the words “, and all other costs related to the investigation and hearing” where they appear in clause 54(1)(i) as being enacted therein.

I so move, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment negated.

Clause 18 agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 25 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to admit that we don’t win very many votes in this House. We have tried our best. And the minister is doing what he feels is best, so I would like to thank him for his forthrightness and his answers, and the officials, so that we were able to expeditiously solve these problems on these four Bills that were at hand. So thank you, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Health critic from the opposition for his line of questioning this afternoon. I think we both, in the course of the committee, learned some things today. And I want to sincerely thank the officials from the Department of Health who have been here to assist us all.

Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend The Northern Municipalities Act

The Chair: — I'll ask the minister to introduce her official.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have to my right John Edwards who is director of municipal policy and legislative services. And to his right is Lorne Tangjerd, senior policy analyst with the Department of Municipal Government.

Clause 1

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, we don't have a great deal of problem with this Bill. First of all though I'd like to welcome your officials as well to the Assembly this afternoon.

And we don't, as I said, have a lot of problems with this Bill. I wonder if you might however take the time to tell us what problems you feel were associated with the previous Act, and what this Bill does to try and restore those . . . or try and change it to move it in the right direction. You might want to take a few minutes to address that.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes, thank you. The purpose of the changes to The Northern Municipalities Act is essentially to parallel last session's changes or amendments to the urban Act, and also the amendments to the urban Act that we have proposed for this session.

And these amendments include updating provisions relating to petitions for a binding by-law by the voters, fire prevention by-laws, dangerous dog by-laws, conflict of interest, authority for municipalities to do custom work, and broadening the authority for intermunicipal agreements.

There is one special clause related to northern municipalities which states that the entry to municipal status will be changed. We have now northern settlements and we are changing the status where a community will become a northern hamlet, and there's some requirements around that threshold that will be changed. And we're also making a provision that will limit municipal funds to be applied only for municipal purposes.

Mr. Boyd: — Madam Minister, are there any costs associated with the changes that you're proposing to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — No, Mr. Chair. To the member opposite, no, there are no costs that will be affecting

any of the taxpayers of these municipalities.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Madam Minister. I think that concludes any of the concerns that we have. We think this Bill is properly done and addresses any of the concerns that the northern municipalities may have had.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 39 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chair, I move that the Bill to amend The Northern Municipalities Act be moved without amendment and I would like to thank the member opposite for the questions and the officials here today.

Mr. Boyd: — Madam Minister, we thank you as well for your cooperation and the officials for their cooperation in coming down this afternoon. Thank you.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 60 — An Act respecting Condominiums

The Chair: — I ask the committee to come to order and the Minister of Justice to introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. With me today is Madeline Robertson of the Department of Justice and Ray Petrich, also from the Department of Justice, who is the master of titles.

Clause 1

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, and welcome to your officials here this afternoon. Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would mind taking a few minutes — maybe not as many minutes as you took in your speech the other day about it — but just a few minutes of your time to outline the problems that this Bill addresses.

(1600)

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. To the member, the member from Kindersley quite properly pointed out the other day when this matter was in second reading that the genesis of this Bill was when the previous government was in power. A great deal of the work that was done on this Bill was done during that time and I ought to have given due credit to the previous government when I was on my feet at that time.

The member therefore will know that there has been a continuing concern, a mounting concern, about the fact that the previous legislation, which is some 25 years old, was not adequately covering some of the matters that the experience of condominium living was unearthing in Saskatchewan and the numbers of concerned increased steadily over the years. So quite properly the previous government began to have a look at it, and as the member has observed, this

legislation was by and large completed during the term of the previous government.

And I have no quarrel with that at all. I mean that is the way of it. We were prepared to proceed with it last year and didn't because of pressure of time but we're very pleased to bring it before the House this year.

The significant problems that had been drawn to the attention of the Saskatchewan government and which have been addressed in this Bill include really a wide variety of things. The operation of the corporations that are the condominium corporations is a significant area of reform, where all sorts of requirements that are obvious to us now had been omitted from the original legislation. And we have moved to patch up some of those deficiencies.

For example, the requirement to hold an annual meeting and to hold regular meetings; the requirement to provide certain financial information by the condominium corporation to the condominium owners, and that sort of day-to-day operational requirements have been attended to in this legislation; the requirement to establish reserve funds to provide for major repairs and replacements; the simple matter like being able to file a caveat against the title to the land to show that you are the owner of a condominium unit is a reform that is obvious and necessary.

There is in the Bill provisions to provide a procedure for owners to amend the condominium plan with the issue of tenants and powers with respect to tenants where condominium units are rented to other persons. Matters like parking spots and that sort of thing are attended to, and various matters relating to municipal taxes.

I haven't covered it all by any means, but these are matters which were drawn to the attention of the Government of Saskatchewan over many, many years and we are pleased to have found time on this legislative agenda to get this Act passed and address some of those problems.

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, are there any costs associated with these changes to the taxpayers of the province.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I can't think of any. I think the answer is none.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, well any time that you bring forward a Bill that the previous administration had any part in, we're pleased to see that. And we're also . . . it holds some hope out for the province of Saskatchewan that it may eventually move in the direction that we feel it should move.

And so for that reason we think that there isn't any problems with this Bill and are pleased to see that you would be continuing in the trend of moving in the direction that we'd like to see it move.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Could I suggest, Mr. Chair, that we approve this Bill in committee by parts?

The Chair: — Would that be agreed? We shall.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 116 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, we thank you for your forthrightness on this Bill as well as the officials for coming down this afternoon and helping out. We appreciate that. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chairman, I too would like to thank Ms. Robertson and Mr. Petrich for coming and assisting us today.

THIRD READINGS

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

The Speaker: — When shall this Bill be read a third time?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — With leave now, Mr. Speaker.

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

Bill No. 35 — An Act to amend The Certified Nursing Assistants Act

The Speaker: — When shall this Bill be read a third time?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — With leave now, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — No leave required.

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

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Registered Nurses Act, 1988

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

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

Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act

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

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

Bill No. 62 — An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act, 1981

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

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

Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend The Northern Municipalities Act

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

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

Bill No. 60 — An Act respecting Condominiums

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

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

(1615)

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**General Revenue Fund
Saskatchewan Research Council
Vote 35**

The Chair: — I would ask the minister at this time to please introduce the officials who have joined us here today.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Chairman, behind me I have Ron McGrath. He's the controller at the Research Council. Immediately behind me is George MacKay, the vice-president of the Research Council. And to my left here, Jim Hutch, president of the Saskatchewan Research Council.

Item 1

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, and officials, I don't anticipate that we will be here very long.

One of the things that I had the opportunity to do last year was to satisfy some of my questions that I had had about the SRC (Saskatchewan Research Council). I have a reasonable working knowledge, thanks to my association with Mr. Hutch in times past and with some of the personnel working there and my association with NRC (National Research Council).

And I can certainly appreciate the work that the SRC is doing for Saskatchewan and for many of the businesses that access the expertise that we have in that organization and some of our associations that we have with other research councils across the province. So we spent a fair length of time last year talking about the wide parameters of the operation of the SRC.

And I guess just a general question that I would have to

allow you, Mr. Minister, to have a response and perhaps update me and other people that are interested in the SRC. Have there been any significant changes within the operation of the SRC, or different directions that you may have chosen, or new programs that you have embarked upon that you would be wanting to share with the people of Saskatchewan? Mr. Minister, I just give you that opportunity to do that now.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for the opportunity to put on the record some of the things that we think are fine professional achievements by the Saskatchewan Research Council. There are no major changes in direction of the Research Council. Over the past year there have been, I suppose, exciting projects but certainly nothing that would indicate a definite change in direction.

I think over the years I don't remember controversy surrounding the Saskatchewan Research Council. I think all governments, whether it would be the hon. member's previous government or ours or some previous government before that, I think have all been very proud of the accomplishments of the Research Council as it complements the government, the people of the province, and industry as well. I know that there's a good deal of work that the Research Council does. It involves the private sector, and there's very high regard for the Research Council in the private sector as well.

I guess one of the things in response to the hon. member's question that I would want to put on the record is just the vision of the Research Council, their mission statement, and that is that the Saskatchewan Research Council will play a major role in helping Saskatchewan rebuild its economy. It's technical expertise, capabilities, and laboratory facilities create wealth and jobs by helping to establish new businesses, to save and expand existing businesses and to manage our natural resources that are necessary for our economic renewal.

The Research Council in terms of economic development has funded over 150 projects — I guess that would be last year — to the tune of some \$1.2 million for small business through the IRAP program (industrial research assistance program) and established the strategic technologies in automation and robotics program to assist the development of Saskatchewan business in engineering and advanced technologies.

The Research Council has assisted small businesses with engineering and fabrication of plastic moulds and electronic design support. They are a key player in development of diamond exploration techniques appropriate for Saskatchewan geology and the utilization by Saskatchewan mineral companies.

The Research Council has a collaborative research on the first horizontal well project in Saskatchewan with, I believe it's Sceptre Resources in 1987, and does ongoing work with the industry. After five years of

horizontal wells, they now account for some 13 per cent of Saskatchewan's total oil production, with over 300 wells drilled. That represents somewhere in the area of 150 to \$200 million of activity per year.

And as an example of the Research Council transferring new technology to small business, they've developed a new bulk kitchen wrap dispenser called E-ZEE Wrap for a Perdue company and generated a half million dollars in sales, created 4 full-time and 10 part-time jobs. And this product won the best new Canadian product award at the Toronto housewares show.

In the area of agriculture, the Research Council has been in the forefront of water supply location and water quality improvement. They've developed low-cost, drought-resistant feed supplies. We're very proud of the bovine blood sampling and the DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) research for disease resistance to ensure purity and quality of livestock. They closely have been monitoring the environment through such technologies as remote sensing, water and soil analysis, and stack testing to help control air pollution.

They've been working with farmers to reduce livestock feed costs by improving the feed value of crop chaff and flax straw. They've done field demonstration projects and research programs on behalf of organic farming in the province to improve production. And they are looking at . . . or they've worked in regional processing methods to diversify the rural economy.

In the environment the Research Council performs a number of activities to enhance and protect the environment such as water quality analysis, toxicity testing, radon testing, stack testing, and other testing for the environment.

They have given the province the ability to act quickly through emergency monitoring services in the case of chemical accident spills. And the lab has helped maintain a safe environment for all Saskatchewan people.

They also participate in monitoring our lakes and our rivers and our water supply to ensure that our drinking water meets or exceeds the provincial standards that have been set by this legislature.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I think that I would take my place. And if the member has any further questions, specific programs or the budget of the Research Council, I'd be happy to answer those specific questions.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman. I concur with the comment that you made. And I have to admit that the SRC, I think, is one of the few organizations that are under the thumb of government that has been able to escape the tentacles of government to a large degree now. I would assume, Mr. Minister, that it is because of the excellent officials that operate that and are above-board and beyond any

kind of reproach. But however, having said that, we just want to prove that now for a little while.

My first question, Mr. Minister, relates to a question . . . is the same question as I asked last year and that is the funding for the SRC. And I asked the minister at that time if he could supply me an answer as to the balance of funding that came from government and that which came from private business.

And this is the answer that I got. Grants from the provincial government, 28.4 per cent — those are direct grants from the Consolidated Fund; industry contract, 51.2; provincial government contracts, 11.4; federal contracts, 9 per cent. And the minister said, so in essence I guess we say there's 72 per cent of the total funding of SRC comes from contracts and 28 per cent, in round figures, comes from government funding through the Consolidated Fund. Could you apprise me of any changes in that percentage in the way in which the SRC is funded?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Chairman, the . . . I'm not sure that we have an absolute, final figure on the '92-93 fiscal year, but I would give our best estimate to the member.

From industry the funding for '92-93 is estimated to be 53 per cent, and this is money that the professionals at the Research Council go out and earn by the good work that they do. The federal government is 9 per cent; provincial government, 12 per cent; and the operating grant would be 27 per cent, and that's our best estimate. At some later date I'd be happy to provide the member with the final figures on that.

Mr. Neudorf: — I'd look forward to getting those, Mr. Minister. I guess what I was more interested in than anything is to the trend and whether the . . . And I'm pleased to see that you said that 53 per cent was from contracts — is that correct? — 53 per cent was from contracts, I believe you said. And my information was that last year that was 51.2. And in addition to that there's the provincial contracts and the federal contracts, making a total of about somewhere in the neighbourhood of the low 70 per cent.

And that, I think, is encouraging and I think that reflects the confidence that the industry has in the SRC and that the SRC is doing a good job. And I would hate to see the reverse being true, where SRC would have to start relying more upon government, direct Consolidated Fund grants, to keep it going. And so certainly that is a positive trend.

First of all, Mr. Minister, I would like to thank you for the response that you gave us in response to the global questions that we've been asking every department and the answers that you have provided. However, as is often the case in this business, detailed answers beg more questions. And we'll just embark on a few questions that I have in response to your global answers.

I noticed in — what is the heading of this, personnel report? — there is an increase of \$60,000 being added

to the total salaries for out-of-scope, temporary, or casual workers. What is the reason for that increase of \$60,000?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — The item that you refer to on the . . . I believe you were asking about the out-of-scope temporary, casual category? Yes, that is increased by about \$60,000.

This is the hourly, short-term people that are taken on on contracts. And I think you'll find over time, as the Research Council is able to raise more money by the professional work they do in the private sector, that you'll find that that amount will tend to increase. So as the percentage of work and revenues generated from the private sector, that amount should likely go up correspondingly over time. And that's the situation here.

(1630)

Mr. Neudorf: — There's an inflection in that answer and that is that you would say that the more out-of-scope temporary and the more out-of-scope casual workers there are the better, because it signifies that the SRC is doing more business with industry on a part-time, piece-time, contract basis. And the natural offshoot of that kind of . . . the reality of that type of an arrangement is more out-of-scope temporary and casual. But that is a comment that you can address later on.

With respect to that same issue, Mr. Minister, I notice that there is an increase of out-of-scope temporary casuats from five to eight as opposed to March 31, '92 and March 31, '93. What would the reason for that be?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — At the Research Council it's viewed as a positive move to have an increased number from five to eight.

And what that means is that they've actually got more private sector work to do and they don't necessarily need people on full time. But what sometimes happens is that these people will have other jobs, but they have a particular expertise and they'll be hired to offer that particular expertise to the Research Council.

Another thing that we have to keep aware of is that quite often, or at least in some cases, people who may have another job and do this part-time or casual work for the Research Council will eventually work into enough time and have an expertise that's a growing field; that they'll eventually become a permanent employee of the Research Council. So we view this as a very positive move within the Research Council.

Mr. Neudorf: — Exactly, I couldn't agree more, and that's the point that I wanted you to make as well — is that that is a good sign.

And I'm just saying to all members here, just because we're talking about temporary work, just because we're talking about casual work doesn't mean that that in itself is a bad thing. And I appreciate you coming out and saying exactly what you said, because

it's not very often that we hear members from your side saying things like that. And in particular, in the SRC that is absolutely true and accurate. So I have no contention with that at all.

Mr. Minister, my next question is on the same topic, on the same page, and that is dealing with out-of-scope permanent this time. And I just want you to comment on a discrepancy, an apparent discrepancy in the trend that I would have assumed, almost like an anachronism here, and that is that on March 31, '92 you had 212 permanent and you spent \$8.276 million. Then on your report dated March 31, '93 you have one more employee, bringing it to 213 and your expenditure was \$8.176 million or a drop of \$100,000. I'm not complaining about the drop, but I would want to . . . I'd be interested in the explanation that you could offer. Was it personnel changes — lower-classified, lower-paid personnel? What was the reason?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — First off, I want to address something to the hon. member that you mentioned first. The trend here for temporary casual is a different situation than the temporary casual situation you'll quite often get on people who have a lot less training, such as restaurant employees, for example, where it's sometimes very difficult for them to exist with that type of employment.

An Hon. Member: — You guys are predictable.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Thank you for accusing me of being predictable. It's a very different situation at the Research Council where almost all the people who work there are very highly skilled professionals.

The explanation for the increased number of out-of-scope permanent employees increasing by one but yet a drop of \$100,000 in the payments can be explained by people who either retired or resigned during the year, and people came in on a lower end of a wage scale, thereby there was some savings there.

This is not necessarily something that would happen over a long period of time. I don't think there's any trend being set there. It's just the way that it worked out during the year as to who was no longer employed and different people coming in that were hired at a bit of a lower rate than those that had left.

Mr. Neudorf: — I'm not going to make this connection, but if you are saying that you saved \$100,000 by getting in less qualified, perhaps, and less experienced personnel, and therefore you didn't have to pay so much. And before we just found out that there was an increase in activity, and the SRC was actually getting more special contracts. I guess that speaks well for the young blood that's coming in, but at the same time I hasten to add that it also speaks well for the older blood that's there and recognize it and correctly manipulates the system for its benefit.

Another question I had, Mr. Minister, is regarding reclassification and conversion of employees. And I noticed that there have been 13 employees that have

been reclassified since last year at this time. And the question I would have for you, Mr. Minister, is: what was the reason for those reclassifications, and did those reclassifications include salary increases for some of those employees, and if so, how much? Now if that poses a problem at this time, I would want your commitment that I would get a list of those names with those monetary figures that I am requesting.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — You too, hon. member, are predictable in that you twist my words a little bit when I answered the previous question. When I answered the previous question we're not talking about intentionally bringing in less experienced people, but just because of the nature of some people who resign or retire, of course they do have greater experience because they have gained that experience working at the Research Council.

And when a new person comes in, of course different people have a different learning curve, and some people it would take them maybe a little bit longer to get to that level of experience within their job. I think that's normal in going into any new job or starting out a profession. So there are some people that would, I acknowledge, have less experience, but it's not done by design. It's because of the nature of refilling positions as people either resign or retire from their positions.

Specific to this question that you ask about the 13 reclassifications, I don't have an actual list for the member, but the Research Council will undertake to provide you with that list once they get back to the offices in Saskatoon. They'll send you the list.

What happens in reclassifications at the Research Council is that when there is an expanded work area in terms of the work that they're actually doing, or there's an expansion in the knowledge that they've acquired in working on projects over the years or months, that there is some reclassification and with that goes a comparable salary increase.

And the way that this is determined, I would want to inform the hon. member, is that there is a committee that's set up to review this. The committee is made up of employees with one management person on the committee, and they have the sole responsibility to make that determination as to whether or not there should be a reclassification, and if there is a reclassification what is the increase in salary that should go with that.

Mr. Neudorf: — Okay, Mr. Minister, I will look forward to getting that response and those answers from you.

I notice also, Mr. Minister, that on personnel report number three there are no names of employees that have been terminated, and I'm assuming severances were paid to, but there is not any total that I can find on severances that were paid. I'm asking you, if these severances were paid, why are those totals not included?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — For the fiscal year April 1, 1992, until March 31, 1993, there were no severances paid out by the Research Council and therefore, they're not reflected in the sheet that I gave to the member.

Mr. Neudorf: — I notice also, Mr. Minister, that several employees have been listed as resigning. Were any of these people requested to resign? In other words, were any resignations requested and now are there any of these employees that might be considering or taking court actions against the government . . . against the employer?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — There was no one asked to resign from the Research Council. These people resigned for a wide range of reasons; some cases, we don't necessarily know. But no one was asked to resign. There are no legal actions regarding employment or any other matter as far as we know at the Research Council.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Minister, could you give us the reasons why six employees resign. I mean, that's a fairly substantial number of people that are resigning from the department. Could you supply those reasons for us.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — If you just look at the list, I don't wish to talk about the names of the people individually but I can . . . If you refer to your list, the first two on the list that resigned is what we would refer to as technology transfer. Both of those individuals are in the same business but have started their own business. They do the same work but they've started their own business. One of the people still comes back — the first one, for sure — still comes back from time to time to do specialized contract work for the Research Council.

(1645)

The three middle ones in each of those cases were very young people that worked as lab techs. And they obviously found employment elsewhere, where they found that there was possibly some chance of promotion. We don't really know what happened to those three people, but in each case I'd want to inform the hon. member that they were quite young people just beginning their careers.

In the case of the last person on the list, this person was here for two years from France. They were on a two-year contract with the Research Council. And I'm not even sure that resigned should be the proper term there, but at the end of their two-year term they returned to France.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Regarding the manuals used by the Research Council for the board of directors and for the government, I've had my staff go to the library and to get copies of these manuals if available. And we found that they were not available; there are no manuals here. Are these manuals selective, are they secretive, or what's the reason why these manuals would not be available?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Well I guess they're internal documents for the operation of the Research Council. There is, I don't think, anything of a confidentiality nature to them. If the hon. member wanted to look at the manuals, you'd be more than welcome to do that. If we knew that you wanted specific ones, or you wanted all of them, I suppose we could bring them to you; or sometime if you wanted to arrange to stop into the offices in Saskatoon, they would be made available to you.

The Research Council is very proud of their manuals and they certainly have nothing to hide about them; it's just not been the practice to provide the manuals to libraries within the province.

Mr. Neudorf: — I'm going to take you up on that offer, Mr. Minister, because if I'm going to be responsible for shadowing the SRC, I'd like to know a little bit more about them. And that's why I wanted access to them and I didn't have it. So I'll take you up on that offer and I will look forward to receiving a copy of those.

On the occupancy chart that you have provided for me, as of March 31, '93, I notice that there's a fish hatchery in Saskatoon, 267 square metres and under environment.

This fish hatchery is, I am assuming, doing research. Could you fill me in a little bit about the type of research? Which fish are you researching and what is the relationship between that research and the fish hatchery . . . not fish hatchery, but rather the fish farm that was located in Waldheim? And if there was any correlation or any symbiotic relationship between the SRC and that Arctic Fish Company, as it was called, in Waldheim?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Chairman, when they say fish hatchery, that just indicates which building it is. It's no longer used as a fish hatchery and the Research Council has not been in the fish hatchery project for at least a couple of years.

In terms of the relationship to fish hatcheries in the private sector throughout the province, the Research Council provides ongoing consultation and services to people in the fish hatchery business, so I'm not sure there's any direct relationship to the fish hatchery at Waldheim. But it wouldn't be unusual for the Research Council to have done some work for them.

Before I sit down I want to assure you that if you wish to review the manuals at the Research Council in Saskatoon that Mr. Hutch would be more than happy to set up an appointment for you. The only thing that I would ask if there is at some point in time information that's of a confidential nature, that you'd respect that.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think I know how this operation works and confidentiality is not something that I have to be reminded of, or lectured on. But I will just assume though that there's nothing fishy going on in that aspect. Sorry about that.

One further question, or one area of questions —

depending on whether it will be one question will depend on your answer. Mr. Minister, I could not help but notice on another section where there's a list of computers that the SRC has purchased for the '92-93 fiscal year, and I notice that there's a total when I add them up of over \$127,000. They're buying various computers and the computers when I look the list over are of varying kinds of different companies. There must be at least a half a dozen different ones.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is: how are these computers purchased? What's the format and the procedure? Are they tendered? Or how does the SRC go about purchasing their computers?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — In terms of how the computers are acquired, I don't think it's the tendering system that you're thinking of, if I can sort of project across to you what you are thinking. What happens in most cases but not necessarily all, the employee or the department requesting the computer are asked to get three quotes. Sometimes it's difficult to get three quotes if there's highly specialized computer equipment that's required.

And there's a great variation in the types of computer equipment. For example, a geologist may have quite a different need for a computer system than a project . . . And I look at a release here from April 20, 1993 where there's an ultrasound research project to benefit feedlot operators, which would be very different from a computer that a geologist would want to have, or someone to use for general office duties.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well I buy that argument to a certain extent. But surely in software and so on, there are lots of companies that make specialized software. Even in my own industry of the hog industry there are different companies that will supply software for those particular issues.

But I'm not particularly concerned that there was any one company getting a favoured hand. Because when I look over the list I notice that there's such a long and a wide range of suppliers. And that's what makes me buy your argument that they go shopping with specialized equipment to specialized people and they've come up with a whole range of suppliers. And there's no inflection on my part that there was anything untoward happening here. But I just wanted to hear what you had to say on that, Mr. Minister.

Now before I take my seat, the member from Morse has a couple of windy questions for you, and you will see what I'm talking about in a little while.

But I want to take this opportunity if I don't get the opportunity again to thank you, Mr. Minister, and thank you to the officials for the responses to my questions.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, the SaskPower I think, or someone in the government recently provided a contract to someone in relation to wind power for generating electricity. And I was wondering whether the Saskatchewan

Research Council was involved in any of the bids.

very expert work that they do for the province.

I know that they have been involved in some of the companies that want to set up some of these wind-powered generators, and I was just wondering whether your Research Council had been involved in any of that.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Yes, the Saskatchewan Research Council did bid on the project, and they were not successful. I believe, and I would stand to be corrected because SaskPower would have these figures and not the Research Council, but I believe that the Research Council came in second.

Mr. Martens: — I believe it was an Ontario firm that got the bid. I know that there was an individual from my constituency that bid on it, and he's connected with an Alberta firm but lives in Swift Current, and I just was wondering. So you don't know, but I'll ask SaskPower then when we have that discussion about the contract, and we'll see what transpired.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I remember the contract being awarded. The funding for the project came jointly from the provincial government and the federal government. And if my memory serves me correctly, it was in the area of 170 to \$180,000 — the contract that was awarded. I think that most of the low bidders were evaluated so that we were comparing apples to apples, and a firm from Ontario was successful as the low bidder. And the only consideration that was taken once we had them all evaluated was that the low bid would get the project, and that's the tendering policy at SaskPower.

Mr. Martens: — Is Sask Research Council still involved in businesses that want to generate electricity with wind? Are they still involved with companies like that in the province? And if so, would you tell me if there's more than one or there's four or five of those people who are interested or a consortium or a group of people that are interested in that?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I understand that there is no specific client right now, but there's a contract arrangement between the company and the Research Council.

There is, in particular to wind, there is one expert at the Research Council that's a permanent employee at the Research Council that's available to do work for the private sector. And the role of that person right now is exchange of information between entities to develop as much expertise as they can on the generation of electricity by wind.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 35 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I'd like to thank the hon. members for their questions. And I'd like to thank the employees of the Research Council for travelling here today, and wish them well, and thank them for the