

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PRESENTING PETITIONS**

**Mr. Osika:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again on behalf of concerned citizens of Saskatchewan who are concerned about the closure of the Plains Health Centre in Regina I present this petition:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

And the signatures are from Regina, from Craven, from Lumsden, from other small communities in southern Saskatchewan, and southern Regina. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Belanger:** — Yes, Mr. Minister, once again I rise today to present petitions of names from throughout Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

The people that have signed the petition, Mr. Speaker, they're from Regina, they're all throughout Saskatchewan, and I would like to present this to the Assembly, please.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to present petitions of names from throughout Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

The people that have signed the petitions, Mr. Speaker, are primarily from Manor; they're also from Arcola and Alameda and Weyburn and Saskatoon. I so present.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present petitions of names from people throughout Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

People that have signed this petition are from Moose Jaw, from Regina, from Weyburn, from Assiniboia, all over southern Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Aldridge:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise today to

present petitions of names from throughout Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

The people that have signed the petitions, Mr. Speaker, are all from the city of Moose Jaw.

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present petitions of names from throughout Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

The people that have signed the petition, Mr. Speaker, are from Grayson, Melville, Regina, and throughout the province. I so present.

**Mr. McPherson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have petitions from people throughout Saskatchewan and again of course from throughout western Canada, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

Mr. Speaker, the people that have signed this petition mainly are from Fort Qu'Appelle, Regina, but there's a number from Penticton and Vancouver, B.C. (British Columbia), people of course who appreciate the Plains Health Centre staying open, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — Now the hon. member knows what I'm going to say before I say it, and I simply remind him that debate is not permitted when presenting a petition, and he's starting to engage in that.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . him out.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. Now the Speaker is not seeking advice here.

Are there any further petitions?

**READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS**

**Clerk:** — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed, and pursuant to 12(7) they are hereby read and received.

Of citizens of the province petitioning the Assembly to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

## NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

To the minister responsible for Agriculture: why is the Agriculture department delaying the Thickwood Hills Feeder Cooperative Limited application to raise their borrowing limit to promote cattle production; what is the reason for this delay; why has the department suggested the co-op split into two separate co-ops in order to capitalize on the \$3 million limit twice, rather than raise the limit?

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Scott:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly my pleasure to introduce from Milestone School 36 students in grades 3, 4, and 5, and also teachers Laurel Herman, MaryJo Steve, Bev Siebert and John Kodman. John taught my sister a number of years ago, so it's great to see him here.

Also welcome a number of the parents and chaperons, and I look forward to visiting with the students and teachers after the question period, and I would ask all members to join in welcoming them here today.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the Minister of Social Services, it's a great pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to other members of the Assembly, Dr. Craig Househam who's sitting in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, in the front row.

And Dr. Househam is the deputy director general of the Department of Health and Welfare in South Africa's Free State province. He's visiting Saskatchewan, and he's been here for a few weeks to see how we administer and deliver health and social services programs. In particular, he has a keen interest in the innovative changes that have been made to our health system and the discussions we're currently having on social policy and programs. He's also interested in our form of democratic government and the systems and processes that make it work.

As members know, Dr. Househam is one of several officials who visited Saskatchewan as part of our commitment to help the Free State establish a reformed and democratic government. In the past two weeks Dr. Househam has met with officials from the departments of Health, Social Services, Executive Council, and other central agencies. He's also had discussions with health service providers in Regina and Saskatoon and the Midwest Health District.

Members will be interested to know that the Free State province is making some major changes to its health system. It has established six districts to deliver primary health services. It has shifted funding to put more emphasis on health centres and other community-based services to ensure quality health

services are available to everyone.

Dr. Househam joins a long list of international delegations who have come here to study our health renewal program. And I would like to ask all members to join me in welcoming Dr. Househam and also in wishing him and his province success when he returns home to South Africa.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would as well like to acknowledge the presence of John Kodman in this Legislative Assembly. John taught for a number of years in Moosomin at McNaughton High. And while Moosomin has lost an excellent teacher, I'm sure the Milestone students are appreciating his presence. Welcome, John.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Bradley:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also want to join my colleagues in welcoming the school group here from Milestone. Of course, Milestone being my home town, I'm very familiar with the students, the teachers, and the chaperons. So I really hope that all the members will be on their very best behaviour today because I'm sure I'll hear comments on the weekend about it.

I really do enjoy having my colleagues here also from the school in Milestone. And I'd just ask everyone to join me in a warm welcome.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too today, through you and to the members of the Assembly, would like to welcome the group in from Milestone. Amongst that group is a niece and a nephew of mine and a couple of their kids I believe are there that go to the school, Chandra and Ryan, as well as Rhys. Stand up and give us a wave there, Tammy and Chuck Thomas.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McLane:** — Also, Mr. Speaker, in the gallery behind me there's a couple of gentlemen I'd like to introduce as well, a constituent of mine, Mr. Clark Tweet, who is the secretary of the Concerned Rural School Trustees. Clark Tweet, would you stand up.

And also Mr. Larry Caswell, who is the chairman of that same group. I ask the Assembly to give them a welcome.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

## Opening of Maymont School

**Mr. Jess:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The day before yesterday, during Education Week, I was proud to be with the Minister of Education in the village of Maymont in my

constituency. We were both present to take part in the official ceremony opening the new K to 12 Maymont School.

Last week I told the Assembly about the multi-use village complex just completed in Maymont. The school is a central part of this complex and, as I said last week, this is an exciting new development and partnership, a collaborative sharing. The library, for instance, is there for the 145 students and 9 teachers. But it is also there for the seniors whose complex is a short distance away. This is an intelligent sharing of a resource and a pleasant way for seniors and youth to see each other, something that doesn't always happen in our communities.

To codify this new multi-use idea, an agreement between the community and the school division has been signed. This is one of the first projects to be built under the Department of Education's initiative towards joint use between schools and other partners and has resulted in a community centre second to none.

It is a good and forward-looking initiative, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to see it begun in my constituency. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **World Water Day**

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to recognize this day's designation as World Water Day. Water is one of our most valuable resources, extremely important, and should not be taken for granted.

This week, Saskatchewan Conservation and Development Association met in Saskatoon. The association is made up of the C&D (conservation & development) boards and the watershed boards in this province. These board members spend countless hours of their own time to discuss the conservation and development of water resources in this province. They review the water concerns and problems arising mostly in rural areas.

Because of their consultations and research, lots of Saskatchewan land that was once flooded is now arable. I would ask the members of this Assembly to join me in congratulating the conservation and development boards for their continued work.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **Estevan Legion Donations to Hospitals**

**Mr. Ward:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Royal Canadian Legion, Estevan branch no. 60, since 1987 has donated more than \$90,000 for specialized equipment in Regina hospitals. This is in recognition of the fact that Regina hospitals serve the people of southern Saskatchewan, not just the local citizens.

This year I am proud to announce to the Assembly that the Estevan branch presented a cheque for 25,000 to the Hospitals of Regina Foundation, a donation towards the purchase of a hemodialysis machine for Regina General.

Mr. Speaker, 350 people in Saskatchewan use these machines. They are necessary and they are expensive. The people of Estevan are proud to make this contribution through the Legion. The money was raised primarily from the annual poppy sale.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the Legion contributed 10,000 to the local St. Joseph's Hospital auxiliary in Estevan towards the purchase of an endoscopy machine — this in addition to a previous 10,000 for the same purpose.

These two donations for specialized equipment are an indication of the community spirit, the provincial community spirit, one finds in Estevan and all our towns. I am proud to represent them and I applaud the ongoing work of the Estevan Legion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **Choices and Consequences Youth Conference**

**Ms. Murray:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This week the Regina Northwest Interagency Service Project sponsored a conference for grade 7 and 8 students. Over 800 students from eight public and separate schools attended the conference held over three days at the Northwest Leisure Centre in my constituency. I attended one day myself, Mr. Speaker, as part of my commitment to Education Week.

The conference was called "Choices and Consequences". And as the title suggests, students were confronted with a variety of speakers on a series of topics on the choices we all must make in our lives and the likely consequences of those choices.

I suppose one of the phrases most used by those of us over 20 is, if I had known then what I know now I would never have, or I would have . . . And we can all finish the sentence, Mr. Speaker.

With speakers like Alvin Law and the other capable participants, students were given some preparation so that the phrase might become a permanent part of their adult vocabulary.

The Choices and Consequences conference was a good one. The students were enthusiastic, partly because they were released from school to attend, but mainly because this provided them with another kind of necessary learning experience. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **University of Regina Arts Festival**

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that you would agree that only an oafish lout would destroy a work of art; however, eating one is an entirely different matter. And that's what I and several other people will be doing tomorrow night.

The sixth annual University of Regina fine arts festival begins tomorrow with an edible art event appropriately named "eat your heart out." Thirty prominent and upcoming local artists are, as we speak, sculpting edible art pieces which will be displayed, then judged, and then consumed with gusto by those of us in attendance.

I had debated making a tray of rats a roni in honour of the opposition third party there, but I didn't have time, given duties in the House. More tickets are available, and the proceeds will be used to send senior visual arts students on a gallery tour of New York.

There are other events throughout the week at the university and other venues: recitals, plays, exhibits. I have attended before; they're always excellent. So fine arts week — I encourage all who can to attend.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **Congratulations to Toronto Dominion Bank and Trust**

**Mr. Thomson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in somewhat of a contrast to my friend from Thunder Creek, who on Wednesday continued his attack on the banks and business community of our province, to actually make a statement on how these organizations continue to support Regina's continuing economic growth.

On Wednesday I had the pleasure of representing the Premier and Minister of Economic Development at the opening of the Toronto Dominion Bank and Trust on Hamilton Street. The Toronto Dominion is making a major investment in the community of Regina, particularly in the area of expanding into trusts and estates. And this again highlights the importance of the financial services sector in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Toronto Dominion for their continued support of the Regina business community, and I want to congratulate the Minister of Economic Development for his work in building partnerships. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — Now I'll ask all the members to come to order and give their full attention to the hon. member for Weyburn-Big Muddy.

#### **Provincial AA Hockey Champions**

**Ms. Bradley:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce more good news for Weyburn.

Today I want to congratulate the Weyburn PanCanadian Midget Beavers who have recently won the provincial AA championship. This is the second year in a row the Beavers have won the championship, and they won this year in grand style, defeating a good team from Martensville in double overtime 5 to 4.

Now I'm not a sports expert, but I can figure out that if a league

has an age limit — here, 16 and under — and if one team wins two years in a row, that means there is an abundance of talent at all ages and that there is some very good coaching taking place.

That coaching is provided by Norm Cross and Darcy Pindus, and I congratulate them as well. Credit also goes to PanCanadian Petroleum of Weyburn who has sponsored midget hockey for 25 years.

As the title of Ken Dryden's book says, hockey is *The Game of our Lives*. It is played with skill and enthusiasm at all ages and provides exciting entertainment for we fans.

Congratulations to the Weyburn PanCanadian Midget Beavers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Osika:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce a guest.

Leave granted.

#### **INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Mr. Osika:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we travel through our lives, our lifetime, and bumpy roads from time to time, often — quite often as a matter of fact — you meet people for whom you develop a mutual respect. And I've had the good fortune of, during my lifetime and different careers, meeting sincere, honest people that some of them who've become lifelong family friends.

And I'd like to introduce one to you, Mr. Speaker. A gentleman that I had the pleasure of meeting while in charge of Fort Frances detachment in Ontario, Mr. Lyle Turgeon, who is now with Transport Canada and is from Winnipeg, is in the east gallery. And I would ask the Assembly to please welcome my good friend to this Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **ORAL QUESTIONS**

##### **SaskPower President's Remuneration**

**Mr. Aldridge:** — Mr. Speaker, as this House is well aware, SaskPower greeted the people of Saskatchewan with a massive rate increase to start the new year, an increase endorsed by the NDP (New Democratic Party) government. This massive hike was necessary, said former NDP election campaign chairman Jack Messer, to get this Crown's fiscal house in order.

Mr. Speaker, when Jack Messer assumed his position as the head of SaskPower, he was awarded a pay and benefits package that totalled \$177,000 a year. Today Jack Messer is receiving \$183,000 in total pay and benefits. Will the Deputy Premier try and justify a \$6,000 raise for Jack Messer while the rest of us are gouged with massive rate increases?

**Hon. Mr. Anguish:** — While I want to thank the hon. member for his question, I'd also want to point out that SaskPower has,

as many of the Crowns, gone through a great deal of restructuring to meet the competition, to meet the challenging times of the future. These are not simple solutions. They are very complex solutions. And the management, the board, and the employees of SaskPower have worked together to make the corporation good for us today and good for us into the future.

In issue of the salary, I point out to the hon. member that the actual salary, I don't believe, has increased at all from the date that Mr. Messer was appointed. I believe the salary is \$150,000. I think the member knows that. It's a salary that would not be competitive with any utility of comparable size anywhere outside of Saskatchewan, and it's certainly a fraction of what the former administration paid to George Hill. In fact it would likely be about five per cent of what George Hill's compensation package on departure from the corporation would have been, which is in the ballpark of a million dollars.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Aldridge:** — Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the minister opposite that there's been a few Hills in this province that have got compensated too much by this province.

Mr. Speaker, part of Jack Messer's raise is made up of additional benefits, including another week of paid holidays — now up to five weeks annually. Mr. Speaker, most people in this province, if they're lucky enough to be working at all, wait years to get five weeks of paid vacation time. Jack Messer waited just three years. But if you're willing to hike everyone's power rates as Jack Messer has, you can pack your holiday bags for five weeks, I'm sure.

Will the minister explain where the fairness is when people like Jack Messer get more perks while the rest of us receive higher power rates and fewer services from this NDP government?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Anguish:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member confuses good management with a variety of other things in the question that he asks. And I think that he would want to try and focus a little more clearly on what the issues are. One is a compensation package for a very competent and experienced senior manager of the corporation. The other is a rate issue which brings into line with the challenges of the future.

The member would know very well that there's massive cross-subsidization in the past at SaskPower between various rate categories. It's a system that's been in place under all administrations and we have to correct that because of the North American Free Trade Agreement which your Prime Minister said he'd tear up upon coming into office and never did.

So we're preparing for the future. We wish you would focus on the issues and make sure that those issues that you're focusing on are for the benefit of Saskatchewan people in facing the challenges of the future.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Aldridge:** — Mr. Speaker, Jack Messer was recently quoted in the Regina *Leader-Post* as stating:

If anything, utilities like SaskPower need to become more efficient and streamlined to make more money for taxpayers.

What the people of Saskatchewan actually see is SaskPower firing the front-line worker so as to provide more money for NDP appointees like Jack Messer.

Will the minister make a commitment in this House today to pull the plug on this shameful waste?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Anguish:** — There is no shameful waste to pull the plug on. I would say that SaskPower, the management and the employees, the front-line employees of the corporation, will stack up against any utility anywhere in North America for their efficiency.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Anguish:** — I'd also, Mr. Speaker, want to point out to the member opposite that the changes at SaskPower did not start with the front-line employees of the corporation. The front-line employees of the corporation are the ones who deliver the very good service; it's the managers who manage a very good service to Saskatchewan people.

Under the previous administration there were somewhere around a dozen vice-presidents at SaskPower. Those vice-presidents were reduced in numbers. The senior management, the out-of-scope people, were the first to attain efficiencies within the corporation and the front-line employees that you talk about have a program that they have worked on, challenging the future . . . Taking Charge of the Future, I should say. And that was done in concert with employees, in scope and out of scope, and the management and the board of SaskPower. I think we should be proud of the corporation that can compete with any corporation in North America in terms of efficiencies and the member should focus on that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### SaskPower Vice-president's Remuneration

**Mr. McPherson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleague has just raised concerns about the former New Democrat Party boss, Jack Messer, and the pay and benefits package he now receives. I would like to point out that there's also Carole Bryant, a former member of the NDP executive and current SaskPower vice-president, has also received a substantial raise.

Mr. Speaker, when this government chose to take advantage of Carole Bryant's depth of experience in the power business, she began at a salary of \$95,000 plus benefits. Mr. Speaker, her pay has now increased to almost \$129,000, which brings her total pay and benefits package to \$154,000. Will the Premier try to explain, or will the minister try to explain, how he can justify

giving political appointees a raise while gouging SaskPower customers. And at this time I'd like to send across to all of the cabinet ministers the list of the pay and the benefits so you could follow along in question period today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Anguish:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that the member opposite has problems with women leaders. Carole Bryant is a leader in terms of management within the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and her salary is not out of line with a comparable job in Saskatchewan and it's certainly very much under what a comparable job would be with utilities outside of Saskatchewan. And I think that the member opposite should encourage women to move into management positions and not hold the glass ceiling there that he seems to support.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, a few moments ago the minister talked about the challenging times in this province but I think it's clear that the challenging times aren't hitting Jack Messer and Carole Bryant. Mr. Speaker, Carole Bryant was quoted recently as stating, and I quote: "We have to reduce our operating costs. That's what last year was all about."

It would appear what last year was all about was giving Carole Bryant and Jack Messer shameful raises and then letting them raise our power rates to pay for it. Mr. Speaker, the Premier showed leadership by taking away the two Lexus vehicles that those two, Jack Messer and Carole Bryant, had leased when they first got those jobs; will he show the same kind of leadership now, do the honourable thing, and roll back these shameful wages and increases?

**Hon. Mr. Anguish:** — Well the member opposite talks about rolling back. This government has tried not to roll back anything in terms of what the Saskatchewan taxpayers have enjoyed as services within the province. What we've done is hold the line, created efficiencies, and we know that this member who asked the question today will likely be rolled back as quickly as his leader was rolled back by him after the provincial election.

I state again to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that these salaries are very, very close to the same as when they came into office in 1991; they have moved just a fraction of a per cent. He's distorting the figures in terms of what he says are outlandish kinds of pay increases. That's not factual information. And I think the member should focus on the future, and how we develop this province with utilities, with the private sector, and with the Legislative Assembly focusing on the important problems of the day, which would be job creation, growing our economy, and making sure that Saskatchewan people have the services they've come to appreciate from competent governments of the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) and NDP over the years.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if the minister really and truly wanted New Democrat political hacks to have more money, perhaps he would look at the perogy king beside him and get a few donations from that angle.

Mr. Speaker, as part of SaskPower's cost cutting, the rural underground distribution program that buried overhead cable to keep our farms safe was eliminated. SaskPower officials, and the minister, stated at the time they just couldn't afford to maintain the program. Will the minister explain why his government feels it can afford shameful raises to Jack Messer and Carole Bryant but can't afford to keep in place a program that has proven to save lives?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Anguish:** — Well the program that the member refers to is a program that will be ongoing. It will be changed to have some efficiencies in line with all the other changes that are happening within the Crown corporations in Saskatchewan.

We want to make sure that the Crown corporations are there to serve the people of Saskatchewan for a long time in the future, just as they've been in the past. And just because something has served us well, like the party opposite would do — we're opposite to them — when's something's working well we don't throw it out; we keep it, try and improve it for the efficiencies it has, and use it into the future for the good qualities that they have.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Job Relocations

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my questions this morning are for the Minister of Economic Development. Mr. Minister, we have learned that Ford Credit Canada is going to be closing its Regina branch office and relocating these services to Calgary and Edmonton effective June 1.

Can you tell us how many jobs will be lost in Regina and what the reason is for this decision?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — The member opposite brings forward an important issue and that is relocation of jobs that is going on throughout Canada. You will know that CIBC (Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce) has announced that they're going to locate their call centre for western Canada, and as that relocation goes on there will likely be jobs lost in other centres in western Canada as they move to Regina.

The same happened with Sears when they did their call centre in Regina. And as companies amalgamate, and change, there will be net levels of winners and losers.

And I want to say that in the case of Regina, with the number of call centres and the number of people working in that industry in Regina, I'm proud to say that we are doing very, very well. And one of the reasons that we're doing so well is because of

the competence in our Crown, SaskTel. We have an advantage with that Crown corporation and we're doing, I believe, a very good job as an industry in attracting call centres.

On the issues you refer to, I don't have the details but I will get them for you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, our office spoke with the representative of Ford Canada at their head office in Oakville, Ontario this morning. And he told us that 12 people who work in the office here in Regina . . . He also told us that one of the main reasons for the move was the difference in provincial taxes.

Ford pays nearly \$600,000 a year in capital tax here in Saskatchewan. In Alberta they will pay nothing. Yet your Finance minister says Alberta's low tax regime is overrated.

Mr. Minister, this is concrete proof that the high taxes in Saskatchewan are driving businesses and jobs out of this province and into Alberta. How many more jobs do we have to lose before you begin to address the problem, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well I say again, it's never pleasant, when people move from one jurisdiction to the other, to the area that they're leaving. And the 12 that are leaving from the Ford call centre is important indeed. But what worries me more is when the federal government takes the position that for no good reason, even at great expense to the taxpayers, they look at moving people from Regina to Winnipeg.

But on the positive side I want to say to the member opposite that if you look at the increase in the number of people working at CDSL and their call centre here, which has gone up quite considerably, the hundreds of people working at the Sears call centre that weren't working here a few years ago, or the 4 or 500 people that are going to be coming when CIBC offers their call centre in Regina, you will find that we have a net gain in people working in call centres that is very significant.

Why are they coming here? Because of the competence of workers in Saskatchewan and the tax rate as it would apply to E&H (education and health) on long-distance calls.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Food Bank Use

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Premier. Mr. Premier, when you were leader of the opposition you said you would, and I quote, "put an end to food banks." I quote from *Hansard*, Mr. Premier. You even went a bit further and added that an NDP government was:

. . . going to put as a priority, as an objective within the first term of our government, the elimination of the food banks in the province of Saskatchewan. Nothing else will do.

*Hansard*, March 21, 1990.

Well, Mr. Premier, your first term has come and gone and food banks' lines are longer than they've ever been. Last year, Mr. Premier, our caucus brought forward good Samaritan legislation to ease the burden on food banks and those who rely on them. What have you done, Mr. Premier, to promote the benefits of the good Samaritan Bill and eliminate the need for food banks?

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's concern for the issue of food banks and the issue of poverty in our province. And it has been, as he well knows and as all members know, it has been a lead priority of our government since 1991 and continues to be a lead priority of this government.

Mr. Speaker, we have put together in the most current circumstance, a package of proposals to redesign the delivery of social services. We believe that these proposals that we're advancing will support the independence of those who seek to become independent of welfare and social assistance, and at the same time improve the lives of those who we will continue to support, as good neighbours.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, again to the minister. Mr. Minister, while your government has done little to help food banks, private industry — those you used to criticize in opposition — are taking tangible steps to help. Our office has been in contact with the Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors. They are putting together a package to distribute to grocery stores which will promote the benefits of good Samaritan legislation and outline efficient methods of how grocery stores can donate food to food banks.

Mr. Minister, I commend private industry for taking these steps. What are you doing? What is your Department of Social Services doing to eliminate food banks, as you have promised?

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of our communities and businesses within our communities who, like most of us in Saskatchewan, do share concern for our neighbour.

I had the experience of working with business as I sat as a director of a food bank in Moose Jaw. This is not a new concept that business would work to support the food banks, Mr. Speaker. I repeat again that it has been and remains a high priority of this government to deal with many of these issues, and to the current circumstance, we are advancing some very significant proposals for change.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would remind that member and his caucus, and indeed all the members and all the people of our province, that life would be for all the people of Saskatchewan — and particularly for the poor — better, if today we were not dealing with the heap of debt that that group of people left on all of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Plains Health Centre Closure

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, a further question and this question is to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, I understand that one of your cabinet colleagues, the Minister of Energy and Mines, is going into hospital for surgery today, and our caucus would like to wish him all the best for a speedy recovery. We are, however, a little surprised to hear he's having back surgery, as he's always accused us of giving him a pain somewhere else.

We also were interested to learn that his surgery is taking place in the Plains health care centre, a hospital your government will be closing in a couple of years. Mr. Minister, in light of the valuable service the Plains Health Centre is providing to so many people, including your minister, will you now reconsider your decision to close the Plains Health Centre?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for the concern he shows for my colleague in the cabinet, and I share that concern and I will pass your best wishes on to my cabinet colleague.

I want to say to the member that the services that are provided to the people of Regina and southern Saskatchewan at the Plains Health Centre are going to be provided in exactly the same way at the Pasqua Hospital and the General Hospital, Mr. Speaker.

What these members are trying to do is convince people that somehow the services are going to be taken away, but those services are going to continue in the same way they always have except they're going to be in better facilities.

Now these members, Mr. Speaker, have this wrong about this issue. This issue was an issue that has been made by two boards of the Regina Health District. And I say to that member in the Conservative Party and I say to the Liberal Party, that if they are saying that the boards in the communities that make decisions on the basis of their elections and their appointments should not have the right to make local decisions, I think they should say so. But we're going to support the people in the communities that have made these decisions, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Education Funding

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the members opposite understand how important our education system is. The NDP member from Regina South made some very disturbing comments in this Assembly a couple of weeks ago when discussing our education system. He said, and I quote:

The system we have today is antiquated. It's redundant and it's unresponsive. It is permeated by massive overlaps in some areas and huge gaps in others.

Mr. Speaker, I think the NDP member from Regina South has

our education system confused with the cabinet. Mr. Speaker, boards of education are forced to cover nearly 60 per cent of the costs to operate our education system. Government grants to school boards have declined at alarming rates and it appears that this trend will continue.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Education or the Minister of Finance assure boards that the proverbial budget knife has not been taken to grants to school boards for a fifth consecutive year?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to be able to answer the member's question today, but I'm afraid, according to the rules by which governments operate, he's going to have to just be patient. He's just going to have to be patient and wait until the Minister of Finance delivers the government's budget next Thursday.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have heard ministers blame the federal government for the past number of weeks. We have heard what the reduction in transfer payments are going to be for the next year. The reductions amount to a decrease of .01 per cent of this government's total operating budget. I say again — .01 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, this government is using Ottawa as a buffer so that they can break an election promise and slash the education system of this province. Al Klassen, president of the SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association) said, and I quote:

The consequences of the government's actions if it stays this course are clear: fewer teachers working in Saskatchewan, fewer programs for students, more school closures, and higher property tax.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Education, without blaming someone else, stand up, take responsibility, and tell the concerned people of Saskatchewan why she refuses to preserve our education system?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, there's something over a million people who live in this province and I know of only 10 who don't understand the harm that the federal government has visited upon the finances of this province. And they're all sitting over there.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, they should tune in and try and smell the coffee and figure out what's going on here.

Everybody knows the fact of the matter is that the federal government has reduced the CHST (Canada Health and Social Transfer) envelope by \$106 million for the next fiscal year. And



if the members opposite think that that's easy to handle, then stick around and try and figure out how a government operates and how important \$106 million is in the operation of a province like this.

Not only do they do it this year, they're going to do it again next year and they're going to do it again the year after that. And if you don't think that that impacts on the education and health and social policies of any government across this country, then, Mr. Speaker, they're badly mistaken.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### Government Document Translation

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Premier.

A few weeks ago, students from my constituency, along with some French-speaking students from Quebec, came to visit the legislature. They were given a tour which they enjoyed very much. And at the end of the tour they were given a pin attached to this card — Saskatchewan's flag. As I'm sure you know, the card is printed in English on one side and in French on the other.

Mr. Speaker, imagine my horror and embarrassment when one of the Quebec students pointed out seven mistakes in grammar or spelling on the French side. I would like to send a copy of the card, corrected by the teacher and student, to the member opposite. Like many members in this House today, I do not speak French and I just assumed the translation was correct.

Mr. Speaker, would the minister please explain to this Assembly what safeguards his government has in place for ensuring any translation of government documents are done properly. And will he be recalling the existing stock that is out for distribution?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, the member raises a point with respect to a card to which a Saskatchewan flag pin was attached. And we would certainly take a look at that. Just looking at it quickly, Mr. Speaker, I can see . . . Ask the question, you've got to be quiet and listen to the answer, guys.

Just a quick look at the card indicates that there are serious mistakes in the French translation and we will certainly take a look at that and have it corrected. I thank the member for bringing it to our attention.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The Natural Resources Act

**Hon. Mr. Scott:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the first reading of a Bill to amend The Natural Resources Act, 1993 be now introduced and read for the first time.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Members may want to consult on translations later, but I'm having difficulty hearing the Bill being introduced. I'll ask members to come to order.

##### Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act, 1993 and to make a consequential amendment

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Personal Property Security Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

##### Bill No. 51 — An Act to amend The Film and Video Classification Act

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Film and Video Classification Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

**The Speaker:** — Convert question no. 20 to motions for return (debatable).

Question no. 21 converted to motions for return (debatable).

#### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### SECOND READINGS

##### Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of The Municipal Hail Insurance Amendment Act, 1996.

The present Act provides the framework for the Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association. This association of representatives from rural municipalities provides farmers throughout Saskatchewan with the opportunity to purchase a minimum level of insurance against hail damage to crops.

This Act also allows for the establishment of a wholly owned subsidiary which is called Additional Municipal Hail Limited. This company is licensed and regulated under The Saskatchewan Insurance Act to sell hail insurance in Saskatchewan.

Currently the association is limited by statute with respect to the amount of money it can invest in the subsidiary that sells

insurance. The present cap of \$200,000 was established in 1924. The Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association has requested that the Act be amended to increase the maximum amount it can invest in its subsidiary from \$200,000 to \$2 million.

An increase in capital is necessary after two years of exceptional hail damage. The regulatory requirements of The Saskatchewan Insurance Act dictate that the amount of capital in the subsidiary be increased by \$380,000 as a result of the claims paid out. As the association's investment is already at the \$200,000 limit, the regulatory requirements cannot be met without this amendment to the Act.

Increasing the cap on investment is also consistent with the direction being undertaken by the Superintendent of Insurance to increase over time the level of invested capital for all hail insurers to \$1 million.

The proposed amendment will raise the association's maximum investment level to \$2 million, which will not only meet the regulatory requirement, but will also provide room for further capital injections in the future, should capital be required.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, these amendments respond to the request of the Saskatchewan municipal hail association. They permit the association to invest more money in its subsidiary, as required, and they allow for some additional room should more capital be required.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act.

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to take a few minutes today to discuss the proposed amendments to The Municipal Hail Insurance Act. As there is only one amendment to this Act, I will not discuss it at great length and the details of the entire Act. But as we all know, the effects of hail on crops and property across our province every year are indeed excessive.

The amendment to this Act simply changes the level of permitted investment of capital stock in a company from \$200,000 to a maximum of \$2 million, as the minister opposite indicated. The reason for this change is simple and straightforward. The present level of \$200,000 was set all the way back in 1924 and I hope that we've progressed since that time, Mr. Minister, and would recognize the need for the change.

As I understand it, this proposed increase in the maximum level of investment allowed has been requested due to more than one consecutive season of exceptional hail damage in our province, as you have already indicated. I would also indicate that being a rural resident and a farmer and having to endure many hail storms over the course of my farming career, Mr. Speaker, that I do relate the hail storm similar to some of the ravages of your government however in some of the things that they've done to rural Saskatchewan as well.

I can relate to the health reform which really gutted the health

system in rural Saskatchewan. I can only relate to the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) fiasco which started back in 1992 by a former cabinet minister and be carried on by the present Agriculture minister. The cuts to SaskPower, the underground program which we're seeing deleted; proposed cuts to education; the list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker. But I will not dwell on that today too much.

All of us — rural and urban — are acutely aware of the amount of damage that hail storms have caused here in Saskatchewan in the past and almost certain to appear again. I'm not looking forward to that but it's just a fact of life and what nature does to us. Not only do farmer's crops suffer leaving the farmer with no crop or a dismal one to cultivate and all sorts of problems in looking after the land, preparing it for the following year and trying to adhere to some of the rules that Crop Insurance Corporation has put into place on farmers, causes many problems and time restraints. So there are millions and millions of dollars of costs involved in a hail storm that are not always covered by hail insurance and we have to recognize that.

Not only are people in the rural areas affected but so are the people in the urban areas. I wouldn't like to segregate against them as well, but the hail can cause damage to property of homes and cars and gardens and all those sorts of things as well. So we have to recognize that too, Mr. Speaker.

Due to the fact that the level of investment that is currently allowable was set over 70 years ago, the proposed new level of investment falls in line with today's economy. An investment of \$200,000 does not go nearly as far today as it did in the 1920s unfortunately, and we're seeing greater hardships on the farmers of today.

In light of all this, I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, to hold up the debate on this Bill any longer, and I would approve that The Municipal Hail Insurance Amendment Act, 1996, be passed on to the Committee of the Whole.

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

#### **Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend The Mental Health Services Act**

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of The Mental Health Services Amendment Act, 1996.

Almost three years ago Saskatchewan took the lead in the area of mental health services by introducing The Mental Health Services Amendment Act, 1993. That Act was the first of its kind in Canada because it provided for community treatment orders. Prior to community treatment orders, a small group of people with long-term disabling mental disorders were often unable to function safely in our communities because they refused to follow prescribed treatment and they were destined to suffer needlessly, and sometimes they came into conflict with the law. This resulted in considerable grief for themselves, their families, and other care-givers.

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of community treatment orders has made it possible for those in our community who are too ill to recognize their need for mental health treatment to get the attention they require. This is done on the order of a psychiatrist. It requires a person who meets strict criteria set out in the legislation to submit to compulsory medical treatment but to still be able to live in the community. It avoids their having to be placed in an institution, which of course would be a greater intrusion on their freedom.

For the protection of the individual concerned, the order comes into force not on the word of the first psychiatrist, but a second psychiatrist who has also examined the person and written a certificate in support of the order, which certificate may be enforced for up to three months.

There are about 35 people in Saskatchewan subject to community treatment orders at any given time. They are people with long-term disabling psychiatric conditions who need ongoing medical treatment and who need to be able to get that treatment so they can live in the community.

Community treatment orders make it possible for them to be treated successfully in the community instead of in a hospital. A person who is subject to a community treatment order must submit to medical treatment which is prescribed for the mental disorder and they must attend follow-up appointments.

There are important measures set out in the Act, Mr. Speaker, to protect the individuals who are made subject to these orders, including the right of appeal to an independent review panel. Mr. Speaker, the Act to which I am giving second reading today, that is The Mental Health Services Amendment Act, 1996, will refine and improve certain administrative requirements with respect to community treatment orders.

Essentially, there are five such refinements. First, the Act proposes to change the definition of attending physician. When the original psychiatrist is not available to supervise the person's compliance with the community treatment order, this Act proposes that a psychiatrist other than the one who issued the order may be allowed to provide this supervision.

(1100)

Second, when a person who is named in a community treatment order refuses an examination by a second physician, a new provision would make it possible to compel that person to attend to such an examination.

Third, in rural parts of the province where psychiatrists are not available, a new provision would make it possible for some other physicians to conduct the second examinations and issue the appropriate certificates to bring the community treatment order into force. This, however, would only be valid for 21 days during which a second psychiatrist would have to confirm the order's ongoing validity.

Fourth, current legislation requires that a person's nearest relative be notified when the person is detained in hospital for treatment, involuntarily transferred from one hospital to

another, or placed under a community treatment order. This amendment proposes that under compelling circumstances when notification of the nearest relative could jeopardize the safety or health of a person, the attending physician should be allowed to exercise discretion and not release the information to the nearest relative. Examples would include cases where there had been abuse of the individual by the relative, or for some other reason it would not be in the best medical interests of the person to notify the nearest relative.

Finally, a new provision requires that 21 days should elapse between appeals. At the present time, a person under an order can make multiple and even daily appeals. This makes it necessary to assemble review panels to conduct hearings and render decisions repeatedly. This was not the original intention of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in order to arrive at these amendments, we have consulted with the providers of mental health services in all service areas of the province. As well, we have consulted with the Mental Health Advisory Council and the Schizophrenia Society of Saskatchewan, that is the association of family members and friends of people with schizophrenia, which represents most of the people who may be affected by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, these refinements improve the legislation our government introduced in 1993 by increasing administrative flexibility while respecting and protecting the rights of individuals. They do not involve any policy shift. Accordingly, they are applauded by psychiatrists and mental health program managers. There is complete consensus on most provisions and in any event, there is an acceptance of the provisions as a reasonable compromise and an acceptable balance of interest.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I hereby move second reading of The Mental Health Services Amendment Act, 1996.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Julé:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. Speaker, typically when we talk about health in our society, we are talking about physical health. When we picture hospitals, we generally think of them of places for healing physical injuries, but the overall health of any individual must include mental well-being.

I'm not surprised that most of us avoid talking about mental illness. Unfortunately in our society, there is still a stigma which weighs heavily on mental disorders. People make jokes about crazy people even though they may know perfectly well that mental disorders are not a reflection of an individual's character. No one plans to act oddly. No one chooses to live their life plagued with bouts of depression or schizophrenia, or any other type of mental illness. These people and their families deserve compassion and understanding.

People may have no idea how far-reaching mental illness is in our society. Estimates show that although only 3 per cent of the population suffers from long-term incurable mental illness, well over 30 per cent will suffer from a mental illness that seriously affects their lives. Trauma, periods of stress, or other factors

may prompt a mental illness from appearing, even if a person has no history of problems. So when we talk about reforming The Mental Health Services Act, we are making decisions that could very well deeply affect our own lives at some point in time.

Finding the appropriate changes can be tough. Proper mental health care is a delicate balance between protecting society from harm and protecting an individual from harming himself. So many factors come into play, and they can all have a significant outcome on how people can get through life.

The proposed amendments to The Mental Health Services Act that I have picked out seem dedicated to protecting the rights of an individual living with mental illness. One of the main concerns with families, individuals, and other professionals in the mental health field is making sure the individual is given the rights given to other people in society.

Community treatment orders have consistently been a bone of contention. For years, mental health patients have been concerned that they can be detained in an institution or ordered to seek medical treatment on the orders of one psychiatrist. This Act would make it mandatory that two psychiatrists would be required to sign an order before an individual could be legally detained for a maximum of three months. I agree with that stipulation if that's the way it is.

In the proposed amendment, in communities where two psychiatrists are not available, a general practitioner could sign the community treatment order. We must not punish an individual or a society because only one psychiatrist is accessible in a community. Of course, we do have trouble securing doctors in our province because of faulty government policy, but that debate is for another day.

The other major change I agree with is in the appeal process. Currently one of the biggest complaints in the mental health system is that patients detained by a community treatment order can conceivably make an appeal daily. This costs time and money, and we are already financially strapped in this province if this government is to be believed. I am not advocating that time and money are more important than the rights of an individual, but the legislation as it stands right now can be counter-productive.

As I understand it, the third big change to the existing law has to do with informing the closest relative if a patient is institutionalized. Currently it is mandatory to inform a relative in this case. If this Act is changed, it would allow for a greater degree of leeway when it comes to institutionalized patients. In some forms of mental illness, the patient's reality is very different from the accepted reality of society. These people can be paranoid, and often they turn their thoughts and fears towards the people they are closest to. In the worst case scenario, these people could become more agitated, and their rehabilitation could be slowed if a relative is told about the institutionalization.

As far as I'm concerned, proper health care is about treating everybody as an individual. Lumping people into a standard

model will rarely produce the same results as treating everyone for their unique problems.

Therefore I have no problem with this plan. I have done some consultation with people that this amendment could affect and overall I am fairly satisfied with the proposed changes. I recommend this Bill be passed to the Committee of the Whole, and our caucus will bring up any further concerns at that time. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

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

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act, 1990

**The Chair:** — I would ask the minister to introduce his officials please.

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Yes, I'm pleased to introduce again, Doug Moen who's the executive director of public law and policy in the Department of Justice. I also have with me today, Darcy McGovern who is the Crown solicitor with legislative services, and Brent Prenevost, who is the Crown solicitor with legislative services.

**The Chair:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Chairman, with leave, to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Chair, it's really my pleasure this morning to be able to introduce a small group who have just joined us in the Speaker's gallery. This group of adults are here touring. They're from the Moose Jaw Mental Health Clinic and they're touring the legislature this morning. They're going to spend about 15 minutes with us in the House, I expect, and I'll look forward to having a short visit with them at about 11:30.

Mr. Chair, they're accompanied today by Fairlie Godin. I would ask all members present to welcome these visitors from Moose Jaw.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 25 (continued)

#### Clause 1

**Ms. Draude:** — Welcome to your staff.

I just had a further question on the interest that was going to be paid on the money, that once it was transferred . . . if it's transferred over to the government, to the Department of Finance after 10 years, you said that the interest wouldn't be transferred.

And also I was wondering if after a number of years, somebody comes back and the government does . . . after a number of years if somebody would come back, would there be interest paid to that person if the government had used their money or was using their money for 20 years.

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Thank you for that question. I think, practically, it's in the discretion of the Minister of Finance. I would suspect that it could be paid at that point, and I don't see why it wouldn't be if the government had actually been using that money in the General Revenue Fund for all those years.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

#### **Bill No. 26 — An Act to amend the Statute Law**

**The Chair:** — I would ask the minister to introduce his new officials.

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — I've introduced Mr. Brent Prenevost already, but he is going to help me on this Bill.

#### **Clause 1**

**Mr. Osika:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if we could just ask a few things about this particular Bill of the minister and his officials. First, if I may ask, I would like the minister to kind of give us an overview in general terms what in fact this particular statute covered and what was its purpose — the statute law itself — if you would, please.

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — This particular piece of legislation is sort of a housekeeping Bill, and it deals with very minor amendments to quite a number of statutes, dealing with inaccurate references, numbering errors, typographical errors, and other minor mistakes.

It also corrects errors that were made in previous consequential amendments and makes consequential amendments that were previously missed.

**Mr. Osika:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And this . . . over the last short period of time, have any of these errors, to your knowledge, have any of these errors caused any problems in dealings and any problems that may have arisen as a result of any of these particular Acts or statutes that you're now cleaning up or correcting, as a result of misspelled words or inappropriate verbiage in any portion of the sections?

(1115)

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — There are none, to my knowledge, that have had any consequence at all. They are basically just corrections. And if there were some, we would identify them, and we would end up dealing with them in a different type of amendment, not in this amendment.

**Mr. Osika:** — Thank you again, Mr. Minister. I expect that this was a long and arduous process, that various departments . . . or was there one particular department or number of people that were assigned specifically to review all these statutes in order that we now arrive at this stage?

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — I think the best way to say is that somewhere somebody has a file, and every time they see too many A's in a word, something else, they make a little note on it and it goes into the file. And then eventually all of these things are gathered together into this particular Act to correct everything that some of the people have found over the last year or two or three.

**Mr. Osika:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I don't have any other concerns. Thank you very much.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 28 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

#### **Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Hotel Keepers Act**

#### **Clause 1**

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Minister, I would just like some clarification, and it's more around the area of the hotelier's right to have the person leave after a first disturbance. Do you see the possibility that there could be some abuse there by a hotelier if indeed someone is slightly out of order, slightly out of order, and they decide, the hotelier decides, that to ensure that there is no further disturbance he immediately asks that person to leave? If he does not, if he refuses to leave, is he automatically creating a disturbance and then therefore is immediately going to be receiving a \$250 fine?

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — I appreciate that question. I think what we have to remember is that this is a . . . the hotelier is a business person and they will be using some of their . . . also their commercial sense of what's appropriate in how they deal with this.

But I think that it's . . . if the hotelier names or requests somebody to stop making noise, or whatever the problem is, that you're not immediately into the provisions of this legislation, because there is also the sort of continuation of that, and that practically the remedies here would usually be quite a ways down the road, last resort, and that most disturbances would be dealt with completely outside of this kind of a legislative remedy.

And I think that's true of all of the kinds of statutes that we have that create penalties — that it's there to give the hotelier

the ultimate power. And also, I suppose in this case, the hoteliers have agreed that they are also subject to the fact that if they don't keep a quiet hotel, or a hotel that's at least a reasonable haven away from disturbances, then a guest could complain that the place is a rowdy place.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Yes, well I concur. I mean we've all stayed at hotels and we've been privy to many a party, I'm sure, on a particular floor . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon me? I have never been booted out, no.

Who is the final person that determines whether or not there is the disturbance? Is it the hotelier, because I am the client, or is it a police officer? Like, who decides that there is a disturbance?

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Well practically, a police officer would have to lay the charge, but finally it would be a judge in a court that would make the decision. So it'd be like, I suppose, even a speeding offence. You're charged. If you don't agree with that charge, you have the right to go and tell your story and then a judge would make the ultimate decision.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Good, and thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

I think all hoteliers will use discretion. I mean I wonder about the particular situation where if I am to be . . . if there is a slight disturbance, and it's not a full-scale situation where I am on the verge of having a police officer called to have me evicted, I worry about the situation where the hotelier then says, because there is the fear that I will get a \$250 fine if we proceed through the laying of the charge, and the hotelier then says, well you have the option; you can leave. Do you see that that could be a problem?

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — I think, once again, it's a matter that will be dealt with in a reasonable fashion by a person who is a business person, making a decision about what kind of guests they want to keep there. I mean if they want a place that encourages parties and things like that, then probably they would set it up in a way that encourages people like the staid members of this place to come there. So I think, practically, it would be dealt with in a commercial basis.

Maybe the net effect of this change that we're making in this piece of legislation is that it will just change that little placard that's usually in each room, and it's from \$25 to \$250. So you'll know that it's a little more serious to create a party than it had been before.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you very much. And I agree — I mean we're looking at 1965 numbers. And I know that in terms of \$250 versus \$25, I think we're just catching up to the real costs. Thank you.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — I'd like to thank my officials for their assistance in this matter and I'd also like to thank the members opposite for their thoughtful questions.

(1130)

#### **Bill No. 16—An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act**

**The Chair:** — I would ask the Minister of Highways to introduce his officials, please.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to introduce Dave Abbey, manager of the legislation and safety branch of the Department of Highways and Transportation.

#### **Clause 1**

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering if the minister could just give us a brief overview of the Bill before we start.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Thanks to the member for his question. Generally it's a clean-up. There's a few new sections that we have introduced that have been requested by the Department of Justice. In one case there was a fatality involved so we're changing the regulations . . . or the Act a bit to cover that concern. But the majority of it just a clean-up of The Highway Traffic Act.

Clause 1 agreed to.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Yes, you got through that. Clause 1 went a little too quickly. I would ask permission to revert back to clause 1.

#### **Clause 1**

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have a few questions for you on this particular Act, Mr. Minister. And before I reach that point though, I would like to welcome your assistant with you, your officials, Mr. Abbey. We had the opportunity to tour the province and inspect a number of the highways last year, and while we found those in northern Saskatchewan to be relatively in good shape, those that we had to travel through southern Saskatchewan were perhaps . . . we could be less complimentary about them.

And I would certainly encourage the minister to take the opportunity to drive those highways along the very southern edge of our province, perhaps Highway 13 from either east to west or west to east and learn to appreciate the countryside of Saskatchewan, because you will spend more time dodging the potholes than you will simply driving down the road.

But that doesn't deal directly with the issues within this Bill, Mr. Minister, and I wonder if you could please tell us what the remunerations for the Highway Traffic Board members were prior to this legislation, since you're changing the method in which they were paid. How were they paid previously, and what was that remuneration?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Thanks for the member for that question. There's no change in the remuneration. But what we're doing at the request of Justice is putting it into the Act. It's going to parallel other boards and commissions, so there's no change.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I want to welcome you and your officials here to talk about this Act that you're proposing to put into law today. Just from your preamble, I noted that you said you're trying to clean up some things, and we're sort of wondering just how far that clean-up is going and if it's going to cover some of the things that are of concern to our constituents.

I note that in the Bill, you are dealing specifically with the term, agricultural implement, and that piqued my curiosity because we have had some concerns in our constituency from farmers who have been moving equipment on roads. And it appears, I guess, when you get into an accident on a road, there doesn't seem to be a definitive law in our system to determine who is at fault or who is guilty of a crime or who isn't guilty of a crime or who isn't at fault. There really isn't anything definitive on the whole issue of moving these implements on the secondary highways and on the municipal roads.

So we're wondering if somehow you have addressed this problem in this Act, seeing as how it's supposed to clear up some of these problems as you've alluded to.

And just to get your mind onto the subject a little more, we have a specific case on a road south of Tompkins, Saskatchewan where a young farmer is moving a tractor with a cultivator. He comes into a low spot on the road. A vehicle approaches him from the other direction over a hill very quickly, has very little time to slow down but in fact does get pretty well slowed down. The young farmer, of course, is also trying to stop as quickly as he can and get off to the side as much as he can, but the result is that the truck hits the side of the cultivator, and there's a bit of a wreck — nothing too serious, fortunately.

But it does raise some questions because the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) called to the scene made the determination to tell the young farmer that he could be charged and that he might in fact be charged. After the fact, he wasn't charged of course, but now we wonder.

How does this process work, and is this kind of a problem dealt with in this legislation? Or have you simply left it go into regulations, as I think is alluded to further on in the Bill? In which case nothing is solved and we still don't have a definitive answer. So I'll let you comment, Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — I thank the member for the question. This does not limit the size of the vehicle on the road. That's dealt with in other areas. And I guess what I want to tell the member, that the person can in fact get additional insurance, but the owner is always responsible, you know, in a case like that. And I mean it doesn't really matter, the size of the vehicle, whether it's a very small one or a very large one.

What we're doing here is . . . because of ag diversification in the province of Saskatchewan, we have a lot of small companies, in fact farmers, building farm implements. And they are concerned that in some cases these vehicles are not used for a road vehicle but in fact used in the farm operation. And I can send you some pictures of some of the situations that are out there. And so what we want to do is allow what's a farm vehicle or a farm-used implement to be considered that way.

On the other hand, if it's used primarily for on the road, that it'd have to be registered. And those will be dealt with in regulations. And those regulations, there will be a lot of consultation over the next few months. Hopefully they would be brought into this session if the session is still sitting. If not, certainly they would be done at another time. But there will be a lot of consultation as to what should be a farm implement and what should not. And this is what we're trying to address, is the small manufacturers, the farmers that are in fact inventing a new farm implement.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Minister, what has happened here is that you've managed to give me about 10 different questions to ask, and I still don't understand that I've gotten an answer because you really haven't resolved the problem at all, I think is what you're saying, and that you're going to work on it.

And of course we want you to work on that; we do want that resolved. But the question that rises in my mind immediately is that if you're going to do it in regulations and through consultation, who are you planning on consulting with? Who are you planning on talking about this with? Who's going to know what these regulations are going to be? And how are we going to have public input or public knowledge about it if it's not done here on the floor of this Assembly in some form of process that includes those of us who are elected to represent our people?

My constituent came to me with that problem and said, how do we address this problem of liability? Buy more insurance — well, that's easy for you to say. Who's going to insure them? Who will give you liability insurance? How much is that going to cost? Those are things that come up immediately.

What if this young farmer happens to be a 15-year-old boy who doesn't have a driver's licence? Is he covered under any part of the law with liability insurance? He doesn't have a licence; his vehicle doesn't have to be licensed. How is that farmer then protected?

Or can we go back to the American scenario, where in fact we're going to find our farmers ending up in court and being sued for the cost of their farms because there is no law that really protects them or tells them definitively what their responsibilities are or are not.

And right now, we don't have that. And what we need is a definitive law, not through regulation, but put into an Act and discussed in this legislature and then passed and have people know exactly where they stand. Because we found a loophole in our system that really amounts to every individual farmer

having to wait and depend on the court system to decide for them after an accident whether or not they're going to lose their farms. And that's not fair to farmers and it's certainly not fair to the travelling public that happens to meet those farmers on the road. So it is a negative factor for everyone.

Minister, I want you to think about that and address that question on the licensing, on the liability, and how we can solve this problem and incorporate perhaps an amendment into this Bill in order to achieve the results that we require, and that is to bring some peace of mind to the community.

Can you suppose that you're a farmer now out in Saskatchewan having to move your equipment. I would guess, just off the top of my head, that probably 95 per cent of farm equipment is more than eight feet wide these days. And I would guess that probably 75 per cent of farmers have to travel on roads in order to farm land that is not adjacent to one quarter to the other. Absolutely impossible then for any farmer to have any peace of mind in Saskatchewan if they have to move on a road. Because they now know that there isn't a law that protects them, and without a law to protect them, every time they go out on that road they may in fact be jeopardizing their farm operation.

So how does that affect the farmer who has a hired man? Is now the farmer at risk of losing his farm because the hired man goes out on the road with the cultivator and happens to run into another truck or a car; or perhaps a person from the city that's out joyriding or visiting the area and all of sudden you end up in a wreck and you've got a lawsuit on your hands?

How can farmers live with any peace and contentment in their lives knowing that this kind of risk potential is out there and you aren't prepared to deal with it when you say that you are going to bring in an Act to clean up the problems that are in The Highway Traffic Act. I mean if you're going to clean up the problems, the ones that have been presented to you ought to be the ones that you start to work on.

And this is one of those areas where now we find ourselves wondering, what about implement dealers? They're called upon to deliver equipment. How are they responsible now if they hook onto a cultivator behind their truck and start transporting it out to the country? I'd like you to address that issue as well, as you go into this.

Where do they stand? Are they liable and responsible then to lose their dealerships if they happen to have an accident on the road with a piece of equipment that's over width.

Now we know that you can get permits for the highway. I don't know of any permits that are required for municipal travelling in municipal roads and that sort of thing. So where do they stand in this whole scheme of things?

I'll allow you the opportunity to answer, Mr. Minister.

**The Chair:** — Order, order. Why is the member on her feet?

**Ms. Murray:** — With leave, to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Murray:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I thank the member from Maple Creek and the Minister of Highways for this courtesy.

It's a great pleasure for me to introduce this morning to you and through you to my colleagues in the legislature, a group of 22 students from Glendive School in Montana, United States of America. They are with the International Club and they are here as part of a tour of Canada, stopping to visit in the capital city of Saskatchewan, Regina, to watch and see how our Legislative Assembly works.

So I am pleased to introduce them and to introduce their teachers, Bruce Peterson and Roseanne Bos. And I will ask all members to extend to them a warm welcome.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 16 (continued)

#### Clause 1

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Thank you very much. Farm vehicles, farm machinery do not need a permit on Saskatchewan roads between certain times of the day — sunrise and sunset — and this Act, the changes to the Act will not change that. Certainly if someone hits someone, they're responsible, they're liable. And people have to know that.

And in regards to the question of a 15-year-old, I would hope that farmers know that shouldn't be recommended. Because if your 15-year-old son or relative or friend is driving your vehicle and is in a collision on the highway, certainly there is no insurance at all. So I would urge that that's a major concern and they should not do that.

(1145)

**Mr. Goohsen:** — So, Minister, you're saying that my 15-year-old son now in Saskatchewan can't drive a tractor on the road?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — That's correct.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — That's news to me. You know, realistically, I've thought for a long time that anybody that was responsible and capable of driving and could drive a tractor was allowed to do so and you didn't have to a driver's licence or any other kind of permit to drive. And if you don't have to have a licence and there's no restriction under that process of our law, what part of the law then would restrict a person from being able to drive if they were at any age? You know, I think maybe you'd better think about that answer a little more carefully.



Before the students from the States leave, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to just welcome them here from the side of the opposition benches and the Conservative Party, and we're glad to have you in Saskatchewan. We hope that you'd have a good time and don't run into that blizzard that's out there.

Minister, to get back to work here. I think I'm going to make a suggestion to you, because in all fairness, it's easy to criticize what you're doing here because you really have left out an awful lot of what needs to be done in cleaning up The Highway Traffic Act. And I think really you could have done a better job on this. But rather than just stand here and criticize, I'm going to make a suggestion to you.

I think you can put an amendment into this Bill very quickly and very easily that would simply say that farm vehicles have the right of way on our Saskatchewan secondary road systems, and that they would have that right of way at all times and under all conditions, with perhaps some regulations that would say that they have to have a slow moving vehicle sign, perhaps a flashing light. Other than that, be totally alleviated from all liability and responsibility, providing that the machine and the equipment is operated under safe and normal and reasonable conditions.

And I think there's nothing wrong with having a definitive answer to the law that simply says that — that you're not going to be responsible or liable as long as you're moving under normal, reasonable conditions, and aren't drunk, or doing some other law infraction; or wandering helter-skelter, you know, because you're under the influence of drugs. And obviously we have laws that cover that.

So I think the law can be very definitive and can be very exacting and say specifically what we want, and that's that farmers have no responsibility or liability that will cost them their farms in the event of an accident on a rural road providing that these things are covered.

And I think we can extend that even to the highway system for our machinery dealers and people that have to come off of the highway systems onto the rural roads. And I don't think that the general public would argue with that, Minister. So I wonder if you'll consider that and answer my previous question.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well I think what the people of Saskatchewan want, to the member opposite, is that people follow the rules of the road. And that's exactly what we're saying. The changes to the Act here are not dealing with that specific issue.

I want to clarify the issue of the 15-year-old. Certainly you do not need a driver's licence to drive a farm vehicle. However, you have to be . . . you cannot be younger than 16 years old. So you have to be very careful with that one. And I would urge that you tell all your farmer friends that if in fact the person is under 16 years old, that there certainly are some liability concerns there.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well thank you, Minister, and we certainly will pass that on. Because I think there are an awful lot of

farmers that really don't believe that they're breaking the law or have any extra liability if they allow a young son to move a tractor on the road.

Now the definition of a vehicle comes to mind. And it seems to me that you're going to have some problems here with people looking at different kinds of vehicles and saying, well now I got this truck type vehicle that sort of maybe has the cab already ripped off and a few things, but it's got a big water tank on it to haul water for spray, and is that a farm vehicle? I can think of maybe a bale wagon type of farm equipment that might come into some dispute as to whether it is now a truck or is it a farm vehicle. We've got the self-propelled types.

So how in this Act or in the process of your definitions, how do you define what a motor vehicle is and which ones are and which ones aren't? And I know I've had a constituent ask that specific question about the bale wagon type of vehicle. It was a home-made thing that was built onto an old truck chassis. And because it hadn't been made by a manufacturer, there was a dispute as to whether it was a farm vehicle or whether it was in fact a motor vehicle and had to be licensed and insured. So could you tell us how you make that differentiation.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well to the member opposite, this is exactly why we're changing the Act, so that we can address these issues through regulations. And I will send these pictures over if I can, and I would like them back.

It just will demonstrate the problem that's out there. Because we've got vehicles right now that are hauling bales for instance, but from one quarter section to one quarter section it looks like a truck but because of maybe wheel size or because of speed limitations, really is not a truck. It's a vehicle that the farmer invented to help on his farm.

We had the case in Prince Albert last year where the fellow collects manure, liquefies it, and then spreads it in fields for the farmers in the area. He has large wheels on his vehicle so that he can only travel at a very slow miles per hour, like 25 miles per hour. And it's really . . . but it looks like a truck, but it really is not a truck any longer. It has the cultivator and the spreader on the back in fixed positions.

So this is some of the problems that we have to address for our farm community out there. Does he need to register those vehicles or does he not? Is it a farm vehicle or is it not? And there's a lot of these situations out there. And over the next few months we will be consulting with different groups, farm organizations, to get some idea of what kind of standards can we use for farm implements; what kind of regulations should be in place to determine whether it's a farm vehicle or a farm implement rather than a vehicle.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well thank you, Minister. And I appreciate your having sent the pictures over so that we can see that we are actually talking about more or less the same kind of vehicles. And I guess we could probably come up with some pictures of some that aren't quite so pretty maybe as these ones — they've even got paint on them. But the reality is that the principle is the same.

So then I want to get back, Minister, and you say this is why you're bringing the Bill in and you're going to have these regulations and you're going to come up with answers to all these problems, and we want you to get these problems answered all right. But again you didn't answer my question then, who are you going to consult with?

Now in your pictures you show bale handling equipment to a large extent, I see. Who would you consult with that would represent them? Surely you can't expect to go and talk with every farmer in the province. Or maybe you will. If that's the case, fine. Maybe you're going to have another commission or another road tour like we went on with the safe driving committee. Maybe Mr. Abbey and my colleague here could join with you and we'll go around the province and talk to each and every farmer and find out exactly what everybody's problem is. Realistically though, I suppose you're not considering that. But if you are, let us know and we'll certainly cooperate and participate.

But on the other hand, if you're choosing not to do that route and go and talk to each and every individual, then who do you talk to that represents each of these different groups? Are you going to talk to SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), the National Farmers Union? Who represents these people in your negotiations? And if they have input that they want to get to you, how are they going to go about that process? Do they all write you a letter or do they expect that there'll be a meeting some place that they can talk to you about these regulations? How is it going to be done? Where is the process?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well certainly the process has not been determined yet but certainly we will want to talk with SARM and SUMA, the different farm organizations, certainly dealers, certainly the farm community, and certainly the opposition. I mean, if you have any ideas at all or . . . and I'm sure you have one or two good ideas that you could probably send them over. So we're going to be listening.

As you might appreciate, this is a very, very difficult area. There's a lot of new inventions by the farmers. We have very innovative farmers out there, and so we're certainly going to . . . it's a concern that we have to address, but it's a very difficult area.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well thank you, Minister. I appreciate the fact that you are now going to consult with people and that you have specifically spelled out for the record those that might be included. I think you might want to expand your list actually though, and make sure that you catch everybody.

I have a little problem understanding the section 23(5), and in there it refers to a resident who is temporarily driving for non-commercial purposes, a vehicle for which a permit has been issued by another jurisdiction. Could you explain to us, is that going to allow the permit from another jurisdiction to apply in Saskatchewan? Or how is that going to work?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well thank you to the member opposite.

A very interesting question, one I asked my department people several times. Right now if my brother, for an example, who lives in Alberta, Pincher Creek, comes to visit me and I want to run over for groceries and I jump in his vehicle and run over for groceries, it's not legal.

And we don't think that's fair. In fact we believe that it's probably against the Constitution. So this is why I mentioned that this Bill is trying to clean up some of these areas. This is one area that we're trying to clean up.

So in fact I can take my brother's car over to get the loaf of bread at the confectionery store when he comes to visit me. That's what it does.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister, that makes sense. And I'm glad you're doing that, and I'm glad that I asked the question, so it'll clear that up.

I would ask you once more, because I don't think you really answered my question, whether or not you would entertain some kind of amendments that would allow you to specifically spell out some of the things. And I gave you the one suggestion where definitively farm vehicles could be on the road.

Would you consider that, or would we be wasting our time to go to the work of delaying this and preparing the amendment? If we're going to be wasting our time, you may as well tell us today, and then we'll carry on.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well certainly if you have some amendments that we can look at, we'll certainly be interested in at least taking a look at them. I would hope that the amendments wouldn't be something right off the wall or anything like that. I'm sure they wouldn't be, so send them over, and we'd certainly take a look at them.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister. I appreciate that, and I've got my colleague working on the legal process that we'll have to go through. And he'll figure out how we get this through the legal department here in the legislature in order to get that amendment drawn up. And if we can't get it introduced today, maybe we'll introduce it as a private members' Bill later or something like that so that we can bring it in.

I don't know if we're going to hold the Bill up or how we're going to handle this. But as he gets his research, we will know in a couple of minutes.

In the meantime, I would ask you if you could explain more carefully section 7. And I suppose I could go clause by clause, but I'm not sure we want to let you get that far into it, so I'll go to these specific questions. Could you explain what your intention is in clause 7? It will save me reading it and save a lot of time.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — I thank the member for the question. What this amendment does is make it a law that large trucks, for an example, that are stopped for some mechanical problem on a road outside of a city or town would have to use both flares and hazard lights. And it says that the flares have to be 30

metres from the vehicle. So there's some distance requirement there.

This stems from a fatality that happened back — was it last year? — a couple years ago, in fact, where there was a vehicle of a certain size that was stopped at a municipal road. There was a collision, it was at night, there was no flares. So we want to address that situation.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, now getting back to this point about farm machinery. If this happens to be a cultivator with a flat tire, is this farm equipment exempt or not exempt because it is farm equipment, or does he now have to start carrying flares in the tractor?

(1200)

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — It's not required on that type of a farm implement.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister. We're going to be working on trying to draft up some assistance for your Bill, to try to make it more workable for the province. We think you've done a reasonably good job in most of the areas, by the look of it, but I think you've missed the target on a couple of points. So we'll try and put that together in the next couple days.

And my colleague here has some questions, so I'm going to turn it over to him. And thank you for your direct responses and thank your official for his help in the past, as well as here today. We've met with him and we very much appreciate that open approach that he has to discussing the issues that we have with our constituents. And we very much appreciate that. Thank you, Minister.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Minister, I have a couple questions for you under section 6, clause 6 of the Bill, where it applies to exceptions to the rules.

I wonder if you could clarify what you mean by the highway traffic devices and how you are interpreting this piece of the legislation to actually be implemented and work.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well this is another section of the Bill that's here for clean-up purposes in a sense, though it's a new section. What happens now is that by law, you have to stop at a stop sign. And by law, you have to stop or yield at a yield sign. But by law, for example, a driver, where there's a sign, no left turn, for an example, can make a no left turn and really not be against the law or offending the law. So we're cleaning that up so that in fact if there is a no left turn sign, that in fact it is against the law then to make a left turn.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. We can certainly understand why you would want to make it against the law for anyone to go to the left. We perfectly agree with you on that; I think you should encourage that.

But my concern, Mr. Minister, deals with traffic control devices, and I wonder if you could expand what you mean by that. Do you mean electronic devices such as signal lights on

highways? Now those can malfunction. So when you say you have to obey whatever those signs are telling you without any recourse, as this piece of legislation would outline, you could run into some very serious problems here where somebody is disobeying the rules of the road simply because the highway traffic device is failing in some manner. And I think that leaves this piece of legislation open to some very serious concerns.

I have one other concern though that deals with your assistant, Mr. Minister, that you can consider while you're thinking of the answer to this. I'm surprised to see your official in here without his gown on today, because the last time he was here, he was wearing a gown as the Clerks do, which seemed appropriate at the time, and he has failed to do so. So you can contemplate that.

But I'd like you to consider the highway traffic control devices and expand it a little more from simply a fixed sign to those electronic instruments that are out there.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — I think what the member is asking . . . I'm not sure, but probably to do with traffic lights and in fact if the traffic lights are not working. If the traffic lights are not working, you revert to the rules of the road. So people on the right, for instance, have the right of way, etc.

And certainly in the earlier question about no left turns on a no left turn sign, we're going to do that on right turns as well.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, it's possible though for a highway traffic signals . . . say that both of them are green at the same time because one of them has failed to switch and the other has switched. And so as far as the traffic coming from either direction is concerned, they're both in the right. But one of the signals has failed. And so if you see a vehicle approaching from the opposite direction or from the side and you say, I've got the green light and I'm going to go through that even if I end up to be dead right, I think there's a problem there, Mr. Minister. And so when you say exceptions for . . . that you . . . if I can read the clause:

Every person operating a motor vehicle shall obey the instructions of any traffic control device.

I think you need some sort of appeal in there or some sort of clarifications that when they're operating properly.

**The Chair:** — I want to just, for the clarification of the committee, to advise the member that officials helping the minister do not have to wear cloaks in the House.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well I'm not sure if that's ever happened, the scenario that the member opposite mentions. But if it is a problem, certainly it's something that we would look at.

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you — not so fast, Mr. Speaker — thank you. I know it is Friday. I have a number of questions, and some of them have been hit on a little bit, but I'd like to go back if I could, Mr. Minister, when we were talking about the definition of agricultural implement. And maybe it would be

appropriate if you could tell us right now what the current definition of agriculture implement is.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Okay, under section 2(1)(b) of the existing Act:

“agricultural implement” means a vehicle designed and adapted exclusively for agricultural, horticultural or livestock raising operations.

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you. I guess we’ve heard you say that you’re going to be consulting over the next while with the people that are involved — the farmers, the people in rural Saskatchewan — and I would take it from that you’re going to be redefining agriculture implement then. Is that right?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Correct.

**Mr. McLane:** — I guess the question I would have then would be, Mr. Minister, is why is it not possible to have that definition right in the Bill?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well the reason I guess, to the member opposite, is that ag diversification is changing so rapidly that what we might cover in a Bill today might not be good for tomorrow. So I think regulations is the right place to determine that because regulations can be changed quicker than an Act can be changed. And so in the fast-changing agricultural scene, I think it’s best that those be placed in regulations.

**Mr. McLane:** — I think, Mr. Minister, that some of the problems that we’re seeing with many of the Bills . . . is that very thing. The problem with doing things in regulations is that they are done . . . us as elected people do not have a chance to talk about those. They’re done behind closed doors, and they go out and things are changed. We do not see that. That’s a problem I raised a couple of days ago with any of the legislation that we’re going to be looking at . . . is the problem with regulations. The Bill is wide in scope, and yet in the regulation is where all of the problems are arising from.

So I don’t see a problem with going back and revisiting legislation to change those terms. And I would ask you that you would try and initiate some of these changes and get some of the things out of regulations and get them into the Bill so that we have a chance to debate it and look at it. And so that the people that you’re consulting with, along with whether it’s the opposition here or who it is . . . that we know what’s going to be changed, what’s coming down the road.

I guess the problem I would have with it, if we . . . the term agriculture implement here is really what this is about to start with. So if you’re going to go out, consult, come back, and through the regulations put in the definition, and we don’t happen to agree with that, we really don’t have the opportunity to talk about it and discuss whether that is appropriate or not. So I ask you once again if you would consider putting some of things right into the Bill.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well thank you for the question. I want to tell the member opposite, this government has always been

very open and honest, and we will continue to do that. We certainly will table regulations if they’re ready before the House adjourns. If not, I’m certainly willing to send you over the regulations so you can take a look at them. But what might even be more useful to us is that if the Liberal Party could come up with their idea of a definition and send them over to us, we certainly will take that into account.

**Mr. McLane:** — I appreciate that offer. Once again my concern would be that as you’re consulting with the people out there . . . and it was raised earlier whether it was going to be a farm group or who’s going to be representing those people, whether it’s all the farmers in the province, which I’m not sure you have the time to do or the resources to do that . . . it is indeed what the farmers of the province want to see in that definition. So I appreciate your offer, and we’ll be taking you up on that as well.

I guess, just in conclusion on that point, Mr. Minister, have you done any consulting to that, and can you give us some ideas what you might be looking for in change in terms of that definition — agriculture implement?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Certainly that’s one of the reasons we want to consult. Some of the ideas that have come forth so far is perhaps speed be part of the equation, perhaps the size of the tires, and how that would limit speed — some of the few ideas that have come forth so far.

But certainly we will be wanting to listen to the farm organizations, to dealers, to farmers, your ideas, as well as the Conservatives’ ideas, before those regulations are developed.

**Mr. McLane:** — I’d just be a little careful if I were you, Mr. Minister, in listening to the third party’s ideas. I heard the member earlier talk about how good the roads are in northern Saskatchewan. I spent a considerable amount of time up in the North this fall as I do every fall, and I’m not sure where he was, but I didn’t find that the roads were very acceptable up there either. So I’d be a little careful on accepting his advice.

I guess if we can then . . . Now you talk about official signage again, and I guess there again the definition of official sign. Is there a definition of that term right now?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Right now, for instance, the Highway Traffic Board might set a speed limit, and then we would have the authority then to put up the official sign. And that’s what my officials say, that the official sign portion of this Act does, is pursuant to the power authority governed by this particular Act.

**Mr. McLane:** — I’m not sure I understand. I’m not sure I understand your response, Mr. Minister. Maybe you could try once more on that, could you?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — What this change does is . . . if there is a sign erected pursuant to this Act, it becomes an official sign. And that’s part of the clean-up that I was talking about earlier.

**Mr. McLane:** — So official sign in the context of this means a road sign; it doesn't mean the sign on a vehicle?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Yes, it does.

**Mr. McLane:** — The next question would obviously be then. The official signage for a slow-moving vehicle, which would be an agriculture implement, is that going to be addressed in this legislation, or is that addressed elsewhere, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — No, not in this Act but it is in the regulations. So if there is some concern or some suggestions with that regulation, certainly we could take a look at that.

**Mr. McLane:** — I'll point out to you right now, the concern that there is, is that — I don't recall the timing of it; it's years ago — that the triangle florescent sign was designated as the official slow-moving sign. I'm just wondering if that's being reviewed, if we're looking at that, that's going to be maintained as official signage, or in how it's been enforced. Many of the farmers use different types of signage. So I'm wondering if we're looking at changing that as well — an example of another problem with the regulations.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — The regulations on the slow-moving sign is dealt with under The Vehicle Administration Act, which is a different Act. But certainly if you have some suggestions in regards to some concern or some changes that you're requesting, if you would send them over to the minister in charge of SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance), he certainly would take a look at your suggestions.

**Mr. McLane:** — My next question, Mr. Minister, is on the Traffic Board, and I'm just wondering if you could tell us how many members comprise that board.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — There are six board members.

**Mr. McLane:** — Could you tell us who those individuals are?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — The members of the board are Bob Long, who is chairman; Allan Oliver; Jim Mills; Louis Wolkowski; Zenny Burton; and Christine Schmitt; and Barry Weafer is the secretary of the board.

**Mr. McLane:** — Of those members, Mr. Minister, is there a northern rep on that board?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Christine Schmitt is from the Arborfield area so . . . I don't what you mean by north I guess. North of where?

**Mr. McLane:** — I think the minister knows what I'm getting at. We're talking about northern Saskatchewan. We've talking about Ile-a-la-Crosse. Use that as a parallel.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — There's none at this time.

**Mr. McLane:** — Would that be something that might be addressed in this legislation or is that something that's going to be decided in regulations again?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — This is done by orders in council. And it's been the position of this government that we would like to keep boards and commissions to a minimum. But certainly if there is at some time where there is a board member that resigns, maybe it could be looked at at that time.

**Mr. McLane:** — Could you tell us how long the present members, the six of them, how long have they been there on reserve appointments?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — To the member opposite, I'm going to try and give the years, but I'm not sure how accurate they are. And I'm wondering if I could send that information at some point in time to you?

My belief is that Mr. Long began serving on the board in 1993, Mr. Oliver and Mr. Mills in '94, Mr. Wolkowski and Christine Schmitt in '91, Burton in '94.

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'd appreciate it if you would send that across at some point.

Can you tell us possibly then how long the appointments are for and when would then expire?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — The appointments are two years. And so there's some that will come up . . . I can't recall just offhand when, but it's a two-year term.

**Mr. McLane:** — Is it opened ended? How many reappointments can there be?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Right now it's open ended. But like I said earlier, the government wants to keep boards and commissions to a minimum.

**Mr. McLane:** — You mentioned that they're appointed by an order in council. Are there are qualifications that a member must have in order to be appointed or to sit on the board?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Certainly this government believes that the qualifications and requirements are just to be a good citizen. And I think we'll continue to do that because that gives us points of view from many different walks of life, and I think it certainly gives good input to a board like the Highway Traffic Board.

**Mr. McLane:** — On the board, to ensure it — and I suspect there's possibly some differences on the board when it comes to applying regulations — is there anything in place, a check and balance system in order to facilitate a problem of that nature?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — The Highway Traffic Board, as the member will know, is a quasi-judicial board, so they can in fact review their particular decision, you know, a process to them, and/or I would suspect then it would maybe be the courts. But they are a quasi-judicial board.

**Mr. McLane:** — A simple question — how often does the board meet? Is it required to meet at certain times or a number of times throughout the year?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Under mode of carrier issues, the Highway Traffic Board meets between — and it varies depending on the requests and the issues — about 18 times a year. The driver's licence, which is two members of the board on a committee, about 30 times a year. There's about another 15 days a year involved in public hearings. But it certainly depends on the workload that comes before the board.

**Mr. McLane:** — Is that all the committees of the whole . . . that you mentioned?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Yes, there's the two committees: the motor carrier committee and the driver's licence committee.

**Mr. McLane:** — I guess this question I wasn't thinking about asking, but it comes to mind when you talk about the driver's licence thing. We've got another Bill coming up very shortly under review as well. And I'm just wondering how the powers of the Traffic Board are going to be affected in relationship to that Bill. How are we going to address that?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — That question probably should be put to the minister in charge of SGI when the next Bill comes.

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you. Can you tell us what the remuneration for the board members are?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — The Highway Traffic Board members' honorarium rates are \$120 for a member, \$175 for the chairman. And government rates are \$24.61 per day for meals and \$28.38 per kilometre.

**Mr. McLane:** — Per kilometre? Can I drive?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Cents.

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you. I almost got excited there. Go back to the Board of Internal Economy and raise that one.

Thank you, Mr. Minister. You've answered my questions regarding the per diems. I assume that they apply as well to the committees. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — It is.

**Mr. McLane:** — And the cost for the travel and sustenance, you've already answered. I guess in the proposed legislation, you are suggesting a change. Again I assume that's being done through regulations. Can you tell us what you're looking at? Are you going to be offering a decrease to these board members?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — This amendment here makes no change at all. The amendment adds that provisional members of the Highway Traffic Board to receive the remuneration and at the rates approved for government employees. It's always been done in the past but just was never in the Act.

**Mr. McLane:** — So you are not suggesting that there be an increase in remunerations this time.

Do you think, Mr. Minister, in your opinion, that there would be an appropriate . . . since I've heard your Premier and your government talking about being open and moving into the 21st century — that we would have an all-party committee review on the appointments of the Highway Traffic Board?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — To the member opposite, I think if you look at the people who are on the Highway Traffic Board, they're beyond question. They're excellent people; they do a good job. I have no intentions of removing them from the board and they will continue to do their work.

**Mr. McLane:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Moving on then, with respect to the amendment that provides a resident who is temporarily driving, for non-commercial purposes, a vehicle from another jurisdiction, that they need not get a Saskatchewan certificate vehicle registration. Can you tell us a little bit about the current process that's in place now and what you're looking at here.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well probably what happens now is — and I'll use the example I guess I used earlier — is if my brother comes from Alberta and he comes to my house, I currently can't jump in his car and drive it to the store, for an example. It happens now. I'm sure I'd jump into my brother's car and drive it, not knowingly breaking the law. So I think we're just trying to clarify that, so in fact that would be legal.

**Mr. McLane:** — When your brother comes across the border and hits Saskatchewan, is the first item in discussion at your house, when you're going to spend some money and time on the highways in the province? I ask a facetious question.

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — No, actually what we discuss is health care premiums.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McLane:** — That is something, Mr. Minister, that you'd be an authority on, given the health . . . or the drug plan that we've got and the ambulance rates and those types of things. So I'm happy to hear that he's concerned about those as well.

Just another question then on the insurance side of this. What would happen, for example, and if you are driving that car and are involved in some sort of a mishap. Is there insurance?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — I don't know. I suspect that the RCMP could charge me. What the fine would be or what would happen, I just don't have that answer today.

(1230)

**Mr. McLane:** — Could you get you get that and send it as well?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Yes, I will. We're going to look and see if we can find it now. If not, we will certainly make you aware of it.

**Mr. McLane:** — Also you might want to consider, while

you're researching that, is how this would . . . the no-fault would apply in that sort of a circumstance as well.

And another question, Mr. Minister, would be — and this just flows from it — that if your brother is driving your vehicle, what happens if there's any problem?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — I'll start from the last question and move forward. My brother in fact could drive my vehicle if he's here, if he has a valid driver's licence.

No-fault insurance, that would be a question you would have to direct to the minister in charge of SGI, and I know that he would know that for sure.

The fine apparently is, in total, \$60 if I was charged with driving my brother's car when he came to visit me.

**Mr. McLane:** — I guess when you talk about the amendment, exactly what are you proposing?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — What we're going to be doing is legitimize what's happening now. Like I mentioned earlier, I probably do jump in my brother's car and drive down to the store. Well right now I'm illegal and could be fined and charged. What we're going to do is allow that to happen so in fact when I do jump into my brother's car and drive to the store, it's okay.

**Mr. McLane:** — Would there be a problem, Mr. Minister, in doing that? I think it begs the question is . . . I guess we're assuming that the vehicle you're going to be jumping into is roadworthy under the eyes of this province. Is that incumbent upon you to ensure that?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — That's probably another question that should be put to the minister in charge of SGI. But I would suspect that if the vehicle is here that — and it's roadworthy in Alberta — it's likely roadworthy here.

**Mr. McLane:** — I don't think the question would be whether the vehicle is roadworthy or not and whether it's the same in Alberta or Saskatchewan, not saying that your brother wouldn't be in keeping with the law, but many times vehicles are, for whatever reason, are driven and are not caught. I guess the question I would be asking would be, is it incumbent on you to ensure that the vehicle is roadworthy under Saskatchewan laws? Who would . . . I guess what I'm asking, who would be charged if the vehicle is stopped and it's not roadworthy?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Well certainly I may get a ticket if I jump into my brother's car and the headlight is not working or tail-light or whatever the case might be; certainly I have that responsibility.

**Mr. McLane:** — With respect to loaded vehicles, and I guess, could you define for us what the definition of a safely loaded or unsafely loaded vehicle would be?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Is there a specific vehicle or a specific concern that you might have; it might help us answer the

question.

**Mr. McLane:** — Well I guess we're talking about farm implements here, and so I guess that's what . . . Is the intent of this Bill solely to look at those or is it to look at vehicles in general?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — To the member opposite, certainly farm implements have been covered, I believe, under regulations since 1993 in regards to tie-downs and those kinds of precautions. In regards to other vehicles, if — under the new amendments — if a car was transporting a dangerous good, for an example, they would be liable under this Act to make sure that that dangerous good was not leaking, if it was a liquid, for example, or in fact was not done in appropriate situation or protected in an appropriate situation so that that would not occur.

**Mr. McLane:** — So will this apply to vehicles other than agriculture implements?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Okay, could you give us some clarification on that question again, please? Is it the driver that you're concerned about?

**Mr. McLane:** — I'm trying to get at what vehicles we're talking about. Are we talking about all vehicles or are we talking about agriculture implements?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — We're talking about all vehicles including agriculture vehicles or implements.

**Mr. McLane:** — Back to safe loads then. I assume then the definition of a safe load will be defined in the regulations. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Okay, the department informs me that regulations to securing a load is under 70(3) of the regulations — now that was passed in 1993 — which will tell you exactly how you are to secure a load in regards to a commercial vehicle.

But an implement that's driving down the road is not covered under that. It's a very complicated issue, and I can send you more information. But it's my understanding that implements, because they're not presumed to be carrying a dangerous good, is not covered by the regulations under that subsection.

And we do have information in booklet form that we can certainly make available to you.

**Mr. McLane:** — Guess this just points again, Mr. Minister, you know, the importance of having some of these regulations in the legislation as opposed . . . as to the regulations.

You talk about commercial vehicle. Now how does that apply then to a farm grain truck or a farm wagon, a grain cart?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Okay, farm trucks or wagons, if they in fact have to be registered and if they have to be registered by weight, are under the regulations. If they are a vehicle that is

registered by wheel base only, they are not.

**Mr. McLane:** — In the regulations then, is there anything that would discriminate between a cart being towed by a licensed vehicle, such as a truck, or one being towed by a tractor?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — It appears to us that if it was a tractor pulling a wagon it would be not under the current regulations. And if it was in fact a half-ton pulling a cart, it wouldn't be covered by those regulations as well. It would be based on weight, 5,000 kilograms.

**Mr. McLane:** — So are you looking at changing any of those?

(1245)

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — The security of loads regulations are presently being looked at Canada-wide so that we could have similar regulations across Canada. And that process is happening now.

**Mr. McLane:** — So will we have those then, Mr. Minister, before — if there are changes made to debate in here — before this legislation is through?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — I don't know that. It doesn't pertain to the Act that's before us. And whether it would be set at the same time other regulations are ready to go into the Act, I don't know.

But it brings up the point I tried to make earlier about the importance of maybe putting some of these into regulations, so that as needs change the regulations can change, rather than having to go back to the Act each time.

**Mr. McLane:** — The problem again though, Mr. Minister, is that when that happens then we don't have this forum to discuss it and talk about it or debate it. And that's what we're trying to get changed.

The definition of dangerous goods then, is that defined in the same area under the regulations, or is that going to be changed?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Dangerous goods, under the definition of the Act, means any product, substance, or organism included by its nature or by the regulations in any of the prescribed classes of dangerous goods.

**Mr. McLane:** — Dangerous goods, as it relates to safe loads then, if you're talking about grain, for example, blowing off . . . gravel might be a better one, stones off a load of gravel. Are those part of it?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Okay in regards to gravel or grain, I guess would be covered. If you look at subsection 70(1) and (2) that are being repealed:

No person shall cause or allow a vehicle to be loaded or drive a vehicle so that when the vehicle is driven on a highway the whole or any part of the load drops or is liable to drop onto the highway.

Certainly an offence but it's not a dangerous good.

**Mr. McLane:** — Are those regulations being looked at in light of this Bill as well?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Could the member repeat the question, please.

**Mr. McLane:** — This question was just simply, are you looking at changing those regulations in light of this Bill?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — No.

**Mr. McLane:** — On a safe load then, do the regulations apply, will they apply, then to an overloaded grain truck, whether it's a commercial vehicle or a farm vehicle?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — The statute applies to everyone. And I'm not sure if you're talking about the statute or the regulations.

**Mr. McLane:** — When you were talking about safe loads — and I guess you could argue the point that being overweight is an unsafe load — how does that apply under this legislation, or in the regulations, whether they would need to be changed to look after that, or if you're contemplating that?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Overweights are not included in this Act. They are covered under The Highway Traffic Act. Or Highways and Transportation Act, pardon me.

**Mr. McLane:** — I guess under the law then, what would . . . Just for example, Mr. Minister, and just as we're winding down here. On a farm implement going down the road and a hydraulic line breaks, is there any possibility of some legal consequences under that, through no fault of the farmer?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — I'm sorry, but I'd have to ask for the question again.

**Mr. McLane:** — You're talking about safe loads. And you're talking about farm implements, agriculture implements. In the event of an unforeseen mishap in terms of a broken hydraulic line or a piece of equipment, machinery, part of the machinery breaking, is there any . . . I guess I'm asking, what would the owner of the equipment that's using it be liable to under the safe loads legislation or the regulations?

**Hon. Mr. Renaud:** — Under the safe loads regulation, there would be nothing, but under the Act, if charges were laid, certainly he would be responsible there, and depending on the insurance end and what his responsibility is under liability.

The committee reported progress.

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act, 1990

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 25, An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act, 1990 be now read a



third time and passed under its title.

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

**Bill No. 26 — An Act to amend the Statute Law**

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 26, An Act to amend the Statute Law be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

**Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Hotel Keepers Act**

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that item no. 12, Bill No. 30, An Act to amend The Hotel Keepers Act be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

The Assembly adjourned at 12:57 p.m.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

Osika .....	443
Belanger .....	443
Krawetz .....	443
Draude .....	443
Aldridge .....	443
Julé .....	443
McPherson .....	443

#### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk .....	443
-------------	-----

#### NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Goohsen .....	444
---------------	-----

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Scott .....	444
Cline .....	444
Toth .....	444
Bradley .....	444
McLane .....	444
Osika .....	446
Calvert .....	454
Murray .....	458

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

##### Opening of Maymont School

Jess .....	444
------------	-----

##### World Water Day

Draude .....	445
--------------	-----

##### Estevan Legion Donations to Hospitals

Ward .....	445
------------	-----

##### Choices and Consequences Youth Conference

Murray .....	445
--------------	-----

##### University of Regina Arts Festival

Crofford .....	445
----------------	-----

##### Congratulations to Toronto Dominion Bank and Trust

Thomson .....	446
---------------	-----

##### Provincial AA Hockey Champions

Bradley .....	446
---------------	-----

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### SaskPower President's Remuneration

Aldridge .....	446
----------------	-----

Anguish .....	446
---------------	-----

##### SaskPower Vice-president's Remuneration

McPherson .....	447
-----------------	-----

Anguish .....	448
---------------	-----

##### Job Relocations

Boyd .....	448
------------	-----

Lingenfelter .....	448
--------------------	-----

##### Food Bank Use

Toth .....	449
------------	-----

Calvert .....	449
---------------	-----

##### Plains Health Centre Closure

Toth .....	450
------------	-----

Cline .....	450
-------------	-----

##### Education Funding

Krawetz .....	450
---------------	-----

Mitchell .....	450
----------------	-----

##### Government Document Translation

Krawetz .....	451
---------------	-----

Mitchell .....	451
----------------	-----

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The Natural Resources Act

Scott .....	451
<b>Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act, 1993 and to make a consequential amendment</b>	
Nilson .....	451
<b>Bill No. 51 — An Act to amend The Film and Video Classification Act</b>	
Nilson .....	451
<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>	
<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS</b>	
Speaker .....	451
<b>GOVERNMENT ORDERS</b>	
<b>SECOND READINGS</b>	
<b>Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act</b>	
Nilson .....	451
McLane .....	452
<b>Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend The Mental Health Services Act</b>	
Cline .....	452
Julé .....	453
<b>COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE</b>	
<b>Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act, 1990</b>	
Nilson .....	454
Draude .....	454
<b>Bill No. 26 — An Act to amend the Statute Law</b>	
Nilson .....	455
Osika .....	455
<b>Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Hotel Keepers Act</b>	
Krawetz .....	455
Nilson .....	455
<b>Bill No. 16—An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act</b>	
Renaud .....	456
McLane .....	456
D’Autremont .....	456, 461
Goohsen .....	457
McLane .....	461
<b>THIRD READINGS</b>	
<b>Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act, 1990</b>	
Shillington .....	466
<b>Bill No. 26 — An Act to amend the Statute Law</b>	
Shillington .....	467
<b>Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Hotel Keepers Act</b>	
Shillington .....	467