

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature
39th Day

Thursday, May 6, 1976.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

Diking of Wascana Creek

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question but everybody is away. Perhaps I could direct it to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I had hoped to ask the Minister of the Environment because it is really his Department.

As the Minister may be aware in the recent election in Regina the burgesses', in their wisdom, turned down any money to be used for diking along Wascana Creek for future flood prevention. I regret this decision very much and I am sure the people who live along the creek regret it even more. In view of the decision of the voters of the city of Regina can the Minister tell me what now will happen with the federal-provincial city scheme for diking along the banks of Wascana Creek within the city of Regina?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't answer the Hon. Member's question and I will have to take notice and get a response for him either later today or tomorrow.

Mr. Malone: — A supplementary. Will the Minister be here later today?

Mr. MacMurchy: — I believe that he is in Coronach at some sort of a hearing and plans to be back by this evening. So I don't think he will be here in time for Question Period, but later today.

Salary Increase to Crown Corporation Employees

Mr. S. J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

I asked yesterday about salary increases to employees in five Crown corporations: Sask Housing Corporation, FarmStart, SEDCO, MCIC and the Research Council. It is my understanding that salary increases were given to the employees in each of these five Crown corporations. Can the Minister now indicate what the salary settlements were in respect of each and what recommendation was made to the Anti-inflation Board in connection with them?

Hon. J. R. Messer (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — I expect that information later today. I can either

convey to the Member at that time or tomorrow morning in the Question Period.

Mr. Cameron: — As a supplementary, may I ask the Minister why these wage settlements were not announced in advance of going to the Board, and why has there been no announcement in respect to them?

Mr. Messer: — I have no knowledge of whether they were or were not announced in advance.

Outlook Irrigation Project Expansion

Mr. R. H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask this question. The question is intended for the Minister of Agriculture and perhaps I can ask the former Minister of Agriculture.

Are there any current plans that the Government knows of to expand the irrigation project on the west side of the Outlook Irrigation Project? On the west side of the river?

Mr. Messer: — I know of no immediate plans to expand the irrigation project on the west side. I think there is still considerable irrigation that could be undertaken on the east side. The plans in the recent past at least were to finish the development there before any other expansion was undertaken.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question. What are the current plans then, if the Minister can tell me? What does the Government intend to do with the extensive expenditure they have gone into for the drainage ditches and dikes on the west side, which are empty of water?

Mr. Messer: — I would hope that they could be kept in some sort of maintenance as at some point in time we may be able to utilize them if the plan is rejuvenated for the west side development.

Mr. Bailey: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The former Minister of Agriculture, could you tell me what happened to the land that was purchased for irrigation and not put into irrigation? What is the present status of that land?

Mr. Messer: — Well, I can only speak for the time that I was responsible for that land as Minister of Agriculture. It was at that time leased out to the farmers and I would expect that that is still the situation.

Resignation of Mr. Perry Wilks

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — A question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Is it true that a member accompanying Premier Blakeney on

May 6, 1976

his tour gave his resignation prior to leaving and the person in question is Mr. Perry Wilks?

Mr. Messer: — I know of no such resignation.

Mr. Katzman: — Are you aware of a newspaper article last year, new manager for Agribition, which is Mr. Wilks?

Second supplementary: are you aware that a member who has joined the Premier on this tour was paid for out of the Cattle Checkoff and Horned Fund, to assist the Premier in meeting the proper people in agriculture?

In light of Mr. Wilks resignation coming forward, seeing as you don't know about it, in light of a statement you made yesterday, does this mean that automatically that foreign trade and the development of trade and industry will become one Department as you suggested?

Mr. Messer: — No, it does not and as far as the reference to Mr. Wilks is concerned I would assume that if you have something that indicates he has obliged himself to another field of endeavor, it may well be that a resignation has been conveyed. It has not been brought to my attention, but certainly the date of termination is sometime in the future and he is still carrying out his duties as an employee of the Government, on the trip with the Premier. Where his salary may be paid from is something that I am not in a position to answer at this time. I certainly have no knowledge of it coming from the checkoff.

Mr. Katzman: — No, my statement was that a member of the Saskatchewan Livestock Association is joining the Premier so that he can meet the proper people, because your people don't know them.

Repairing of Tertiary Recovery Plants

Mr. E. F. A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. There is some preparation Mr. Speaker. The matter is well known to the Minister. There are only two tertiary recovery plants of oil in Saskatchewan, they recover oil that can't ordinarily be recovered. One is owned by Mobil near Swift Current and has been down since March. Would the Minister indicate whether Mobil have told you that they intend to repair. I understand that they don't intend to repair. There was an explosion. I wonder if the Minister would indicate what the Government is doing to bring that tertiary recovery plant back into production?

Hon. E. Whelan (Minister of Mineral Resources): — What the Hon. Member for Wascana says is correct. The compressor that Mobil Oil owns and operates at the Battrum Field north of Swift Current, experienced an explosion some time ago. Today, and for the last number of days we have been discussing with producers who have wells in that field, the whole proposition of repairing the plant and renewing the arrangement that Mobil Oil has with the field.

We also have established contact with Mobil through correspondence and we have a date set to meet with them early next week. We will be talking to them about the tertiary assistance for tertiary plants of this sort where it is necessary to spend extra money to bring oil to the surface.

I think the Hon. Member must appreciate the position that we are in. This is one particular method that is being used. There are two other methods under consideration and one actively being used at the present time. When we consider an increase in the royalties or some sort of compensation for those who are working in the tertiary area, we have to look at the entire activity and for this reason we have had meetings with other oil companies and we will be having further meetings with them and we expect to make some sort of an announcement on it in a week or so.

Mr. Merchant: — A supplementary. Would the Minister not agree that the reason that Mobil have not repaired this fire plug tertiary plant is because your royalty rates, and indeed I asked you these questions in Estimates, because you have one uniform royalty and that rate doesn't make it economical for Mobil to go on producing the 4600 barrels a day that that plant is capable of doing, doesn't make it economical for anyone to go into tertiary recovery in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — No, I wouldn't admit that.

Mr. Merchant: — A supplementary. I gather from what the Minister says that discussions are going on so I ask you now, as I did in Estimates, is it the intention of the Government to come up with a second amount of money, a different royalty rate which would encourage tertiary production to encourage the production of extra oil, particularly at a time when conservation of oil is such an important element in society?

Mr. Whelan: — I think the question is a good question but before you can make an answer you have to look at the federal position in this.

Mr. Steuart: — Ha!

Mr. Whelan: — I hear a strange sound coming from the Hon. Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake but I think we should inform him . . .

Mr. Lane: — Try and get to the question.

Mr. Whelan: — I'll try and get to it if I'm not interrupted I might get to answer it but if I am going to be interrupted constantly I am just going to take notice. What I think we should recognize is that the Federal Government has already entered into an agreement recognizing the need for assistance in this area and they are currently entering into an agreement to assist those that are working in the tertiary areas. This agreement is being negotiated with the Provincial Government at the

present time. There is no doubt in the world that the Federal Government recognizes its responsibility in this area and this is part of the negotiations that are taking place. Not only do we have to look at the oil companies but because the Federal Government gets almost three times as much as we do out of a gallon of gasoline when it is finally manufactured, I think they have a responsibility, we are getting 9.3 cents and they are getting 27 cents, so I think they have a responsibility and they have recognized it and this is part of the negotiations that are taking place.

Mr. Merchant: — Would the Minister agree that 4600 barrels a day of potential production is a great deal of production and that this is a sizeable potential recovery which as a result of your inactivity we are losing on a day to day basis?

Mr. Whelan: — I admit that there is a loss in production but the oil is going to be there until you bring it to the surface. And if you want to talk about a loss in production all we have to do is look at the cutback in exports and what it did to the production of oil in this province when there wasn't a proper arrangement made to see that heavy oil was sent to the United States on a priority basis. The cutback in production over the last year or so because of this policy is just not comparable.

Super Grid Program

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Minister, since the time that you have announced the super grid program, could you provide this House with any information as to the number of rural municipalities that have suggested to your Department that they would be willing to co-operate in the super grid program?

Mr. MacMurchy: — I have not had any responses to my office. There may have been some responses to the Municipal Road Assistance Authority. We only laid out a proposal of organization in order to deliver the program and I have not had an opportunity to discuss the proposal with SARM specifically. The proposal was an organization which we called a Municipal Super Grid Authority, a co-operative approach, and we asked if SARM would come forward with a possible map of setting up such authorities and I have not had an opportunity to follow up on the proposal. I received a call from Mr. Wilkinson yesterday asking for a meeting with Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Anderson, the president and the vice-president, and I suspect the main topic of the discussion at our meeting, which is to be next Wednesday, will be the proposal on Super Grid. There have been some requests from municipalities to proceed and make use of the \$1 million that was set aside in the Budget. We haven't made any commitments as yet. We would want to discuss the whole matter before we make commitments with respect to the allocation in this year's budget.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question. Mr. Minister, you mentioned your co-operation with the RMs and the Municipal Road Authority. Certainly, Mr. Minister, you must tie this particular planned program very closely to the Department of Highways and the

question is, is the Department of Highways or are officials from the Department of Highways planning with you on the Super Grid Program?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Well, there have been discussions between MRAA and the Department of Highways. So far as them sitting down with us with the SARM executive I don't think that is likely to happen at this time. There is no question in the minds of the Government, and I tried to make that clear in my proposal to the convention, that this was going to be a municipal road program and not a government program. That is why we put forward a case for co-operation, a case for co-operation particularly on the basis of maintenance so that it would continue to be there rather than what we have seen in the past, some pressures to transfer municipal roads to the highway system. We just don't want to see this happen with this particular program because we feel that our highway system is pretty extensive now, expanding to some extent in the North and we have got enough to handle within our present highway system without adding extensively any more mileage.

Mr. Bailey: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has indeed touched on my final question. The question is simply this, Mr. Minister, is there not some fear among the two Departments, the Department of Highways and your Department which would be responsible for the Super Grid Program, that indeed the amount of expenditures could be in such a proposition that we would have a continuation of that which is already existing, that many of the grid roads in Saskatchewan are indeed better than our present highways?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Well, I suppose you could argue that in certain cases that some grid roads are in better condition than some of our highways, but I think across the piece the highway system is much superior to the present grid system. Certainly SARM agrees that this is to be a municipal system, they agree that on the heavy volume roads that it be built to a fairly high standard, 28 foot top and 130 feet to 150 feet allowance. I think that there will be cases in the future if this program proceeds where you can make a comparison to one given highway and one super grid road in terms of superiority but that is only in the case of the priorities that Highways may place on their improvement program. So I think that we will continue to have a highway system that is superior to the grid system or a municipal system in the future.

Grassland National Park

Mr. R. E. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Will the Minister assure this Assembly and the people of the area involved that if at the upcoming hearings on the Grasslands Prairie Park that if the committee finds little or no support for a park, and a national park is not recommended, that the Provincial Government will not put in a provincial park in the area?

Hon. A. Matsalla (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in response to the Hon. Member's question. I want to say that once the submissions are made and the hearings are finished and the committee has had an opportunity to review the hearings and make a submission to the Government, we will make a decision at that time.

Mr. Nelson: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that is really good enough for the people in the area. Mr. Minister, could you not assure them before the hearings what the results would be as far as the Provincial Government is concerned if there is not a recommendation for a federal park. Are you telling them that you will have a provincial park, if they recommend no federal park? Certainly there should be some guidelines in these areas.

Mr. Matsalla: — Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not saying that, although I do want to say and emphasize that it is not our intention to interfere or intervene or have any influence on the hearings at this time.

Mr. Nelson: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I see that the Minister of Agriculture isn't here. I wonder if the Government would assure the ranchers of the area if there is not a park that the policy to continue leases and transfer leases could be assured to the ranchers? Mr. Speaker, could someone in the Government, maybe the former Minister of Agriculture could answer.

Mr. Speaker: — No one seems to be interested in answering. The Member for Maple Creek.

Wage Settlement Saskatchewan Housing Corporation

Mr. W. H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — A question to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, I believe the final salary settlement has been reached with the members in the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation that has been before the Prices Review Board. Would the Minister please indicate what is the percentage settlement to that contract with the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation employees?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I don't have the figures in my mind. I will get the figures and provide them to the Hon. Member.

Salary Increases to Crown Corporations

Mr. Cameron: — I would like to direct a question to the acting, acting, acting Premier. Can he tell me if any other salary or wage increases have been referred to the Board in addition to the five I made mention of earlier and if so what agencies or departments of Government are affected?

Mr. Messer: — I am not in a position to say whether there were any

others than the Member has referred to and certainly not within my jurisdiction. I can check and provide it with the other information that I alluded to earlier and pass it on to the Member.

Mr. Cameron: — A supplementary. Will you undertake to give Members of the House the details of any other increases that have been settled and referred to the Board?

Mr. Messer: — Is the Member's question asking for an undertaking to review all of the agencies that had reached settlements and forwarded to the Board? Yes, I believe that is possible.

Chemical Plant in Martensville

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — A question to the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. In light of the agreement now between the city of Saskatoon and your Water Resources Department and now knowing the amount of water which you are going to supply to the Chemical Plant in Martensville, when will construction begin?

Hon. G. R. Bowerman (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — I don't have a knowledge when construction will begin. I would suppose that once the final approvals have been received from the city of Saskatoon and the projects have been tendered, construction will get under way.

Amount of Wage Increase to SEDCO and Research Council

Mr. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister could give this House the amount of wage increases given to the employees of SEDCO and the Research Council?

Mr. Messer: — I think I can provide in general the information that the Member is asking for in the package that I will make available to the Member for Regina South. One has to remember that a lot of these positions are out of scope positions. It doesn't necessarily mean that the dollar amount or the percentage amount is going to be consistent with all of the employees involved, so that I think you are asking for information that can't be provided to you at this point in time, at least not in a precise way, but I will be able to give you the general information in regard to the increases that have been granted. In all instances I think Mr. Boychuk, Chairman of the Board, has indicated that they are within the jurisdiction that he is obliged to confine himself to, primarily under \$2400 increase per year. But I think you will have to await that package of information before we can give you, with any precision, what you are asking for.

Mr. Cameron: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure us that those wage settlements do not exceed the national guidelines?

Mr. Messer: — Well, I am sure that Mr. Boychuk's responsibility is to undertake to see that all of those proposals or agreements that are advanced to him meet the criteria that he was instructed to operate within. If he has approved them I am certain that they then are well within those criteria.

Mr. Cameron: — A supplementary. I am asking you about salary increases that were negotiated in a Crown corporation in respect to which you are the Minister. Now you must have some knowledge about those. Can you assure the House that that particular increase in salary does not exceed the national guidelines?

Mr. Messer: — As my colleague, the Minister of Labour, points out, we are negotiating within the criteria Saskatchewan has established for the settlement of wages. I don't think that even though we related in drawing up those regulations or those criteria to the national program, that does not mean that we have obliged ourselves to be consistent in making settlements that are within the national criteria and their proposals.

SGEA Strike

Mr. Bailey: — A question to the Minister of Labour. I have been trying to follow the result of the SGEA strike of almost a year ago when certain members didn't go along with the union itself and I read in the paper where the members are threatening a lawsuit against the union because of the retaliation that the union has proposed. Now could the Minister tell me if this dispute has been settled or has the dispute been brought to him as the Minister of Labour?

Hon. G. T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — No, it has not been brought to me officially. I know something of the attendant problems. I regard them to be a problem which is properly disposed of between the employees who are members of that union organization and the trade union itself. We do not involve ourselves under any circumstances with internal relationships between members of their union be it the SGEA people or whether it be the College of Physicians and Surgeons or the Law Society or other organizations. I believe this is an internal problem and it has not been brought to me nor has it been indicated at any time that I should have anything more than a passing interest.

Mr. Bailey: — Does the Minister know if the dispute has been settled? Has it been settled, the conflict, has it been settled, is he aware of that? You see the reason I ask that question, Mr. Minister, is that I am looking for information and I am asking the Minister of Labour, where does the individual union member go for help if he feels that he has been wronged by the union?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, there are a number of places where he can go if he believes his individual civil liberties have been offended. He has redress by virtue of the Human Rights Commission that is available to him. He has the normal grievance procedure

that he can use through his union constitution and other safeguards that may be built into the union constitution. I am not prepared to suggest that this provides an absolute answer, but he is not without redress.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister may well be aware that to each of the employees who crossed the illegal picket lines a letter was sent on April 20, 1976, demanding the return of the money which they earned during that period of time and advising them that unless the money was forthcoming on the 1st of May their union membership would be suspended. The first of May is passed by some days, is it the intention of the Government to dismiss employees whose union membership has been suspended?

Mr. Snyder: — I am not in a position to say what the position of the Government will be. The union security clause provides that the employee, shall be a member in good standing and I would presume in the event that the person is not a member of that trade union organization that he will not continue to earn his livelihood in that way.

Mr. Merchant: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That would then mean that the Government intends to fire those employees who crossed the illegal picket line?

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the urgency of this particular question is. Obviously, it is raised by some to be. You will know of the union check-off arrangement and if you want to take the other position, if you are suggesting something to the contrary, then I wish the Member would state his case clearly and precisely because it is not a new principle that has evolved over the last two or three or four years. Union security clauses are common throughout and it is not stamping out any new ground or taking any position that has not been well establish in the past.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 62 — **An Act to amend The Mineral Resources Act**, be now read a second time.

Mr. R. L. Collver (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, I just have a few remarks to address primarily to the Members opposite and primarily to the individual Members opposite who are not in the Cabinet. Some Members here today and some of our citizens may not be too concerned about what any government does regarding any large corporations. After all many corporations are also large and powerful and too secretive.

But, every time a government obtains a broad power over any segment of society it does in fact obtain powers over all of us. The course that this Government is pursuing, the centralization of power in the hands of the Cabinet is crystal

May 6, 1976

clear in Bill 62.

The passage of this Bill together with the other Acts that have been passed in this Legislature and in fact the other Acts passed in previous Legislatures and in fact the other Acts passed in previous Legislatures will be a go signal for the Government and the Cabinet to continue to add more and more discretionary powers in the hands of the Cabinet. Unfortunately that will allow a continued attack on the political legacies of the Province of Saskatchewan. It's passage will also be a warning for other businesses in Saskatchewan that they have no protection under the law. And that means any business, not just large corporations. The Bill should end any doubt about what is intended by the Members of the Cabinet in the Government opposite. The sole self anointed objective is the absolute centralization of power in Cabinet over all of us.

Government Private Members should be as concerned as we are. The power will not be in your hands, it will not be in our hands, it will not be in the hands of the elected Members of the Legislature. It will be in the hands of Cabinet. It should be clear to all Private Members that it's our responsibility to control government. Not allow government or the Cabinet or the Executive Branch of Government as it were to control us. This is not the time to turn this Assembly into a cemetery and leave only the dead to government.

Throughout Saskatchewan in the next few days thousands of farmers will be taking to the land. Some of these men and women are first generation farmers, many are descendents of early pioneers and homesteaders. They came here these people, came here for two primary reasons. Economic opportunity and individual initiative. Bill 62 shuts the door to economic opportunity and shuts the door to individual freedom as it relates to mineral resources in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The early pioneers in this country would be shocked to see what's going on in the Province of Saskatchewan today. The centralization of power in the hands of the Cabinet. Think about in the last five years the amount of additional power achieved by the Cabinet in the Province of Saskatchewan. They have taken over control of the University system. They've taken over control of the oil industry. They've taken over control of the potash industry, total and direct control. They have taken over control of many other aspects in terms of individual initiatives and in terms of local government. The Cabinet has wider and wider powers over local governments to the point where local governments are becoming nothing more than rubber stamps.

The Government of Saskatchewan is obviously on this course of total centralization of power. And the manipulation of power through a vast bureaucracy, so that individual rights and individual freedoms are lost.

Let me remind this House that it was individual initiative that built our province, not government bureaucracy. People of this province, it's been mentioned many times by Members to my right that over 60 per cent of the people are opposed to the centralization of power in the province. Only 40 per cent seem to be in favor of it as of last June. Yet the Government continues because of its majority in this Assembly, to centralize more and more power in the hands of the Cabinet. This power is not in the hands of individual backbench NDP MLAs and they

know it as well as anyone else. The seventeen or eighteen Members of the Cabinet are all powerful and who controls them, the person who appoints them, that's who. The person who has the right to fire them and the person who has the right to make a new appointment, the Premier. Therefore, you are vesting all power in this province in the hands of one man, in the hands of one man.

Mr. Messer: — Gordon and I are together on it.

Mr. Collver: — Well, perhaps. Democratic government, real democratic government, means governing with the consent of the Legislative Members on the day to day basis, not government from the top down. And not government every fourth year, and not democracy every fourth year. Democracy means governing with the consent of the governed on a day to day basis.

With more and more power in the hands of the Cabinet as this Bill obviously indicates the individual freedom in Saskatchewan is deteriorating at an ever increasing pace. The takeover of the potash industry means that thousands more of Saskatchewan citizens are going to be employed by government. Thousands more workers in service and support industries will owe their day to day livelihood to government. Who controls that, the Cabinet? Who controls those companies — the Cabinet — under the law, under the legislation. Look for example at this particular Bill, at just a few subsections of this Bill, to see the amount of control which Cabinet is taking taking unto itself.

Section 21A, Section 22 and Section 3 in total, broadens the powers of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to the point where they can conduct in secret any provisions of the Act, in secret, because Cabinet operates in secret. Cabinet operates in secret through necessity because the Premier has said that it operates in secrecy through necessity. And because other Members of Cabinet have said, those are privileged, that is privileged information that we discuss in Cabinet, even the backbenchers in your very own party are not made aware of the kinds of decisions that are made in Cabinet, in secret. Were all of the backbenchers, for example, in your party aware that the Government hid the increase in civil servants? Were all the backbenchers in your party aware that the Government did not provide sufficient moneys in its Budget to meet the obligations that it has under the wage agreements? Were all of the backbenchers aware that the Government was using and that the Departments were using advance accounts for ongoing expenses rather than for their stated purpose? Were the backbenchers aware of that?

I suggest to you that they were not. I suggest to you that only the Cabinet was aware of this kind of behavior and of this kind of policy to hide things from the people of Saskatchewan.

Think about, for one moment, the control that the Cabinet is getting over your day-to-day lives and the day-to-day lives of your citizens. Is that what you want?

Mr. Mostoway: — Yes.

Mr. Collver: — Well I am glad the Member for Saskatoon Centre said,

May 6, 1976

yes. I am glad that this Member had admitted that total centralization of power in the hands of the Cabinet is precisely what he wants and precisely what this Government is shooting for.

The Land Bank is controlled by the Cabinet; The Natural Products Marketing Act . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think it is incumbent upon the Members to discuss the principle of the Bill that is before us at this time. If I were allowed an interpretation of what the Member for Nipawin was saying, I would say that he shifted the discussion over to a general discussion about the power of the Cabinet versus the other Members in the Chamber. And if he could shift back onto the topic of the principle of Bill 62 I think that he would be more in order.

Mr. Collver: — Thank you for your comments, Mr. Speaker. However, the principle of Bill 62 is to centralize power into the hands of the Government, in the hands of the Cabinet. The principle of Bill 62 is to place this power into the hands of the Cabinet.

Mr. Mostoway: — Hogwash!

Mr. Collver: — Well, you read the Bill Mr. Member for Saskatoon Centre. If he could. As I mentioned the other day if this Government, if the Cabinet is all powerful, what happens to your constituency. You say, Member for Saskatoon Centre, that it is the people's choice, you are the people's choice, but in a democracy people sometimes choose differently, at different times they chose differently. What happens in two or three years when the Government of Saskatchewan changes? Will your constituents be happy with the power in Cabinet over the day-to-day lives. Well, Mr. Member for Saskatoon Centre especially in Saskatoon Centre I would worry, I would worry especially there.

But what will happen to their claim on individual freedom and individual liberty if the Cabinet is all powerful under a government that they are not too happy with their policy. What happens if a Spiro Agnew takes over the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan? What happens if a Richard Nixon takes over the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, when the Cabinet is all powerful and the Premier is all powerful? Would your constituents be happy with that? Would they still argue that government bureaucracy knows best for all; that government bureaucracy is best for everyone at all times? Will they still claim that individual liberty and dignity are out-of-date and old fashioned as you are suggesting by centralizing this power? I doubt very much whether the people of this province will accept that kind of behavior for very much longer.

The Government of Saskatchewan continues to put its neat little political doctrines ahead of the individual rights, the individual freedoms of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Centralization of power is wrong; centralization of power is dangerous and it is dangerous because it has happened before in the world and it has happened before in the history of the world. Your Cabinet, even the Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes) could have the sincerest objectives in the world but if he is given too much power it will corrupt even him. It

will corrupt even the Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista, and it may even, as the Member for Lakeview has suggested, it may even corrupt him absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, the early homesteaders in this province built their farms through their own initiative. They will continue to act as individual citizens in this province and, therefore, fortunately we are still a free province; fortunately we still have a vote and fortunately this Government will be ended in two or three years. And when it is ended, we won't use this power; we will return this power to the people where it belongs. When it has ended this power that is corrupting the Government of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Koskie: — We have heard that before.

Mr. Collver: — Yes, I know you have — this power that is corrupting the Cabinet in the Province of Saskatchewan will be turned around and will be given back to the people so that, in fact, your constituents the people who support your party, who are becoming fewer and fewer every day — every day. Obviously you haven't been home Member for Saskatoon Centre.

Centralization of power is not the philosophy of the party that I have the honor to lead. It was not the philosophy of the party that Tommy Douglas had the honor to lead, but what you people have done with his party, is a sin.

Everyone knows, in this province, that more and more of our young people are continuing to have to leave the province every day. Many of them go to the Province of Alberta looking for jobs and opportunities.

Mr. Rolfes: — . . . statistics.

Mr. Collver: — Well, the statistics Mr. Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista tell us that the young people the people in the productive years of their lives are not returning to Saskatchewan. Why don't you look at the statistics yourself. They are leaving for the same basic reasons, the same basic reasons that their parents and their grandparents came to Saskatchewan — for economic opportunity and for individual freedom of action.

I appeal to the Members, the back bench Members of the NDP, I ask them, stand up once for yourselves; stand up once — Thank you Member for Regina wherever, glad to see him stand up. Stand up once for the individual liberty; stand up once for individual freedom; stand up once against the Cabinet; stand up once against the way these people con you into believing that they are acting in your best interests when in fact they are only acting in their own best interest, the interest of the Cabinet. They make a mistake with prorationing and what do they do? They come to you and say, we have to change the law. We have to change the law because we are in trouble in the courts. Look, help us out because we made a mistake as a Cabinet. And you centralize more power because of the mistakes made by the Cabinet and you back them up time after time after time. Just once stand up for individual initiative and individual freedoms on behalf of the citizens of this province. Stand up on this Bill, because this is an objectionable Bill and it is one that you should stand up on.

May 6, 1976

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say on this Bill.

As usual the Conservative Members have missed the point of the Bill. There is no doubt, of course, that this Bill leads to further centralization of power in the hands of Cabinet, but there is a more fundamental reason for the Liberal caucus to oppose the Bill than that, although I do agree with some of the comments made by the Member for Nipawin.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the proposed amendments to The Mineral Resources Act, I want to say at the outset that these amendments have caused me very grave concern, as I think they should cause anyone who is committed to the British parliamentary system and the basic democratic process we know in this country.

I find it difficult to come up with words strong enough to condemn the Government for bringing in amendments of this nature. These amendments are simply an admission by the Government that it will not do the most fundamental thing any administration should do and this is to govern according to law or to the law it makes and take the consequences thereof.

The Government virtually by these proposed amendments is saying that it will not abide by the laws of the Province of Saskatchewan, but will seek to change them to suit its own purpose and to make the changes retroactive. This type of behavior on the part of the Government shows a contempt for the democratic process and a contempt for the judicial system in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In any democracy an aggrieved person should be permitted as a right to seek redress from the courts if the person feels that he has been unfairly treated or if he takes exception to the laws passed by any administration. The Government by virtue of these amendments is denying this right and saying that no matter what the court decides, the Government will if necessary, change the laws to suit its purpose, notwithstanding the fact that those laws are in the first place improper or unconstitutional.

I am not aware of any other democratic society that has acted in a similar manner or in the way in which this Government is acting. One way we'll ask is if the Government is not prepared to obey the law, is not prepared to recognize and conform to the judicial process, why should anyone else? The Government surely should by its own actions set an example to be followed by those it governs. The result of this legislation is to say that the end justifies the means. It goes far beyond the question of potash companies and whether they acted properly or not. This legislation puts all citizens of Saskatchewan and anyone who deals with the Government of Saskatchewan on notice that the Government will do anything to justify its actions and that it will take away the right to seek redress from the courts, that it will not stand to have any of its policies challenged no matter how bad or how unconstitutional or how ultra vires they may be.

All people in Saskatchewan should be aware of what the Government is doing, because if it can do it to the large multinational corporations, how much easier it is for it to take away those rights from those less powerful. We should

make no mistake, the proposed amendments do exactly that. Take away the right of, in this case, the potash companies to seek legitimate remedies from the courts, the courts that are there for that purpose and that purpose only.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Government is trying to cover up what they are doing by the proposed amendments and are afraid of the remarks of the Attorney General when he introduced this Bill a few days ago. In my view the Attorney General consciously misled this House with his comments, because the amendments do not simply clarify the law as it has always existed, but drastically changes the law and takes away fundamental democratic rights that I thought were sacrosanct and untouchable, even by a government as power hungry as the one that sits to your right.

The laws that were referred to by the Attorney General were not taxation laws and never were drafted as such, but were merely conservation laws to be ended at such time as the world market for potash recovered. The Attorney General and the Government know this to be the case, but apparently insisted on using the prorationing laws as a device to further their war against the potash industry.

I suspect that the Attorney General or other Members who sit to your right, when closing this debate will attack the Liberal Party for opposing this legislation on the basis that we are simply once again defending the potash industry.

I want once again, however, to make it perfectly clear to the Attorney General and to those who sit to your right and to the news media, that the Liberal Party will always defend against an injustice, whether it be perpetrated against potash companies, oil companies or individuals.

These amendments work an injustice because the effect of them is to take away a basic democratic right. These amendments are an admission by the Government of its incompetence in drafting legislation and can be considered as an attempt to plug the holes that were there in the previous legislation. They should be the ones to suffer from their own mistakes and their own inadequacies and it should not be those who have dealt honestly and above board who should be made to suffer.

I say that when rights are taken away from any one individual or group in society, all the rest of society suffers thereby and the effect of these amendments is to once again demonstrate to anyone interested in the future of this province, that the NDP Government is never to be trusted and never to be considered as anything but a band of dedicated socialists who will stop at nothing to inflict their philosophy on all segments of the population, whether they want it or not or whether it is good for them or not.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to not be fooled by the comments of the Attorney General and to look at the ramifications of this legislation which are clear and which all people who are concerned with the democratic process and the rule of law abhor.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I want to advise you that I'll be voting against the amendments.

May 6, 1976

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 29

Pepper	Mostoway	Matsalla
Thibault	Larson	Skoberg
Bowerman	Whelan	Vickar
Messer	Kwasnica	Nelson (Yorkton)
Snyder	McNeill	Allen
Kramer	MacAuley	Koskie
Lange	Feschuk	Johnson
Kowalchuk	Rolfes	Thompson
Robbins	Cowley	Banda
MacMurphy	Tchorzewski	

NAYS — 11

Steuart	Clifford	Bailey
Malone	Anderson	Ham
Cameron	Merchant	Katzman
Nelson (Assiniboia- Gravelbourg)	Collver	

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. P. P. Mostoway (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could beg the indulgence of this House to introduce to you and all Members present here, two charming young ladies from the United States, Elaine Oehman from North Carolina and Linda Witt from Oklahoma. I wonder if you girls would stand, please.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — They are here with the Covenant Players, a Christian Ministry group that is touring the four western Canadian provinces. In talking to them the other day, I understand they are thoroughly enjoying their visit, to Saskatchewan and find it extremely interesting. I want to also say that I think it's situations such as these where we have good will ambassadors who are as lovely as these two girls and as charming and as pleasant, that we gain a credit in the good relations between our two countries. I welcome you girls and I know all Members hope you continue to enjoy your stay in Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

Hon. E. Cowley (Provincial Secretary) moved second reading of Bill No. 78 — **An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking briefly to this Bill before I move second reading, I should like to point out to Members of this Assembly and to others that the last time the Members of The Legislative Assembly Act was amended with respect to indemnities was 1972, some four years ago. At that time a committee was set up by this Legislature, commonly known as the

Woods' Committee, to look into the matter of remuneration for MLAs and other officers of the Legislative Assembly and the Executive Council and to make some recommendations. At that time the Members of this Assembly in their wisdom, or some would suggest lack of it, took somewhat less than the Woods' Committee recommended. I think over time many of us recognized that there would have been value to have looked at that particular Committee's recommendations over the next three or four years.

This Legislature has appointed a committee, commonly known as the Hughes Committee, which has made certain recommendations to the Members of this Assembly and the Bill is now before the Assembly encompassing many of those but with some adjustments to them. One of the adjustments is to make the period which they will be effective from July 1 to June 30, 1975-76 rather than from January 1st. I want to point out to the Members that the fiscal year we have been operating on as Members of the Legislative Assembly since 1972 has been the July 1 to June 30th fiscal year which generally corresponds with June elections in Saskatchewan and seemed to us to be a reasonable period to be using. I might point out that in Alberta the Legislature there is in a similar process that we are and I understand that they are making their legislation effective April 1, 1975, which follows the election, of course, in Alberta.

We made a couple other adjustments with respect to the expense allowance. We have adjusted that or indexed it at about eight per cent a year, I believe, from 1976 onwards and we think this more realistically reflects what is likely to happen in terms of expense allowances for MLAs. I point out, for example, Mr. Speaker, that MLAs do a great deal of driving in their constituencies. I can recall the year prior to the 1971 election when I travelled some 18, 000 miles in my constituency and after that some 11, 000 miles the following ten months. MLAs receive nothing but their expense allowance for this and the civil service, for example, have received since 1972 an increase in their car allowances of something around 50 per cent.

With respect to one other section of the Bill I would like to make some comments, as I did with the press this afternoon, and that is with the provisions with respect to the third party and to the Leader of the third party. The legislation does not specify any amounts and as I pointed out to the press this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, there are no amounts specified for the office of the Leader of the Opposition. These are contained in Estimates, but it is our intention to follow with respect to the third party the recommendations outlined in the Hughes report.

I would also mention that there is provision for constituency offices in the legislation, some \$200 a month. This is not paid to the MLA but is paid on the receipt of vouchers from the MLA showing that it has been expended either for office assistance or for office space.

From the period July 1, 1975 to June 30, 1976, had there been no changes in The Legislative Assembly Act at all, MLAs would have received approximately \$11, 000 in salary plus expenses. Under the provisions the amendments now put forward, that \$11, 000 for the same period becomes \$12, 020, although the expenses are increased, I think, Mr. Speaker, in line with the real expenses that MLAs are facing in terms of increases, both because of the cost of living having gone up and the role of MLAs having been expanded.

May 6, 1976

Mr. Speaker, the Bill was sent over to and has received the approval of the public sector Prices and Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have been asked by my colleagues and the House Leader to introduce this Bill. I personally will certainly be supporting the Bill, I think it is realistic. I think many of us would have looked perhaps at some different levels of remuneration had it not been for the public sector Prices and Compensation Board and the restraint program under way. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members to support this piece of legislation. I know we all find ourselves in a difficult position when it comes to making votes for our own remuneration but I would hope that all Members can see fit to support this Bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. M. Ham (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, just a couple of short comments.

My Leader last August and numerous times since has stated his feelings on this subject of MLA increases and I personally, wholeheartedly agree with his stand and it is also my personal opinion. It is most unfortunate and unfair that this Government has tied the third party allowance to this legislation.

I will not be supporting the Bill.

Mr. D. G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two about the Bill. I haven't any problems supporting it at all. I have been an MLA since 1962 and it has been customary as there was an increase in 1960 just before I came in through a by-election. There was an increase, there has been an increase every four years. As the Minister who introduced the Bill said it is not the most pleasant thing in the world to be in a position to increase your own wages, although all kinds of people do, professional people and people in private business, but they don't have to do it publicly. We haven't had an increase in pay and expenses for over four years so when one looks at that, this Bill in that context, I think that the increase is reasonable. I think the yardstick has to be a measure against the time put in, the energy and the effort put in to be an MLA. That has increased as we are now, since last fall, we have been here in this House for something like five months or more. The time in between we just don't leave here and go home and do nothing else. An MLA's job has become a year round job, full time and overtime when we are in this House and a great deal of hours, weekends and other hours when we are not in this Legislative Assembly.

So I think that the increase is justified and if we don't take an increase from time to time when I think being a Member of this Legislative Assembly will become the prerogative of those who have independent means and while I have no objection to people with independent means being MLAs, I think that it should be open to everyone in society regardless of their wealth or their income, that they should be able to run and become MLAs and not suffer any financial hardships.

I intend to introduce an amendment to the Bill when it

comes into Committee of the Whole, that is:

That no Member shall receive any increase as provided for by Section 5 and subsection (1) of Section 7 of this Act, in the amount of any indemnity, sessional allowance for expense or per diem allowance for expenses payable under The Legislative Assembly Act unless he has signed in accordance with subsection (2) of a document provided by the Clerk of the Assembly stating that he wishes to receive the increase provided for by Section 5 and subsection (1) of Section 7 of this Act.

The document mentioned in subsection (1) shall be signed within three months of the day of Royal Assent.

Now that doesn't cover expenses paid to a third party, it doesn't cover things like the research pay to any of the MLAs both in Opposition or in Government. But it does cover all pay and allowances. I do this, having thought about it a great deal and having watched, over the years, many MLAs deciding, which is their right, to vote against pay increases. But at the same time I don't think that they should vote against the pay increase and then go and take the pay increase because I think a great many people would like their cake and eat it. So I want to suggest this amendment and I hope it gets support so that those people who feel that they earned a pay increase and want the pay increase and need one, will have no problem signing this. And if they feel they don't need one or don't want one at this time or for the next three years, covering however long this term lasts, this Legislature lasts, then that, again, is their prerogative.

I will support the Bill and I will be proposing this particular amendment when we get into Committee of the Whole.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, since last August I have attempted in every way that I knew how to convince the Members opposite but most specifically, the Cabinet opposite, that in this period of inflation it is absolutely essential that we, as legislators, show leadership in the fight against inflation.

I know, at this moment in time, I know no further step that I can possibly take to try and convince the Members to show this leadership. I am very concerned that this Bill was dropped on us at the very last moment when all of us are anxious to get to our farms, I not being a farmer but we do have five out of the seven of us who have to get to the farm. I am very concerned that that has been done. I am concerned that even after great discussion, over the last number of months, with the Members opposite and Members to my right about tying the grant for third party provisions to this MLA pay increase, that it was still done on this Bill, which seems to place us in a very awkward position.

We don't think that the Bill is providing the leadership necessary in the fight against inflation. We have said so since last August. I don't think that it does any good to stall or delay or discuss it any further; there is no further discussion needed as between ourselves. I must say to the Members of this Assembly that it has not been easy to take this stand in this House with all of the Members. It has not been

May 6, 1976

an easy position to take since many, and I think with some justification, believe that it is very difficult for Members without means to go on at the present level of remuneration. However, we still think that the one choice, the leadership choice, is more important than perhaps our personal considerations. Therefore, I do not intend to support this Bill.

As far as the amendment is concerned, that, of course, is an interesting amendment and one that will probably receive some discussion tomorrow.

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments in regard to this particular Bill. Let me say at the outset that it is my intention to support this legislation.

I say that it is my intention to support this legislation for a number of reasons. First of all it was mentioned in the Throne Speech Debate that the Government would be giving consideration to the increase in MLAs' wages. I, as an MLA, have had an opportunity since last November to discuss, not only these increases with my colleagues, but also with my constituents.

So, in effect, the Bill has not been sprung on us at the last moment. We have had ample opportunity to consider the possibility of a pay increase and the fact that this is now before us.

There is no doubt that it is difficult for an MLA to say that he is going to raise his own wages, but I feel as well that we, as MLAs, have a responsibility to not only be honest with ourselves but to be honest with the people of Saskatchewan and the people whom we represent.

I knew what I was getting when I decided to seek re-election as Member for the Morse constituency in June of 1975. I also realized that it is only natural that every four years it is necessary to increase MLA's wages. The argument that we knew what we were getting when we decided to run, and that we must accept that for the next four years is not valid. I think all of us realized that the new session of the Eighteenth Legislative Assembly, would at one time or another be bringing in legislation to bring MLAs' wages in line with the rest of society.

As well, I have no hesitation in supporting this Bill, first of all, because the increases have been approved by the Anti-inflation Board. We, as politicians, are asking the people of Saskatchewan to stay within the guidelines set out by the Government and the guidelines set out by the Anti-inflation Board. I don't think that we are being disrespectful in our leadership by saying, okay we will accept the guidelines set forth by the Anti-inflation Board. Had the Anti-inflation Board not approved this increase I think I would have had second thoughts as to whether I would be supporting it or not, but they have given us that approval. And because of that approval I am quite willing and prepared to support this legislation.

I said a little earlier that we had to be honest with ourselves and with the people in this province, the people that we represent. I told my constituents, when I sought re-election, that I would be honest with them at all times. It is easy for a Member of the Opposition to stand up in this House and say,

no, I am not going to support the legislation, let the Government take the blame. They are the people who introduced it; they are the people we can go back to our constituents and say, look they are the Government, they forced it upon us, I am going to take the increase. I can't say that because I look upon my job as a full time job. My expenditures in 1975 as an MLA were slightly under \$22, 000. I received from the Provincial Government slightly over \$16, 000 in expenses, allowances, indemnity and so on. So that in effect it cost me just a little bit under \$6, 000 to represent by constituency. I expect to continue to represent my constituency. I expect to continue to represent them in the same manner that I have in the past four years but I also have a responsibility not only to represent them but I have a responsibility to my family. I can't ask my family to allow me as an MLA to lose \$5, 000 of my income to represent my constituents. I think they have a right to make some decision as to how I vote on this particular legislation. It is for that reason that I have no hesitation in supporting this legislation and I think that the demonstrations of the way I conduct myself in my constituency in the next four years hopefully will earn from my constituents the recognition that I adequately represented them and to adequately represent them a Member must also be reimbursed for the expenses which he incurs.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I have a few very brief comments following up some of the comments from the Members opposite. I think I can say to this Assembly and to the people of this province that the Member for Morse has very adequately summed up the feelings of many Members on our side of the House. Mr. Speaker, in my constituency, I discussed MLA remuneration with a great many constituents and when I run into trouble it is usually because the majority of them think that I am getting the same amount as the Members of the House of Commons in Ottawa who are paid more than our Premier is presently.

Mr. Speaker, with those very few and short remarks I will sit down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and the Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 33

Pepper	McNeill	Johnson
Thibault	Feschuk	Banda
Bowerman	Rolfes	Steuart
Messer	Cowley	Stodalka
Snyder	Tchorzewski	Lane
MacMurchy	Matsalla	Wiebe
Mostoway	Skoberg	Malone
Larson	Vickar	MacDonald
Whelan	Nelson (Yorkton)	Nelson (Assiniboia- Gravelbourg)
Kaeding	Allen	Clifford
Kwasnica	Koskie	Anderson

NAYS — 7

Collver
Larter
Bailey

Berntson
Ham

Katzman
Birkbeck

Mr. Cowley (Provincial Secretary) moved second reading of Bill No. 79 — **An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be short on this one for all Members of the House.

Bill No. 79 does basically three things. First it corrects the technicality whereby there are certain provisions in the Act which now apply to MLAs while they are currently MLAs of the Legislature but an MLA in exactly similar circumstances who happens no longer to be a Member of the Legislature does not have the same provisions applying to him with respect to a pension for his widow. This Act basically corrects that and treats MLAs in the same circumstances the same way whether they are present or former MLAs.

The second part of the Bill is a formula which increases the pensions for MLAs who are now receiving a pension from The Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act. The public servants in this Session and in the last session and in the one before that have received increases in their pensions. I believe it was two years ago when the last increase was made for MLAs. The provisions for supplementation are modest, Mr. Speaker, they amount to a monthly sum which is one-half of the Member's years of service times the number of years since the Member started to receive his pension. I don't profess that it is the most perfect formula in the world, Mr. Speaker, but it is one which tries to recognize two things. Those who were Members here a long time ago and whose pensions were small because of the formulas then, and also those who gave long service to this House and consequently have no other form of pension.

The third provision is a provision which allows ex-MLAs receiving a pension to serve on certain boards and commissions and be compensated for them.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 79 — An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Mr. Cowley (Provincial Secretary) moved second reading of Bill No. 76 — **An Act to amend The Ombudsman Act, 1972.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, again a very small and brief Bill. This Bill simply amends the salary of the Ombudsman in line with the adjustments that have been received by other senior public servants. It incorporates the \$480 COLA, plus provides for a \$2, 400 increase. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Ombudsman Act, 1972, be now introduced and read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Mr. Cowley (Provincial Secretary) moved second reading of Bill No. 77 — **An Act to amend The Department of Finance Act.**

He said: I would ask leave to introduce this Bill a second time. It was given first reading on the appropriate time, but unfortunately the printer was a little late. It wasn't here until this morning.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 77 — An Act to amend The Department of Finance Act, provides for an increase in the salary to the auditor. The amount provided for is the \$480 COLA, plus \$2, 400. The amount provided for the auditor is in line with the increases for other senior public servants. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Department of Finance Act.

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly on this Bill and indicate that we will be supporting it in our caucus.

I should like to point out a rather weird feature of this Bill where the Government is paying the Provincial Auditor, \$32, 000 which I am sure he earns. He probably earns more, but is not prepared to pay the Premier of Saskatchewan any more money than the Provincial Auditor makes. I think this is something significant and should be considered by all Members here when they decide tomorrow how they are going to vote on the other Bills that will be in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the Member for Regina Lakeview. I have sat in on Public Accounts and there were times when I thought the Members opposite thought the auditor was worth a lot more than some of us in the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:12 o'clock p.m.