

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 12, 1979

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. D.M. BANDA (Redberry): – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you and members of the House a visitor from Winnipeg, the executive director of the Churchill Development Board, Mr. Ed Guest, who is visiting us this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: – For information of the members, Ed is the executive director of the Churchill Development Board which is made up of representatives of the three western provinces and undertook the job to try to promote the use of Churchill to our advantage. We certainly welcome Ed here today. We hope that he enjoys his stay with us and certainly wish him a safe journey home tomorrow.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Cornwall Centre

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): – Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for the Cornwall Centre again. Mr. Minister, did you discuss with Mr. Fred Hill the possibility of his company becoming involved with the development of the Cornwall Centre? If you did, did you indicate to him that you would entertain a proposal from him?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): – Mr. Speaker, I received a phone call on Sunday afternoon (this is last Sunday) at 2 o'clock at my home from Mr. Fred Hill. He said that he had just returned from out-of-town and heard that his name was implicated in the legislature in respect to the Cornwall Centre. Mr. Speaker, I told Mr. Hill that to the best of my recollection his name was not mentioned in the legislature but I did hear on the new media that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) made reference to Mr. Fred Hill and that perhaps he might want to check the newspapers and with the media.

Mr. Hill asked me whether there was a chance for him to participate in the Cornwall project. I told Mr. Hill that if he wanted to get in contact with Chartwood and Eaton's and in some form they can work out an agreement that would be acceptable to them and acceptable to us, we would certainly be prepared to consider any proposal which would include Mr. Hill. He also mentioned Denro; he had apparently talked to the Denro people. It is interesting that those are exactly the names that the hon. members opposite have been bandying about in one form or another.

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the information you have just given us, Mr. Minister, you indicated that only if he were

to contact Chartwood and Eaton's and perhaps go into partnership with them, would he be welcome to do that. Well then, why did you then misinform this House last week (and I refer you to your statement in the House, in Hansard, where you were asked the question by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), and your reply) and I will read it in part, 'If they can come up with the same kind of proposal and carry on through', (if you want to, refer to page 144). To save a little time here, Mr. Speaker, I will drop to the last part, 'and perhaps certainly we will be prepared to consider it' – intending the government to consider a local developer. Will you answer that question, Mr. Minister?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, certainly I don't think there is any contradiction between what I said last week and what I said just a few minutes ago.

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister would like to clarify for me, what he means when he says that Mr. Hill or other local developers can go to the developers in Toronto and perhaps become associated with the, and last week he said that the government would entertain a local developer to deal with the project here, not in conjunction with the developers in Toronto. There is a difference, Mr. Speaker, if you can clarify that position.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): – Mr. Speaker, whether it is taking into partnership or whether it's acquiring the interest of Chartwood or Eaton's, it must include Chartwood and Eaton's. After all, we do have an agreement with them. They cannot be excluded. Obviously, the hon. member has had very little business experience to be able to fathom the kind of simple agreement that has to be negotiated with this kind of understanding or whatever it is. The hon. member – apparently it is just beyond his depth to fathom those kinds of things, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – I'd like to direct a question to the minister responsible for the Cornwall Centre. Your government has followed the policy in the past of breaking agreements, and I'm referring to some like that with the forest industry and re-negotiating leases. I can remember a broken agreement with the Meadow Lake pulp mill that you cancelled so merrily and arbitrarily. Would you now be prepared to cancel the agreement with Chartwood and give to local developers in Saskatchewan, the same opportunity and the same financial opportunity to proceed with the Cornwall Centre that you have given to the eastern developers?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might direct a question to the hon. member and maybe he might help me to deal with it. Is he now advocating that agreements which have been signed should be broken? Perhaps the hon. member may clarify that before I respond, and if that is the case, could he state that clearly?

MR. LANE: – I will answer it, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister is aware of legislation called The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act, that the public should be able to take advantage of in this case. Would the minister now be prepared to tell us whether Chartwood is able to deduct as an expense, for example, its fees charged for leasing the property, any management fees that Chartwood or the developer charges? Are those all items that are an expense before the so-called net cash flow is determined?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, all legitimate expenses are chargeable. I do not have the agreement in front of me and I am not in a position to answer the detailed questions that the hon. member is pursuing at the moment.

MR. LANE: – Would the minister not then admit these are reasonable expenses and

common expenses that are normally deducted. Will the minister not then admit that if Chartwood is charging a leasing fee, which would be normal for Eaton's or any other national company that it gets in, that in fact Chartwood would probably have recovered its initial investment of \$2 million to \$3 million before the project even gets off the ground and in fact Chartwood is not putting up a penny?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, no, I am not prepared to admit that.

MR. LANE: – Mr. Speaker, would you now be prepared (you indicate that there are amendments going on in the leasing agreement between the developer and Eaton's) to table the existing agreement that you have so we can compare it with the amended one whenever it is to be released as you have made that commitment? So that sometime the public can start to get the truth of this rather bad business deal that in fact does not help local Saskatchewan developers?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, I have provided the answer to that same question the other day and I stand by the answer that I have given. Further to my answer, Mr. Speaker, the deal that has been made is a good deal for Regina; it is a good deal for the government; it is a good deal for the people of Saskatchewan and certainly it is a good deal in terms of revitalizing the city of Regina. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservatives are that opposed to the revitalization of our urban communities, particularly our capital city.

MR. LANE: – A question to the minister. Can the minister explain to the general public how Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, Winnipeg and Saskatoon are able to have a revitalized downtown core (in Saskatoon in particular) with a local developer (by the name of Mr. Wiss) and you saw fit not to be able to manage the same type of project in the city of Regina and why Saskatoon is able to have a revitalized downtown with a local developer and you can't get one in Regina?

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! I'll take the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau).

Tabling of Cornwall Centre Agreement

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for Cornwall Centre. A moment ago you indicated to the member for Qu'Appelle that the agreements were signed. You ask if we're suggesting you should break a signed agreement. Then why did you last week suggest to us that you would provide the agreements once they are signed and completed? I'm quoting from Hansard again. Could we get some truth from you, Mr. Minister, on what is actually going on with this development so everyone can know?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, I provided the truth last week and I'm providing the truth this week.

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Mr. Speaker, I have given two different contradictory statements on what you actually said. A minute ago you said they were signed. Her you said you would provide them once they are signed. Now are they or are they not signed?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the members of the legislature that we had agreements. Those agreements at the present time are being revised because of changes in the project. I also indicated to the members that I'll give consideration to tabling the agreements. I have also said that would check with the partners, with

Eaton's and with Chartwood, before any agreements are tabled. And, Mr. Speaker, I stand by the answer that I have provided.

Discrimination Against SGEA Members

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): – A question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Koskie). It has been brought to my attention by a member of your department that the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association members are being discriminated against when they come to your department for financial assistance, particularly in the food, clothing and personal allowances area. Is this true?

MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services): – I could give you a rather short answer like no, but I can in fact elaborate on it and say that it is not true. In fact, any person has the right to come to the department to make application for assistance, as has any other person – a striker is included in that – and the application is processed as is any other application. Accordingly if benefits are payable the striker will receive them.

MR. SWAN: – Supplementary to the minister. Did you not in fact instruct your employees to be less than generous with SGEA members? This is the exact statement the gentleman made.

MR. KOSKIE: – Well, I can hardly comment on your source and verify the statements which you are purporting to make in the House. Categorically I say there have been absolutely no instructions in that respect. I repeat again that we are processing all applications on exactly the same basis.

MR. SWAN: – Supplementary to the minister. During the time when IPSCO (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation) – you knew it was on strike, about one year ago – your department was granting to the IPSCO members food, mortgage payments, clothing and personal allowances, the whole bit. Will you guarantee this Assembly that these same privileges will be granted to the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association members?

MR. KOSKIE: – Since processing previously the IPSCO workers, there has been no change in policy and accordingly we will continue with that policy.

SGEA Strike – Hospital Treatment

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): – Question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Rolfes). Reports indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there is a possible escalation of the SGEA strike which may include the employees of the Wascana and Palliser hospitals. Mr. Minister, have you a contingency plan ready to be put into effect to ensure that the therapy and rehabilitation of the patients in these two hospitals will not be disrupted?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): – Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) has just volunteered. He was talking about some crazies, so I accept his . . . I think it was a cheap shot, a very cheap shot on his part. And you should inform him of that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to answer a hypothetical situation. I have no indication that the strike will escalate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . would you mind, if you want to ask a question get on your feet. The answer is that I have no evidence that the strike will escalate, but I can assure the member from Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that our contingency plans I think will be

able to take care of a light escalation in the strike.

MRS. DUNCAN: – Supplementary Mr. Minister. You are probably aware that a recent strike at the Palliser Hospital in Swift Current caused hardship and suffering, not only on the patients but their families too, and yet your department didn't step in to help alleviate the situation. Will you give us your personal assurances that should the strike include the Wascana and Palliser hospitals, you will immediately implement a contingency plan if the workers walk out in support of the SGEA?

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member again that our contingency plans, I believe, are sufficient to take care of any escalation in the strike as it pertains to Wascana or the Palliser, as eh refers to them. I'm not quite certain what strike she was referring to – I believe it was way back in October of 1978 at the Palliser. My understanding is that the Department of Health at that time did move contrary to the facts that you may have.

MRS. DUNCAN: – Could you table contingency plans?

MR. ROLFES: – No, Mr. Speaker.

Land Bank

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): – Mr. Speaker, my question period was almost spoiled and it was saved only by the arrival of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy). Question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last April an Aneroid area farmer exercised his option in the purchase of land bank land – three quarters of land – which I suppose is O.K. except that there is a rather unique little twist to this one and that is that he had it sold twelve days before he paid land bank for it with a capital gain of \$53,000 for hip national Can you tell me, Mr. Minister, how many similar such instances have gone on in Saskatchewan that you may be aware of?

HON. G. MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): – Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I'm not aware of any other incident of that nature.

MR. BERNTSON: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the former minister of agriculture. Would you be aware of any other such instances?

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)): – Well, Mr. Speaker, on the spur of the moment I'm not aware of any.

MR. BERNTSON: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy). Would you agree with the statement by Mr. Wesson that no action would be taken against this individual or . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, because he broke the law. Mr. Speaker, would you agree with the statement made by Mr. Wesson that there would be no action taken against this individual?

MR. MacMURCHY: – Mr. Speaker, I have not discussed this particular matter directly with Mr. Wesson. If the hon. member would permit me to pursue the matter I'll be glad to do that with Mr. Wesson, and I'll report back to the hon. member by letter as soon as I have pursued it and have an opportunity to discuss it with Mr. Wesson.

MR. BERNTSON: – Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would you not now agree, Mr. Minister, that your land bank program has in fact run counter to your stated intent and

that in fact your land bank program to a large extent is responsible for the reduction of numbers of farmers in Saskatchewan by 6,000?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – Mr. Speaker, I would not agree with the hon. member. The intent of the land bank was to assist young farmers getting on the land. In fact that intent has been fulfilled. I think if the hon. member would listen and listen carefully.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – If the hon. member had listened carefully to my remarks in this assembly yesterday he would have noted that land bank and FarmStart have contributed to young farmers getting on the land far better than any programs in existence in Alberta or in Manitoba.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Municipal Affairs – Rural and Urban

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Rural Affairs (Mr. Kaeding). Since the split of the municipal affairs department into urban and rural, rural affairs has been left without its own assessment, community planning, auditing and accounting branches. What action, if any, have you taken to correct this situation?

MR. KAEDING: – Mr. Speaker, there will be coming forward in this session a couple of bills which will outline the responsibilities of the Department of Urban Affairs and the Department of Rural Affairs.

MR. PICKERING: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As early as last July you were made aware of this by the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and don't you agree that at the time of the split they should have voiced their opinion and looked into the situation of setting up such services for this department?

MR. KAEDING: – Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the requests of the SARM in that regard and certainly those requests are being considered in the setting up of the legislation.

MR. PICKERING: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you going to have the department or not?

MR. KAEDING: – Yes, I am.

Division of Municipal Affairs Department

MR. PICKERING: – New question, Mr. Speaker. It is not true that in fact you now admit that you are actually the minister of nothing and that the split was made by the Premier solely to save your face?

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order. I'll take the next question.

Air Service

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources (Mr. Gross). Mr. Minister, in this Chamber the other day your Premier stated and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, at the hon. member will know, air traffic is not a responsibility of the Government of Saskatchewan but is a responsibility of the Government of Canada and if there is any need for air service between Regina and Saskatoon the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) is the person who has the responsibility.

Mr. Minister, do you agree with that statement by your Premier?

HON. MR. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resource): – Yes.

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Will you also not agree that the only job of the Government of Canada and the CTC (Canadian Transport Commission) is to license and regulate all air traffic in Canada? It is not their job to run around the provinces looking for air carriers to provide service in the provinces.

MR. GROSS: – Mr. Speaker, the job of the Canadian Transport Commission is to license aircraft or air carriers in the province and that is their job. I think that answers the question.

MR. GARNER: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The provincial government should be aware of the inadequate air service in its own province. Has the minister met with Norcanair since last spring, and if so, when is his government going to start accepting the responsibility to provide air service in the province for the tourists and the businessmen who come into this province on the weekend and want to travel back and forth between the two cities? Start doing your job.

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Speaker, it is the job of the federal government and more specifically the Minister of Transportation of the federal government to license and to promote, if that is necessary, where he sees fit, the licensing of aircraft carriers. If there is a need between Regina and Saskatoon, provided there are applicants available for that, the needed steps are to be taken by the federal government. He should be directing his questions to the Minister of Transport in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: – I'll take a new question.

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Minister, in light of your press release dated November 15, where you welcome a proposal by Frontier Airlines on a link connecting Saskatoon and Regina with Minot and North Dakota – if it is the federal government's responsibility, were you in Denver? What are you doing with the taxpayers' money and why don't you start accepting your responsibility? You keep passing it to the federal minister and yet you are doing the job. Who is paying the bill for this?

MR. GROSS: – Mr. Speaker, I have trouble making my reply with the members opposite yapping like they are. Mr. Speaker, it is the job of the department of tourism in my respective area to promote tourism in the province. One concern that we have is getting the proper connections into Saskatchewan and that's the only interest we have in that area in that capacity. If you are talking about the connection to Denver – yes, we would

like to see a connection for Regina, Saskatoon to Denver. Very much we would like to see that connection and if we have anybody who is interested in those connections we would like to follow up those leads and give them the sort of moral support that is required. In this case I want to underline that if the member would read the press release in its entirety he would find that when we are doing is promoting a Canadian carrier first. We would like to see a Canadian carrier do it if it is at all possible and failing that, we would lend our support to another carrier be it the American carrier or whoever it may be. So we are looking after our end of the business of promoting tourism to this province and we would like to see a proper connection to Denver. It is very important that we have that connection and that is why we were down promoting that the Frontier people consider it. We are following up a lead given to us that they were interested. They had been up to visit us a number of times before and we were returning the call they had made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

Resignation of Deputy Speaker; Appointment of New Deputy Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: – I have a letter in my possession which I am sure all members of the House will be interested in hearing. It is addressed to me as the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and it says:

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Circumstances make it necessary that I ask the Legislative Assembly to allow me to retire from the post of Deputy Speaker, a position which I have felt greatly honored to have occupied.

I have endeavored to uphold the traditions connected with the office and if any success has been achieved therein, it is because of the support and co-operation received from yourself and the other members of the Assembly.

Please convey my sincere thanks to them.

Yours very truly,

J. Auburn Pepper

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, I would like first to address a word or two to the Assembly and then to make a motion with respect to a successor to Mr. Pepper. Mr. Pepper had advised me that he was going to retire from the office of Deputy Speaker.

I am sure that all hon. members will agree that Mr. Pepper has served the Assembly with distinction, that it will be acknowledged by members on both sides of the House that he served with ability and impartiality and that neither his ability nor his impartiality particularly when he was chairman of the committees of the whole of this Assembly was ever in doubt. I'm proud to have been associated with him in this Assembly. I am proud that one of my colleagues could serve this Assembly with such obvious merit and distinction and that in so doing he could serve the parliamentary form of government which serves us all.

As I have said on other occasions, Mr. Pepper is a person who is held in the highest regard by his political friends and his political opponents, and is held in that regard by his constituents whether or not they find it possible to support him at the polls. He has again, the same measure of respect, I suggest, to this Assembly. I am sorry that circumstances have suggested that he retire from the position. I know he will continue to serve his constituents well.

Mr. Speaker, we are now called upon to consider a person to fill the post and I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)) that:

William J.G. Allen, Esquire, member for the constituency of Regina Rosemont, be Deputy Speaker of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say a few words regarding the services of Mr. Pepper as the Deputy House Speaker. As last session was my first session in this House, I must say that I found Mr. Pepper to be most co-operative. I think he was very fair and I feel that his services will be missed.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: – I agree with the Premier in that Mr. Pepper is a member who is held in high regard by both sides of this Chamber.

I would like at the time to congratulate Mr. Allen on his appointment. We look forward to working with you in this session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – I would like to join with the House Leader of the opposition in congratulating and thanking the member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). I hope my comments last night about your finding the bottle of booze and putting it in the new Weyburn City Hall didn't do anything to precipitate your resignation from the particular position. If so, I regret my comments, Mr. Member.

As the senior member of the opposition I wanted to join with my colleagues in congratulating you, sir, and thanking you for your service to this Assembly. I know with the appointment of the new Deputy Speaker that there are a number of disappointed people in the backbenches over there, having been passed over for many other positions. I know that that puts added pressure on the new appointee.

I would like to say to Mr. Pepper that as far as the opposition is concerned, Sir, we have always sympathized with your position. You have had a difficult chore with that crowd always causing you so many problems, particularly during estimates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): – Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I will certainly accept the Premier's nomination . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I should say there is a reduction in pay, but we all do this to serve our constituents and province.

I want to say that I will accept the nomination but before I do so and sit down I think it would probably be appropriate to say a few words about the former deputy speaker, the hon. member for Weyburn constituency (Mr. Pepper).

The hon. member for Weyburn has been in this House for a long time – a lot longer, I think than most of us with a couple of exceptions. I see the member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer and the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) down there, but longer than most of us in this House. In those years I think he can look back and say that he has never done or said anything that he need be ashamed of. I am not sure there are many others in this House who could do that. His actions and his words have always been such as to bring great credit, Mr. Speaker, to both himself and to this legislature. I want to say in closing that if I can serve you, the members of this legislature, as Deputy Speaker with one half the ability and one-quarter of the dignity of the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) I think I'll have served you well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: – The Speaker is in a very unenviable position because he's not allowed to speak on anything in the House. However, if I were allowed to speak on something in this House, I would undoubtedly echo the words of commendation which have been said from both sides of the House with my own personal comments as well. However, in order to preserve the impartiality of the Chair, I shall not utter those words at this time.

Motion agreed.

CONDOLENCES

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a motion before the orders of the day dealing with the report which has recently been received concerning the passing of a former member of this Assembly, John Thiessen. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Taylor, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former member of this Assembly and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contributions he has made to his community, his constituency and to this province.

John Thiessen, who died on March 25, 1978, was a member of this legislature for the constituency of Shellbrook from 1956 to 1964. He was born in 1906 near Aberdeen, Saskatchewan, where he received his education and later took up farming. Active in municipal affairs, he spent a total of 42 years serving as councillor, reeve, secretary-treasurer for the R.M.s of Aberdeen, Canwood and Insinger. For 34 years, he served as a justice of the peace in his community. He helped to organize the local community health clinic and was also a member of the school board. Other community activities included involvement in organizing a local park and golf course, teaching Sunday school and working as an Elks lodge member.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy with members of the bereaved family.

Mr. Speaker, may I add something to the formal motion of condolence. John Thiessen

was a person with whom I served in this legislature from 1960 to 1964. He was a person who had a particularly distinguished career in the service of his community, using it in a broader sense. He did so through his church, the community organizations and this Assembly. He was the son of a pioneering couple. He worked not only to better the quality of life in Saskatchewan but also to build the institutions which are part of the fabric of this province.

John's service to the people of Saskatchewan took many forms as the formal notice of condolence indicates. Most of it was really in municipal work. The span of his career of 42 years included over four decades as a councillor, a reeve and a secretary-treasurer of the R.M.s of Aberdeen, Canwood and Insinger. He served in a multitude of other capacities: a justice of the peace for 35 years; a trustee of the Saskatoon East School Unit; founding member of the community health clinic in Canwood; secretary of four local telephone companies; member, president and treasurer of the Aberdeen Board of Trade. We see that his interests span many organizations. The list is long. The spirit of John's career in municipal work was one of practicality and generosity. As one of his colleagues recalls, John was good at just about anything he set his mind to and he tried about everything there was in the communities in which he lived. Accordingly, he was called upon by and large, to be secretary treasurer of the municipality, or the telephone company, or the board of trade, or his church, or as the case may be. He was, of course, an active member of our political party. He was active in the CCF for many years and became a member of the local organization in his constituency in 1948, attended the national convention in 1952 and the founding convention of the New Democratic Party in 1961. He ran in 1952 in Rosthern and was not successful. He ran against Walter Tucker, the then Liberal leader, but he got a large vote and made a good showing. He entered the Assembly in 1956 as the member for Shellbrook, was re-elected in 1960 and was defeated in 1964. He brought the same spirit to his work in this Assembly as he did to his work in the community, concerning himself with such issues as education, the advancement of Indian and Metis people and generally the concerns of his constituency.

He was a good-humored, quiet-spoken man. He was well liked and respected by his colleagues. He was serious and thoughtful and played his full role, particularly in the committees of the House. John's family life, like his public life, was a full one. He and his wife Marie raised a large family and built a strong home life. I found him, when I was his colleague here in this legislature, to be a helpful colleague and a co-operative friend. I turned up, for the sake of auld lang syne as one might say, the last statement he made in the Assembly in the Hansard just before the election of 1964. He was introducing a resolution:

That this Assembly urges that no rail line abandonment be permitted until the federal government establishes a proper agency to study the full economic and social consequences suffered by farmers, businesses and residents of rural and small urban communities, and the adverse effect on the financial position of local government; and urges further that before the abandonment of any branch lines shall be authorized, the railway companies shall have implemented plan for national reorganization of their system.

All this indicates is that the more things change, the more they are the same, since we could more than 15 years later be introducing a not dissimilar motion. This indicates – and the remarks of Mr. Thiessen which I had an opportunity to read and peruse indicate – his concern for his constituents and the possibility of adverse effects on them from rail line abandonment. That is typical of the concerns he brought to this legislature and

characteristic of the service which he rendered to his constituents. I know that others on both sides of the House would join with me in recording our sense of loss and in expressing our sympathy to all members of the surviving family of John Thiessen.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) in expressing sympathy to the Thiessen family. Although I never did have the opportunity of meeting Mr. Thiessen I can see by the record that he certainly had an enviable life in community service. To have 42 years at the municipal level, I think, is a very commendable record, along with eight years in this Chamber. Added to this, Mr. Thiessen served on the school boards, health clinics, church organizations, telephone companies, and community services of many types. I think that is an outstanding record of achievement and I believe that the province of Saskatchewan is better for the lives of men with this dedication to service, as did the late John Thiessen. I, therefore, would like to express my condolences to the bereaved family.

HON. MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): – Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few brief remarks to those who have already spoken. Much of what has been said and will be made a matter of record is that which could be repeated again by myself. I was personally acquainted with John Thiessen and his family. Canwood is very near to what I would call my home town. John was indeed a widely respected citizen in his community. There's no question about that. Those who rubbed shoulders with him on a daily basis recognized him to be a typical, rural Saskatchewanian. Of his 42 years in civic government, the larger part of it was spent in the community of Canwood. It's already been said, not only was he involved in rural government but also he was a man who involved himself in all aspects of community life – telephone company, community clinics, and so on.

I distinctly remember the medicare dispute of 1962 and among many of the interesting activities of those days, perhaps one of the greater honors that could be attributed to John Thiessen, with respect to the Canwood community, is that he was the main force in the building of the new community clinic building in Canwood, and obtaining a doctor for that town and for the community. That clinic is still active. It's very active today with a resident doctor and has been in continuous operation since its inception in the days of the medicare dispute. I think this speaks well for the town of 400 population and the community surrounding. Of course it speaks well for the original developers, one of whom was John Thiessen.

So, Mr. Speaker, without dwelling further on the points which have been enumerated here, I want to extend to his wife and family my sincere condolences. I'm sure that as we remember the life and activities of John Thiessen as a member of this legislature, it can be said that the efforts which he put forth, not only here in the legislature on behalf of a broad constituency of people, the Shellbrook constituency, and others in the province, he did so in a very honorable way in terms of his local community.

MR. N.E. BYERS (Kelvington-Wadena): – Mr. Speaker, I want to join other members of the Assembly in paying respects and tributes to John Thiessen. I did not know John Thiessen until he had retired from provincial politics. After he completed his service in this legislature he moved to the then village of Insinger in the Kelvington constituency and served until his retirement from the municipal field as the R.M. secretary at Insinger. I had occasion to visit John and Mrs. Thiessen on a number of occasions. He was residing in the Kelvington constituency at the time of my election to the legislature. So my association with him has been not as long as some other members of

this legislature. John Thiessen was certainly a true and dedicated servant of the public. You had to meet John to really appreciate how much he enjoyed working with the people of his community. He was a very kind man, a very warm man, a very dedicated person and one who had a very good sense of humor. I don't recall what wise person once said that he would sooner be first man in a little Armenian town than second man in Rome. I think that very much characterizes John Thiessen, who gave most of his life to working in the smaller communities of this province. I certainly got the impression that this description is an apt one for John Thiessen.

He was a member of this legislature and served the public at the local level when many of the institutions like our power system and our grid road system were put through – services that we now take for granted.

John Thiessen retired from municipal work in Insinger and move, I believe, to Saskatoon. I was not aware of his passing until we learned of it a few days ago, but I certainly join other members of this Assembly in expressing sympathy and condolences to the members of the family of the late John Thiessen.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my words of condolence to those of the Premier and others who have spoken. John Thiessen (sometimes we called him Jack), came and went during my sojourn here in the legislature. This legislature was better and Saskatchewan is better for John Thiessen having been here and at other places in the province.

It wasn't by accident that John had these progressive thoughts and that he acted always in the best way possible to serve his community. He came by it honestly. His father was a wheat pool delegate, a reeve of his municipality and a leader in his community. John Thiessen again proved that the apples never tool too far away from the tree. I am sure that his family will continue making the same kids of contributions, due to the leadership and the teaching and the influence of a father like John Thiessen.

I remember is hard work; in fact there was a period of time in the '50s when I shared a room with him and I got to know him very well. I can say that John was a friend of mine and I am proud that he was. I remember when there was one member of the family who rolled a little further from the tree than John. It was prior to the 1960 election, I believe, that his brother in Rosthern (a younger brother) stood for nomination as a Liberal candidate, would you believe. There were some catcalls across the floor of the House when John was speaking one day and they said, what about your brother, John? What about your smart brother, John? John looked across and smiled and he said, well, he may be smarter than I am but he's not as wise. And you'll find that in the record.

Anyway, I believe that his wife and family will be pleased that we have noted John's work. It was mentioned by my colleague Mr. Byers, and I want to say too, that he worked hard in the legislature for certain things which have now become institutions.

It was during the '60s when John was here in our caucus that we fought for and pushed for, as caucus members, the grid road system which was of course a new departure, committing the government of that day to multimillions of dollars which have continued to grow since that time, but have provided a secondary highway system in Saskatchewan that is second to none anywhere on the continent.

Those are the kinds of ideas which grew from members like John Thiessen because he knew the needs and felt the needs and understood the needs of rural areas.

There were other things. Farm sewer and water – our caucus committee worked on that and it came to fruition. Today, because of that forward thinking of people like John Thiessen, there are very few homes that aren't served with modern facilities such as sewer and water because of the farm modernization plan which was introduced during that period of time and has continued to serve the farm areas of Saskatchewan since that time.

John was part of these and many other things which have been mentioned. I can say again, Saskatchewan is a better place; the community John lived in is a better place and I am sure the members of the family he has left behind are going to continue in that tradition of making their communities a better place to live in because of the co-operative community-serving type of people they are. They should be proud to have had a sire like John Thiessen.

Motion agreed to.

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bowerman (Minister of the Environment):

That the resolution just passed together with the transcript of oral tributes to the member of the deceased member be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of the Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): – I move, seconded by my seatmate the Hon. Mr. Bowerman (Minister of the Environment):

That when his Assembly do adjourn at the end of the sitting of the day on which this motion is adopted it shall stand adjourned to a date set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government and that Mr. Speaker shall give each member seven clear days' notice, if possible, by wire and registered mail of the said date.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – I feel that we've been summoned to this Chamber for this fall session and I would hope to conduct the business of this province. It seems to me that there's been very little that has taken place to date. I have not seen any significant bills being introduced. Those that have been introduced to this point in time have been pushed down, shall I say, in the most abrupt manner in that we, as members of this legislature, are being asked to approve bills that are landing on our desks just prior to the questioning on these. I don't think that's in the best interests of this province. I don't think that's what the people of this province want to see in the legislature of this province and I don't think that we as the opposition are willing to stand for that kind of slipshod government.

I also feel that there's a very important strike on in this province of Saskatchewan. Since the opening of this House, we have asked questions repeatedly of the minister in

charge and of the Premier that they would assume the responsibility of their portfolios and try to bring about a settlement of this strike. At this point in time I have seen very little progress, very little progress at all. I have many more question to ask of the members not only on that topic but on other important topics that are facing this province of Saskatchewan. I can't see that an early closure of this House would be in the best interests of this province or of the legislators in this province. I came here to do a job. I'm willing to stay here to do that job and I can't see that trying to put bills in front of this House without due deliberation can be in the best interests of the province of Saskatchewan. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we should stay in this Chamber, discuss the issues and do the job that the people of Saskatchewan elected us to do and not run out on the first occasion . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: – . . . not to run out on the first occasion because some of the situations in this province are embarrassing to the government opposite. I think we should come up with some solutions. You claim to have the great mandate. Let's see you bring about some solutions to the problems that are facing this province today. And that solution, Mr. Speaker, is not to be leaving this Chamber at the first opportune moment but to stay here and debate in due deliberation. I think those are the words that I would have to say and I'm expressing the views of my colleagues here, that we came here to do a job. I'm not sure that you did. From your actions I can't see that you're doing your job at all my friends, and therefore we will want to stay in this House until some of these solutions are arrived at.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – Mr. Speaker, since this session has started we have made repeated requests to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Tchorzewski) for the tabling of the public accounts. And the reason for the request for the tabling of the public accounts is to that the public accounts can be referred to: (1) the opposition, (2) the public accounts committee. Surely the whole function of the opposition in the legislative process is to make the government accountable, to make the government accountable to the people – that's the function. They are the executive branch of government; the legislature is the function of government to make the government accountable. And all we simply ask for are the accounts. Where are the accounts? If we can't have the public accounts between now and the time the session comes in, that type of work, the opposition can go through those accounts, can do some inquiring as to how the money was spent last year and in that sense of the word try to bring the spending of this government under control. Surely that's the function. What do we want to do? We come in here for seven days for a Speech from the Throne debate that says nothing, that gives no direction as to where this province is going. It simply comes out and talks about their dogmatic views about how great they are. It advances virtually nothing in terms of legislation, Mr. Speaker. In terms of the Meewasin Valley Authority they have the audacity to lay on the Table after question period starts, less than an hour ago, the amendment to the legislation. It has been covering the news in Saskatoon for perhaps two or three weeks now and they have the audacity to lay it on the Table less than an hour, less than an hour before! And now they want to get out of the House.

The government made a big to-do last year about their great line that it is the function of the government to open this House and it's the option of the opposition as to when it closes. It strikes me that you fellows over there can talk about that, with all your pomp and ceremony and in all your self-righteousness, and then you turn like this. So what I say to you gentlemen opposite is number one, bring the public accounts before this thing instead of wishy-washy, back and forth. And then you can stand up – you 43

or 44 of you – and say whether or not we are going to close this House.

HON. G. MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): – Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out to all of the hon. members here in the Assembly the real purpose of the fall session, why it was established and the benefits that have accrued as a result of it as it has developed. I think the original intent, Mr. Speaker, of establishing a small portion of the session was to do three things.

1. To introduce the throne speech and have the debate.
2. During the debating period, to introduce a number of the bills to be passed during the session.
3. To introduce legislation that requires passage in the fall in order to meet a particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, the fall session under those kinds of structures has worked very well indeed. We have had throne speeches; we've had excellent debates. I thought the debate yesterday in the Assembly was just outstanding. We had good speakers – you and I spoke. We had a number of bills introduced. There has always been a cry from the opposition members during my stay in the Assembly that they did not have enough time to look at the legislation, they weren't properly prepared to debate when second readings came up, they had to adjourn, there wasn't enough time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We have introduced so far some 46 bills. Now there are more bills to introduce and they will be introduced when we pick up the session come late February, as is the tradition since we started the fall session operation. There will be more bills introduced but the opposition, during the Christmas break and January, will have an opportunity to look at the bills that have been tabled and then when we come back, it will be prepared to debate them and debate them fully. As we introduce new bills they will also during that period have time to examine them and consider them and debate them fully. I think those two procedures have worked well, albeit there have been sessions when it has been necessary, when it has been in the public interest to introduce legislation and have it passed and we've had lengthy sessions as a result. But I don't think that's our case during this fall session. Our case is a normal kind of case where we have the throne speech debate, we introduce the bills, we have some second readings, adjourn and give the opposition time to prepare for the spring session with a number of bills before them. I think that's just an excellent route to follow, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – This session has been an absolute waste of time and the legislators of this province deserve to be condemned for walking out of here without dealing with some of the pressing problems, without being able to hold the government to account for its handling of the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) strike, without being able to hold the government to account on its public expenditures and the record as presented by the provincial auditor, without being able to hold the government to account for what looks like bad business judgment on the Cornwall Centre.

You know the highlights of this session to date have been the throne speech party, the announcement that the government opposite, the Premier, is going to hold a New Year's party at the public expense and the new and first time that we've ever had a members' wives' tea. That's the sum total of the record of this particular session of the Legislative Assembly. Let me tell you, that's something to be proud of. And the members opposite think that they've accomplished something. They're pretty proud of

what they've brought forward. Let's look at some of the legislation. Let's look at some of the legislation that we've got all winter to consider.

Let me take a look at item 8, the amendment to The Arts Board Act. This is a biggy. This is a controversial one that you'll want input on from everybody and I challenge every one of you to take 50 of your constituents and tell them how serious the matters are that you debate. Each member of the board shall hold his office for a term of one year until a successor is appointed, but may be removed for cause by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That's the serious problem as seen by the government opposite.

Then they have another biggy! They have another pressing matter that requires the full consideration of all legislators. The Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts Act. They're going to make a major amendment to The Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts Act – subject to subsection 2, each member of the board on his first appointment holds office for a term of one year and until his successor is appointed.

AN HON. MEMBER: – There's no work to do. Why do you want to sit?

MR. LANE: – Oh, I'm going to make a suggestion on that for the hon. member. Then, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you the one that I know is just going to take the full study of each and every one of us. I know, Mr. Speaker, you're going to be most deeply concerned about this yourself because the controversy that's going to rage in this Assembly when it comes up is going to be some of the most heated debate that this Assembly will ever see. It's going to tear apart, it's going to divide this province from one end to the other. It's going to pit family against family. It's going to pit neighbor against neighbor. It's going to pit community against community. Let me tell you what that vital piece of legislation is. The amendment to The Public Libraries Act says the annual meeting of the board must be held between January 1 and May 15 in each year. Now, have you ever heard, Mr. Speaker, of a more controversial, vital piece of legislation in your years in this Assembly? I know, that's the record. There is only one bill that meets the criteria as set out by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy). That is The Personal Property Security Act. That is going to take some serious study. But let me tell the Minister of Agriculture that that is the same bill we had last spring. We could have introduced it last spring and tabled it. We could have debated it this fall.

It is the same on the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) tabled before the Assembly. In fact, every criterion that you raise has not been met. If we take the argument of the Minister of Agriculture, that the sole purpose of this fall session is to debate the throne speech, then I'm going to suggest to the minister that we cancel it from now on. Do away with it – not have the fall session of the Assembly. Since the institution of this practice we, in fact, have done nothing but increased the cost to the taxpayers of this province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right and I'm going to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that you hear me out because you know, he is typical of the members opposite.

He can only do one thing. He can't walk and chew gum. He can't talk and listen and, Mr. Speaker, it is time for listening for the members opposite – particularly the member for Kinistino (Mr. Cody). What I'm suggesting and what the Conservative Party is suggesting is that we do away with the fall session. We are in fact, Mr. Speaker, wasting the taxpayers' time and the taxpayers' money. If we had the throne speech debate and the introduction of the bills in the spring, we would cut and we wouldn't extend the time of the spring session.

It was the normal practice until five or six years ago that both the throne and budget

speech be held in the spring. In fact, I saw the light and I hope you guys see the light this afternoon. You certainly haven't indicated any degree of concern about the public expenditure when you won't bring in public accounts, when you give the minister responsible for the Cornwall Centre (Mr. Smishek) the ability to go and spend money. I mean, even his wife doesn't do that for heaven's sake. You are giving him the opportunity to go and spend \$37 million.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no justification. In fact, this session is an embarrassment to the government because nothing of any significance has been dealt with by the legislators. In fact, the only major issue of concern (and I question how much concern it is to the general public), is the matter of the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) strike. In fact this has been an absolute waste of time and an absolute waste of the taxpayers' money, and the responsibility for that waste lies with the government opposite. It lies in particular with the Premier. It also lies with his House Leader (Mr. Romanow) when, after several months of inactivity, all he can bring forward are amendments to some of the legislation that he is proposing now. In fact, we say if the government has a matter of vital and pressing public importance, that it indicates to the public, that be the sole justification for a fall session. Until we get a commitment (and we all deserve some responsibility) we are wasting the taxpayers' money; we're charging them more by bringing people in for two sessions instead of one. I say to the government members opposite, you haven't done yourself very proud with this session. You haven't done yourself credit with this session. In fact, as I say, you deserve and you take the responsibility for the silence of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) who refuses to participate in the debate on the SGEA, refuses to ask question. You take the responsibility for the evasions and conflicting statements of the minister responsible for the Cornwall Centre, and I say that that's all we've got to show for this. It's a nice happy little list of parties, and some bills that in fact could be tabled in the spring without causing the public any inconvenience whatsoever. I hope the minister opposite when he gets on his feet, is going to justify calling this Assembly as a member of the Executive Council and is going to justify to the public the expenditure of funds for this session, and the reason for this session.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): – I always did have a difficult time with you noticing me. I thought maybe when I was sitting a little closer to you you might have been able to see me more adequately but apparently not. Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the members opposite would like a good speech and just keep up your yip-yap and I'll be sure to give you one. Mr. Speaker, when I got word that this motion was moved in this House by the Regina member responsible for urban affairs, seconded by his seatmate. I was deliberating on a bill, Mr. Speaker. I introduced by the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Hammersmith), the minister responsible for Northern Saskatchewan. It was a bill which I was hoping might bring some benefits to northern Saskatchewan. It was a bill which I was hoping might bring some benefits to northern Saskatchewan. That's what I was doing, Mr. Speaker, that's what the members of the opposition are doing. They are studying the legislation as it comes before them, and I just got this 20 minutes ago in my desk. And you bring in that kind of a motion!

Now then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) who usually, in his own boisterous way stands up there and gives a speech and just reads . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I tell you that you make an argument that's an awfully weak argument. The member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy) tells this House, tells this opposition that we have to have bills before us to study all winter long. Mr. Speaker, I tell that member and the Minister of Agriculture, nonsense! Absolute nonsense. Because Mr. Speaker, the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) said only moment before you took your place that he required documents from the public accounts so we

could review them. Now how is that argument consistent from the Minister of Agriculture? Mr. Speaker, you know, I know, the members of the opposition know and the members of the government know that is not at all consistent – not at all. If we require the bills before us to study all winter then, Mr. Speaker, we have got to have the public accounts documents so that we can keep you people accountable to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. Doesn't that make a little bit of sense to you? Certainly it doesn't make any sense to the backbenchers. Mr. Speaker, surely the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) newly elected to this Assembly, would like to have an opportunity to say something other than to move the Speech from the Throne. Surely! But oh no, he's going to be just like all the rest of the backbenchers out there. They are doing nothing in here so they figure they might as well do it at home. Well, Mr. Speaker, the opposition in this House doesn't do nothing in the House and it doesn't do nothing outside the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: – Now then, Mr. Speaker, you would notice that the backbenchers applauded and the front benchers did not. And, Mr. Speaker, that's because the front benchers, being slightly more intelligent than the backbenchers understood what I said. Of course the member for Pelly (Mr. Lusney) hasn't heard a word yet; he hasn't heard a word since the day he was elected in here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just take a look at the ministers we have and the backbenchers who are attempting to move up a few rows – the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Engel) as I said – the only cabinet that he'll find is in his kitchen. We have problems, Mr. Speaker, in the government benches. If there's a reason for this government to want to get out of here, Mr. Speaker, it's because the opposition is doing its job. It's doing its job and it's an embarrassment. They thought, Mr. Speaker, they could come into this House and they could put their stuff on the Table and gain some more political mileage with the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, that has not been the case.

The opposition has raised substantial issues which have, Mr. Speaker, created an embarrassment to this government. The Cornwall issue – I'm sure the minister responsible for urban affairs (Mr. Smishek) would love to get out of this House, absolutely love to, because he has to face that tirade. He has to keep coming up with these inconsistencies; he's saying one thing one day and another the next. The Minister of Urban Affairs obviously doesn't know what he's doing in his department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, further to that we have a Saskatchewan Government Employees Association strike, although you would think that the government members didn't know it at all. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) sure could not care less. He hasn't done a thing. He hasn't responded to a question in the House. On one day, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this government took five notices on questions. Five notices. Why? Two reasons: because his ministers aren't in the House on the one hand and because he doesn't have the answers on the other, Mr. Speaker.

Now surely, if I were a government with the ineptitude of this government, I'd want to get out of here too. But my constituents know and I suggest the constituents of the opposition elected us to do a job. Now if you're going to expend taxpayers' dollars to call us in here, then why can't we do the job? Doesn't that make sense? No, not to that bunch of people over there. Not at all.

Mr. Speaker, maybe another reason they want to get out of here is because the throne speech addresses itself to absolutely nothing and they know it. The opposition has had a difficult time in picking something when it has nothing in it. But we have drawn that fact to the minds of the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, and they know, the opposition knows, and the government is fast becoming knowledgeable of the fact that there is nothing in the throne speech. A government is supposed to have all the answers, the social justice policies . . . It's a said sight. I say to the people of Saskatchewan – a sad day indeed.

Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, well now, it's always interesting to know that you're finally waking a few of them up on that side of the House. But I'll just make one more statement here to the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Hammersmith). If you can justify to the people of northern Saskatchewan that you come in here for a short two weeks and can do the business on behalf of northern Saskatchewan, well, I'll tell you, you will be doing something pretty shoddy up there, just pretty shoddy. I don't know how you're going to get away with that. But I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, I may spend more time in northern Saskatchewan this year than you do and we'll see what happens when the spring session opens. I'll tell you, we're not getting out of this House until you give us some answers.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset of my remarks. it's absolutely appalling that a government would bring in such a motion. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I'm glad that it's on their shoulders and not ours. The opposition would like to do a job. We're obviously outnumbered, but what more can I say.

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the comments made by the members of this House. I listened a few minutes ago to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) explain why we needed a fall session . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Take the cotton out of your ears Paul, you might hear. If you would ask the other members around you to keep it quiet, then you will be able to hear me. It's as simple as that. I'm sure that my voice is carrying through very well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Are you ready? Mr. Speaker, they're the ones that went to leave this Assembly. I can be here till next month if they want. So it's up to you, gentlemen, if you want to continue your yapping, keep it up.

The Minister of Agriculture has failed to convince me that there was a need to call this session this fall. There isn't a piece of legislation that has been introduced (as the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) has indicated) that couldn't have waited until next year.

This government has become so arrogant in their replies to questions from the opposition. I don't blame the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban) (Mr. Smishek) for having made the motion he has. For one week, we have been asking, questioning the minister about his responsibilities in the handling and the mismanagement of the Cornwall Centre and so far, we've had double answers. We haven't had one answer yet that we can be satisfied with. I'll tell you how arrogant this government is. I have been waiting since last year for information that was promised to me in this House – photocopies. If the Minister for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Hammersmith) will listen, I asked last year and you promised that information within three weeks. I'm still waiting for it – the photocopies of the logbooks of the aircraft.

We've asked questions in this House in this session that we've had absolutely no answers to. You have been skating everything. You refuse to be responsible to your

duties. You've been unaccountable to the public, to the taxpayers of this province and yet you want to walk out of here. You've been unaccountable to the public, to the taxpayers of this province and yet you want to walk out of here. Why did you call it in the first place? I say the Premier of this province has been irresponsible in calling the legislature without doing something. We have an emergency in this province. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) refused to intervene, refuses to bring both sides together for negotiations and does absolutely nothing. We are now sitting with . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: – They're together right now in the Hotel Saskatchewan.

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Well isn't it about time! We have been asking you to do it for two weeks. The minister suggested the farther I could stay away from it, the better it would be and that's exactly the attitude that you have taken. If you had come closer to it, there wouldn't be a line-up at the welfare bureau today waiting for their welfare cheques from your employees. That's what the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Koskie) is refusing to recognize. Again, we have the evidence that \$108 a month is what you're offering. So that you're really being . . . You're putting a squeeze on.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. As the warm feeling of the Christmas season settles about our shoulders, I'm sure all member want to try to conclude whatever we're on now. However, I realize the latitude allowed on this resolution is quite wide because of the nature of the resolution but I can't allow members to get into details about something that is not pertinent directly to this resolution that is before us. The resolution basically deals with the adjournment of this House to a time unspecified. I realize members, if they feel compelled, must refer to reasons why they need more time to discuss issues or why they may not need more time or why we have a fall session and the purposes for the fall session, but I can't allow members to get into detailed discussions of contract negotiations or bills or resolutions that happen to be hereabouts that might be discussed at some time in the future.

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize for using the specifics that I have and I'll stick to more generalities on this motion.

I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition has been stonewalled since we came in here two weeks ago – stonewalled by every minister and every member opposite. We have been refused answers and we're not getting them and they are asking us to adjourn this Assembly today.

The SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) strike, in our opinion, was serious. It was an emergency. The 11,000 members who are out there on strike collecting no funds are going to have a very bleak Christmas to say the least. We've questioned several ministers. I can talk about SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). We could talk about the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban) (Mr. Smishek). We can talk about tourism and natural resources are the prime example of today. We can talk about the DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan). I can talk about all of these – the public accounts which we've asked for and you have continuously refused and yet at that point in time you have the nerve to turn around and ask us to approve a motion to adjourn this House when we've done nothing, absolutely nothing for the taxpayers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, that is their responsibility and certainly we on this side can sit here till next year, until you can prove to us why we should be adjourning or prove to us why you called this session to begin with. And as the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) said it's about time we started looking at the fact that we need a session maybe in the spring, not

twice, Mr. Speaker. I oppose the motion.

MR. KATZMAN (Rosthern): – Mr. Speaker, we have a motion before us to adjourn this House. Yet when we were called to this session by a throne speech that was lacking in many areas, it is interesting . . . oh, I'm just informed that presently there are members from the other side of the House basically packing their baggage to go home. I would hope that wouldn't be. That's the arrogance we're seeing from the NDP in this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me start by making the comments re the throne speech – why we were all called here and yet we have not seen this type of legislation brought into the House. I refer, during the throne speech, to page 5 where the Department of Environment has suggested that it has not done its job in the past and will be bringing in legislation which will effectively change the environment act of the province of Saskatchewan. That being the case, I would assume that that is urgent and pressing legislation because of the government's involvement in the northern Saskatchewan development area and because of what may happen in the Warman area and other parts of the province.

WE have seen the Government of Saskatchewan's total disregard, as was mentioned by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter), or the Coronach projects. We have not seen an environment bill. That was maybe the reason this session would be called – one of the possible reasons – to discuss the environment and the protection of it for the future generations of this province. That might be pressing legislation in light of what has happened in the Department of the Environment. They have sort of forgotten to do their job in the past and we've had the PCB (polychlorinated biphenyl) spill and several other areas and as my desk mate referred, to the water problems that they're having in Regina with PCBs. Maybe we expected some legislation in this area – pressing and urgent – urgent for the health of the citizens of Regina and Moose Jaw and those of us who drink the water of Regina. There's no legislation and not hint of what that legislation will be. We don't know how big, how thick – no time, they didn't bring it in so we could study it during the break. Now, when I make that comment I remember that prior to being a member in this House, the reason explained to me by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) that they had a fall session was to bring in pressing public concerns and once again the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) said the same thing in his little speech on this issue. He said public interest – things that people will have an input into.

We go through all the bills that have been presented and where are the bills of public interest? Well, the first bill with some public interest, in my constituency and around the city of Saskatoon is Bill No. 46 moved by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) today. He hasn't suggested that tomorrow he would get up on his feet and rise to speak on the seconding of The Meewasin Valley Authority Act. He hasn't suggested what he is going to do so people can consider it while this House is adjourned until the call of the Speaker. Also, he is not listening to the concerns of the public in Saskatoon.

AN HON. MEMBER: – He never has.

MR. KATZMAN: – One of the members says he never has – well he listens to his political friends in Saskatoon but I don't think he listens to the people who are affected by legislation. Last year some of us in this House had a piece of legislation slip by us because we didn't see all of the ramifications. But the bill was passed last year; the ramifications are now visible today.

The member for Saskatoon Riversdale, The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), when asked on Monday, the former minister of finance suggested – oh here is the notice we are bringing in amendments. In he rushed to put it on the table and we have amendments. Shortly after 3 o'clock today we received these amendments. Obviously we are not prepared to discuss them today and pass them or amend them because it takes time to study. He must remember the public in Saskatoon is concerned. Why are they concerned? Because there is a stamp on their title. Because the money lenders say that because of that stamp we will not loan you funds to assist you in improving your property or to buy the farm machinery you may need.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Will they lend it to them now Ralph?

No, they still won't loan it to them because the bill hasn't changed. We have put a hardship on people in the Saskatoon area affected by the Meewasin Valley Authority.

MR. LARTER: – You mean they have done this to people . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. KATZMAN: – Yes, member for Estevan (Mr. Larter). It's another people issue where they have forgotten about the people As I was starting to say, the Attorney General suggested through his former minister of finance, the member responsible for the Cornwall Centre and what else, on Monday, that on Wednesday we would see a bill which would correct the problems within the Meewasin Authority. Well we haven't. We got a bill, as I have said, at approximately 3 o'clock this afternoon. But if we adjourn as the members on the other side are suggesting when they moved their motion, they are saying to heck with the people of Saskatoon who are financially in trouble and don't know where they stand on legislation now that it has been brought to their attention. These people don't know if they can sell their land without offering it to the government first. We have the chairman of the authority standing up and saying, I am requesting the Attorney General to bring in legislation to correct this, correct this and correct this.

The Attorney General brings in legislation (and he has had plenty of time to bring in legislation for us to consider). He could have had this bill in here for us a week ago; he didn't have to wait until 3 o'clock today. But that's not the way the Attorney General and the NDP government seem to want to work. They want to ram it through. They don't want to give it to the opposition with plenty of time to study, and that's what is important. We need time to study the bills. I agree with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) when he made that statement earlier.

We also must remember when we, as legislators, cause a hardship on the private citizens of Saskatchewan – in this case the private citizens affected by the authority surrounding Saskatoon's river bank – we should be prepared to correct it as best we can to take the burden off their backs. But no, that's not what we are going to do. We are all going to go home for Christmas, for a New Year's party paid for by the Government of Saskatchewan for the first time and forget about these individuals. That's not what we are here for Mr. Attorney General. What we are here for is to work on legislation for the benefit of all of the people of Saskatchewan. When we pass legislation that causes hardship we should be man enough to stand up and say, hey fellows, we might have made a mistake here. How do we correct it? Let's get down and discuss it. Let's find a way to improve the situation when we put a hardship on individuals. The Attorney General (Mr. Romano) isn't suggesting that. The chairman of the Meewasin Authority suggest that and goes to him as a member of that authority.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Are you talking to Mr. Devine (Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party)? He's listening.

MR. KATZMAN: – Is he? Well, you know, the member for Regina North-East (Mr. Smishek) makes comments about our leader. Let me make a comment. At least our leader listens to the people who are concerned, not like you members. You don't listen to anybody. You do what you think is politically the best thing. You don't worry about the people who are affected. You don't worry how you dig into their pockets and tie up everything they own, what they've worked a lifetime to build. You don't worry about that. That's not important to you. What is important to you, Mr. Minister? Is it that \$2,000 donation we heard about that you got for the NDP as was indicated? That's what's important. That's why you gave that nice little fixed deal over here in Regina. No private developers involved. That must be what's important to that minister.

Let's get back to the one item I'm talking about. Let's talk about this authority in Saskatoon that is affecting the rights of private individuals. Private individuals have brought their concern to that authority. That authority has stood up and said yes, we agree, we should make changes. The Attorney General sits on that authority. Obviously I would assume the Attorney General, being a member of that authority would bring before the House legislation to correct these problems. No, he wouldn't be involved in legislation to get us out of this House before we cure the problems. That's what we have, Mr. Speaker. We have the Attorney General suggesting that those people back in Saskatoon aren't important. The people in Riversdale, Saskatoon Centre, Saskatoon Mayfair, the Sutherland area, they're not important. They don't count. We're not worried about the farmers in the Biggar constituency or the Rosthern constituency. All that matters is, we said we would bring in something; we'll discuss it next March or whenever. We're not going to worry about it presently. Not at all. You see, we brought in this bill and we thought everybody needed time to study it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Oh, I'm glad to pick up the comment from the member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) who is presently trying to become the Speaker of the House. He made his first move today into that Chair, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest be careful, as he checks out your office when he comes to visit you. He suggest do we want this bill passed today? Let suggest to the member that maybe the Attorney General who had lots of time could have brought it in on Friday, given us the weekend to study it and then I could have answered our comments. Yes, I'll tell you this much: I want the inequalities that are hurting the private citizens of Saskatoon fixed, the inequalities that were forced upon their backs by us, you and us, when we voted in favor of the Meewasin authority. The Attorney General sits on that authority which has passed a motion – nobody argues – and their chairman has spoken out and said we want it fixed. But he's not coming in to get it fixed until the last minute and then he can go out and say I tried. Let me suggest to the minister that I don't see within the bill . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see that I'm getting all this assistance because you know, I can use the fresh breath of air every so often and a drink of this PCB water. Well, Mr. Speaker, we just heard from another section of the government on the other side. I'll get back to the Attorney General a little later, but let me first get to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). The minister who is responsible for nothing. He's responsible for nothing, the minister says. When you ask him whether he will assist this – no keep me out of it. When you ask him about this – don't ask me about that – the minister of some people would say, no comment, no answer and so forth. The Minister of Labour suggests that in the labor legislation in this province as it affects the SGEA (Saskatchewan

Government Employees Association), he makes no comments because he might be charged with an unfair labor practice because they are his employees. He refers to other unfair labor practices that were suggested against him but I suggest to the minister, let's look at the circumstances under those and remember what happened there. They are totally different situations. I suggest that when two cabinet ministers phone people, I'm not surprised they get attacked with unfair labor practices.

Mr. Speaker, as I started to say when I stood on my feet, the environment issue, I thought would come under a bill. We have an uranium issue that is very involved which the people will be speaking to in Martensville and Saskatoon during the month of January on how it affects them, Mr. Speaker. I didn't see the environment changes coming in that would have changed the act so that we all would know where we stood. We might have discovered in the new environment act that it was not a proper thing to have a uranium refinery beside a public park which is basically what we are developing with the authority and the uranium refinery side by side. Maybe the legislation would have said in the environment act that these aren't compatible, therefore, they cannot be. Then it would have solved the problems of an expensive hearing and we would all know where we stand. But we don't see this environment act. They might decide, well we'll bring it in after and put that in but because that refinery is already approved we're not going to change it.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer to one more item that has been talked about by the members on this side. As you are aware, when this fall session was originally thought of, the idea was for the public accounts and the annual reports of all the departments to be tabled in the fall, so that during the adjournment portion all members would have a chance to study these and come back for the spring portion of the session. Even that isn't happening any more. We now see a motion that we forget about that 15 day period and we bring them in later, either because it's a strike in the printers or some other reason. We don't see a total attempt by the Government of Saskatchewan to try to bring in all these reports, the public accounts which are the large volumes which take a great deal of study. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Tchorzewski) hasn't tabled these yet today. That is part of the reason the fall session was originally started by the NDP government. But now the fall session has become a total embarrassment to them because they don't want to give any answers; they just want to come here and get the thing started.

You know, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) if you were a little less worried about Mr. Crosbie and worried about the boards that you sit on and the people whom you represent, it might be a little bit better. All you worry about are the things that are political. You don't worry about the concerns of the private individual.

Mr. Attorney General, as I was saying earlier to you and I said I would come back to the point, the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) asked you just after the House started to correct certain missing portions – 10 days ago the minister said. Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Has the member for Rosthern concluded his remarks?

MR. KATZMAN: – No, the member is just waiting until he can have the floor again.

MR. SPEAKER: – The member has the floor and has had the floor continuously. If he could continue his remarks.

MR. ROMANOW: – . . . irresponsible opposition tactics . . .

MR. KATZMAN: – Mr. Attorney General, before I take my seat let me suggest to you that you have totally bungled your job representing that board. You have totally forgotten about the concerns of the private individuals and land holders in the area of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, and the riverbank area. You are saying to them all as you move to adjourn the House, you don't matter; I don't care about you; it's not important that you are going to suffer because we can't make up our minds and correct the mistakes that we made last spring in moving a bill. Where's the minister? Mr. Minister I suggest that you have bungled our job and the people of Saskatoon will remember this. Therefore, I will not be voting for this motion, because I think it is irresponsible of the government. As you are saying in Ottawa when the Conservatives suggest something – irresponsible. Well you are the irresponsible members in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Morse): – Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make on this motion. Don't leave Roy, I won't hurt you today.

Mr. Speaker, when this legislative Chamber is called into session for a nothing session, I know the government opposite is not going to be able to explain it to the people of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, we'll let the people judge what it is when it comes from a nothing minister. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that's why this session was called in – so the Premier could try out some of his nothing ministers. Mr. Speaker, we have a very crucial situation in Saskatchewan today with the SGEA strike. We've got fighting in the government cabinet. The Minister of Labour will not accept his responsibility. he fights with the Minister of Highways. The Minister of Highways isn't here; he's skating up and down the highways.

Mr. Speaker, the students, the young people of Saskatchewan are being affected by this strike today. They are not getting their education. The parents are footing the bill. The government, typical of this socialist government, could care less.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer is this government going to continue caring less about the young people of Saskatchewan? It's no wonder we don't have them in the province – that they go to Alberta because they know in Alberta they are taken care of.

Mr. Speaker, we have been promised the public accounts would be tabled. We still haven't received them. Mr. Speaker, we need the public accounts tabled so we can find out how this socialist government is wasting the money of the people of Saskatchewan. We have many more questions to ask of this inept government today and throughout the rest of the week. But no, they want to close the session down. We don't want to close the session down, Mr. Speaker. It's the government opposite that wants to close it down.

Mr. Speaker, I think this session will be known as the government's party session – not a session where there was a great deal accomplished, just renewing the old acquaintances.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this government is getting to be more of a closed door government. They would just as soon not have the legislature sit at all and would just like to run it like a dictatorship which they're trying to do right here today. I will not be voting for the motion.

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): – Mr. Speaker, I don't know that any one of us in this legislature could justify leaving here today and going home to our constituents when we have, as far as I am concerned, a number one concern and issue, and that is the issue of the SGEA strike.

Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General would just give me a few minutes and remain silent, I will explain what I would like to say here. Mr. Speaker, if there is one word that comes to mind in explaining my feelings with respect to this session, this sitting and this government, that word is disinterest, disinterested in the strike. We have watched and listened to members either making statements off the cuff, or statements, considered by some members of the government, that have gotten them into serious troubles. Other ministers, the seatmate of the one I'm referring to, is sitting silent when he should be involved. Public accounts have been expected and demanded, Mr. Speaker, and we haven't seen them. Nothing bills have been introduced, 40 some nothing bills that could have been saved for the spring session – a lack of interest and laughing off during question period and goofing off, in some cases. But I think probably, Mr. Speaker, what is more typical of a disinterested government is the example this government uses on a day-to-day governing basis, and that is, government by order in council rather than government by legislature.

I think that is the reason we shouldn't be here, Mr. Speaker. That is why we are asked to go home. This government is not interested in listening to the opposition or the people of Saskatchewan. Let's sign the orders in council and govern the province that way. It was so typified today, Mr. Speaker, by the answers of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban) (Mr. Smishek) or referred to as the minister of nothing. He has had the department for several months and even yet the legislation is not introduced. In fact, I suggest the way this government passes orders in council wasn't even significant enough to come to these Chambers. He is the minister of nothing today.

We as legislators in Saskatchewan, in my opinion, are shirking out duty if we leave this chamber today. We have witnessed this disinterest by the government not exhibiting any kind of leadership with respect to the SGEA strike. I watched the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) in this House, not more than two years ago during a dairy strike, run back and forth to that seat, nearly wear the carpet out, and listen to the bells ring while the strike was being settled downstairs. Why was it settled? Because the people of the province were concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I'm afraid it may have tainted the fine image of the NDP, but the people of Saskatchewan aren't quite so concerned about SGEA and they know that over there. They are not so concerned, so they are not so interested.

Mr. Speaker, we have suggested what we would do. We have asked and begged the Minister of Labour and others in that cabinet to exhibit some leadership to bring the sides together, use his good offices (if I remember the terms used by some of our members) to bring the people into this building and sit down and negotiate. He said earlier today that they are sitting at the table negotiating now. That's fine. I'm happy. We are all happy. So what happens if the negotiations break down and we are not here, what then? Who takes you people to task then?

The irony of this fall sitting, Mr. Speaker, (and we are now being asked to forget what is happening and go home) is that really what has happened with respect to the SGEA strike is that it is a fight between one branch of the NDP and another branch of the NDP – the labor union bosses and the NDP government. It is ironic, and I think worse than that, Mr. Speaker, aside from the fact that it is Christmas, I believe to a great degree that

the government is using the SGEA and the strike to help offset a deficit budget, if you can imagine. I don't know how long they are going to do that though, Mr. Speaker, if the social services minister, as indicated in question period today, is giving welfare to these people. I think that it is a slap in the face to the union movement in this province, when they have to go to your government, the people who are keeping them off the job through a lack of concern and interest for social welfare. You should be very proud of yourselves this close to Christmas. Mr. Speaker, again I repeat the need for us to remain in these chambers for the next several days, or even several weeks if necessary. This government to date has yet to give us what we consider – and I'm sure the press will repeat the same thing, will agree with these statements – adequate, reasonable, leadership answers with respect to the strike. We see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) who sat on his hands for the last two or three weeks, sitting beside an antagonistic minister who in fact I can't understand, who has been at least muzzled if not taken from this cabinet by the Premier (Mr. Blakeney).

Mr. Speaker, disinterest by the government and lack of accountability are so typical of the reasons we're being asked to leave this fall. What's indicative of that sort of situation was that the independent member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) this past session received a letter from yours truly, not a critical letter, a letter of inquiry with respect to highways in this province, May 2. May 4 I received an acknowledgement that my letter was received by him. June passed. July passed. Finally in late July I contacted his office again and I was ridiculed by his staff. I shouldn't be making inquiries about letters I had never written. I then forwarded a copy.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. I think the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) must more than tangentially or peripherally related to the subject before us, and that is the adjournment of this House. For the member to go astray and talk about certain subjects and then come back and make a brief . . . order . . . and then make a brief reference to the adjournment of the House, is not sufficient. The member must talk on the resolution and any side comments can be peripheral to that about some other subject, but he can't spend time talking about letters that have been sent to ministers and whether answers have been received or not. The subject is the adjournment of the House, and I think I must try and hold the member to discussing the adjournment of the House.

MR. HAM: – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually it's just one example of several dozen I could cite as arrogance and disinterest on the part of the NDP government of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this session has been, I think, best typified by the word stonewalled. In question period time after time either we received ridiculous answers, foolish answers, evasive answers, or in the case of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) no answers. To this point I can't understand why his hands can even function from sitting on them so much. Mr. Speaker, again I repeat we as an opposition party cannot walk away from this legislature with the very serious problem facing the people of Saskatchewan, that being the strikers that are at this present time walking in the cold around this building and other government buildings of Saskatchewan. We'd be viewed by our constituents and the public generally, and the government viewed the same way, as shirking our duty. Mr. Speaker, there's no way I can support this motion.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, we've heard a great deal about the willingness of the opposition to sit and to do business. We have heard the opposition say this motion was ill-conceived because it would have adjourned the House today, Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, whereas normally the House would have been adjourned on Friday – two days later. The Premier (Mr. Blakeney) indicated well in advance of the opening of the session that the House would adjourn before December 14, which is a normal period.

He has indicated . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) is extremely aggravated these days – politically nervous and edgy. I understand why that's the case. I just wish he would not bring the anxiety of his, his political anxiety, to this House. Agitate your leader out in the corridor but don't bring it to this House, unless you take part in the actual debates. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. The facts are that the Premier indicated the House would adjourn before December 14. The facts are that always, always in a fall session, the House has adjourned on a Friday, two weeks after roughly the calling of the House. This would close it down in two days. The fact of the matter is that the government has indicated that the major purpose of a fall session is to get the Speech from the Throne before the people of Saskatchewan, get the debate before the people of Saskatchewan, table as many of the bills as we can, have those bills stay over for public comment and debate, to be dealt with in the spring. We've done that. We have 46 bills. I want to say quite candidly, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to have had more. I think we could have more. We are hindered by the obvious fact there is an employees' dispute going on. I think that is indicated by everybody. Any person who would be fair-minded about this (and I'm not talking now of the opposition because their minds are made up) would understand that to be the case. But we have 46 bills. I would like to see a longer list and bills which can be of more meaty substance in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the fall session has been met except for two extra days which I say have been curtailed for the reasons I have already articulated. The opposition says nonsense. Mr. Speaker, the opposition would like us to believe the House should sit because there is a strike in progress. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the public to consider those words very carefully. The member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) just now said public accounts. I've indicated to the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) that public accounts will in all likelihood be tabled, as it has been every year, in the fall session – every year. We've never had such a partisan chairman of the public accounts committee as we have this year, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this House. No, we haven't. We've had Mr. Ken McLeod, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We'll deal with that at the spring session and elsewhere – the actions of this hon. member. The business but the flying of executive aircraft? I don't quarrel with that. That's his right.

But when the hon. member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) got up in the House and said remember about the exchange on the aircraft, about the phone call returns, his answer was in the press. We'll find out about that in public accounts. I say, we do have a very partisan political chairman who has, in a way, indicated regretfully the direction of public accounts which is different from the way it was. But we'll deal with that at a later date. There's going to be lots of time to do this.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have done all of this. I say to the members of the House, public accounts will in all likelihood be down. If they want the assurance, I will assure the members of the House that if we were to adjourn today (I don't know whether we are) we would undertake to table them today or tomorrow. We would undertake to table them. But I don't hear that, Mr. Speaker. I hear they want to hold this House because of the strike. That's what I hear. I heard that from the hon. member for Swift Current. I heard it from each and every member including the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) – because of the strike.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want you to listen to why they are opposing these grounds for adjournment. I ask the public and the strikers and the people of this province to consider why it is that an opposition wants to keep the legislature sitting, the legislature

whose prerogative it is to pass laws while there is a strike? You know what the answer is, Mr. Speaker? The answer is this government believes in the process of free collective bargaining. That opposition believes in back-to-work legislation. That's what the answer is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative opposition wants this House . . . Mr. Speaker, I ask . . . I cannot hear myself because of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor). I don't know about Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order. I tend to agree with the member now and with members before that there is some difficulty in hearing what is going on. I take it this is a serious debate and members will treat it accordingly. That means you are going to listen to the other side's point of view.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I am making the point which has been made by each and every PC speaker this afternoon. The record shows that. Surely, nothing that I say here can be said to be a perversion or twisting of their statements. The press knows that to be the case. Every speaker here says that they've got an SGEA strike and they want this House to sit. Now, I want to ask you, why do they want this House to sit? Someone says for accountability. They can't ask the question if the House is not sitting. They can't make their comments to the press if the House is not sitting. Mr. Speaker, they have been indicating that they make their statements when the House is sitting or not sitting. They can't get answers. The member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) just said that even when the House is sitting, according to him, they don't get the answers. yet they want the House to sit. Mr. Speaker, they want the House to sit. Now I am saying to the trade union movement and the people of the province of Saskatchewan that there can only be one logical reason why they want the House to sit. They want to introduce themselves, as they do by private members' legislation and other precedents, back to work legislation to compel the workers to go back to work. That's what they want to do. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the answer is not that they want to sit, surely the answer is not that they want to sit because of the devastating questions they've been asking us during the course of the strike.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you and the press and the public to consider the record. Friday, the first day after the Speech from the Throne, we had a strike full-going. Thursday, the day before, we had demonstrators outside the entire Legislative Building. Was there an emergency debate raised by the opposition with respect to the strike? Not a word. That's how concerned they were about the strike. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, because we have a course. Our policy is collective bargaining, our policy is collective bargaining and not political rhetoric inside this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – I want you, Mr. Speaker, to look at the record. Take a look at the record during question period. I invite the press to take a look at the record of questions on the strike by the opposition. What are the questions invariably, Mr. Speaker? Invariably the questions show at the end of the question to somebody or other, what are you going to do about it. Please use your good offices is what they just finished telling the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). I have heard about the dairy strike, Mr. Speaker. He said, ah, the Minister of Labour was beating a hole in the carpet going back and forth between the dairy strike. I remind you, Sir, and the members and the public and the

press in the House that the dairy strike, the conciliator, Mr. Sig Walter, in that dispute requested the attention of the Minister of Labour to take part in the negotiations of the dairy dispute and the Minister of Labour complied with a request to the conciliator and they are stretching that into something totally different with the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association). There has been no such similar request, Mr. Speaker. I ask the members of the press, not the opposition because they already committed this point of view, to take a look at the questions. What have they suggested should be done? What have they suggested be done other than that somehow the Minister of Labour should be using his good offices, Mr. Speaker? He has been using his good office; he has directed his conciliators to deal with the strike. Where are the questions? Where are the proposals by the PCs? You know why they have not put a specific proposal and you know why they want this House to sit? Because, Mr. Speaker, their proposal is, make no mistake about it, back-to-work legislation. That's their solution and that's what they want to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that's the position the Progressive Conservative Party is in. They have not indicated a position. They have not asked questions of any substance in the framework at all.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Tchorzewski) raises this. I haven't had a chance – obviously I'm on my feet looking at this – I invite you to take a look at today's question period. Was there a question on the strike? Cornwall Centre – the first 20 minutes of the question period was Cornwall Centre. That's why they want to sit here. How about the air travel between Denver and the like? That's what question period was. Mr. Speaker, there may have been a question on the strike; I don't know. There may have been a question on the strike; there may have even been two questions on the strike for all I know. But this is not an opposition, nobody should be fooled, who is coming in here full of vim and vinegar about the problems of the strike and leads off question period every day on the strike because they don't even raise those questions themselves. Mr. Speaker, I say that that argument is the most shallow and irresponsible cover-up for the true intentions of the PCs that I have ever heard. That's what I say it is. I say, Mr. Speaker, more than that. I say the argument is mischievous. It's an argument to keep this House going so they can politically cloud the dispute. They know how sensitive the discussion are now with the conciliator. They know the conciliator is going back and forth between the public service commission and the employees. They know that. And yet they want this House to sit so they can inject their partisan political comments.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of workers out there. There's a public service commission out there. We're all struggling for a settlement. There's a conciliator struggling for a settlement. That is not good enough for the PC opposition. What they want is this House to continue so that they can continue to make their partisan political comments, such as they are. I say it has been suggested there's going to be back to work legislation around the corner. That's what they want the House for.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying to the members of this House and to the legislature, I have never heard such a mischievous and phony reason in this House, and I've been around for 12 years. This fall session, Mr. Speaker, has been working now for eight or nine years on the same pattern with the exception this year of two days – two days which I think are perfectly justifiable given the circumstances. And the opposition knows about that as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in this 10 days we haven't heard one proposal.

They've had 10 days of this House to put their solutions for the strike on the table. They haven't. Ten days – they haven't given us one concrete operation. They've had a question period today and not more than one or two question on the strike.

They've had proposals on everything else. Cornwall Centre (which by the way is something – not that it matters – but even our good old friends at the Leader-Post say is a necessary action for core revitalization) – it's a peripheral to my argument, but I mean this is the kind of an argument which is of urgent pressing importance where even the media, which is traditionally opposed to us, find support for the government in this area.

In 10 days this is what they have done. Now, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite say they are here to do work. They say they are here because they want to work. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am here to work also. Every one of the members on this side of the House is here to work as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have 46 bills on the order paper and Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take up the words of the opposition at their face value that they're here to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I am also prepared to take the opposition at their face value that they're not going to introduce back-to-work legislation tomorrow or the day after. That's what they say. I'd be prepared to take their word on that as well. And I'm also prepared to take their word, Mr. Speaker, that they're not going to cloud the negotiations with partisan political remarks. That's what they say, so I'm going to take their word for that too. But more importantly, what I'm going to do, Mr. Speaker, is I'm going to take their word that they don't believe in adjourning debates and wasting the taxpayers' money with respect to the bills.

They're anxious to remedy the wrong we committed on Meewasin Valley. We have the legislation, Mr. Speaker. You're ready to work. We're ready to work. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear! Let's go to work.

MR. SPEAKER: – The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) has asked me to adjourn the debate. Is leave granted?

Debate adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order, order! The members are proclaiming that they're anxious to get to work. Order! I'm trying to call attention to the fact that the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding), the Minister of Rural Affairs, is on his feet and has the floor. However, I cannot do that as long as the members keep up a constant barrage of back talk. Now the member for Saltcoats has the floor.

SECOND READINGS

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation) moved second reading of Bill No. 3 – **An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act.**

He said . . . Mr. Speaker, before I move this bill I want to make a few comments. The municipal employee superannuation plan was initiated by a committee of rural

municipal secretary-treasurers back in 1930. It wasn't until July 1, 1941 that the rural municipality secretary superannuation act was adopted by this Assembly. The statute in question was applicable to rural municipal secretaries and to all rural municipalities. The adoption of this act formulated a nucleus of the municipal employee superannuation plan as it is applicable to the municipal employees of today. It was not until the years of 1948-49 that executive members of various urban associations namely the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and the School Unit Secretary-Treasurers' Association began co-ordination of efforts and resources towards the preparation and drafting of a superannuation plan for all employees and respective employers of these associations. The first draft with the proposed requirements to be applicable to these employees and employers was ready in November of 1949 with the rural municipal associations secretary-treasurers' superannuation plan being the basic source of reference in the preparation. It is not surprising, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the characteristic requirements contained in the urban draft were similar to provisions contained in the rural municipal secretary-treasurers' pension plan. In 1959 the two pension plans were amalgamated into one pension plan which at that time became commonly known and referred to as a money purchase type of pension plan. The rate of contribution established by that act was at the rate of 5 per cent of salary earned by an employee with a matching contribution made by each employer on behalf of his employees.

Members of this Assembly will recall that the economy in the '40s and '50s and even into the '60s was not as buoyant as it has been during the 1970s. Because of low salaries paid to municipal employees during those periods, accumulation of funds for retirement purposes was considered by a vast majority of employees to be most inadequate. In 1973 the former act was repealed and a new municipal employee superannuation plan became effective on July 1, 1973. The new act made provision for substantially improved pensions to retiring municipal employees. This act, Mr. Speaker, made provision for a pension earned by a retiring employee to be based on six calendar years of average highest salary on which contributions had been made to the plan and multiplied by the number of years of service provided by that employee.

You will recall that during the last session the six calendar years of highest average salary for calculation of pension earned at retirement was reduced to five years. As a result of that change approved by this government, retiring employees will now receive between \$6 and \$30 per month more pension depending on the highest average salary applicable to that employee at retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to members of this Assembly that the new approach in respect to pensions earned by municipal employees is now based on a concept or principle that retirement is directly related to the last five years of salary earned by each employee. This new approach under the act is commonly known as the unit formal benefit pension plan having in mind the fact that this pension plan is also fully funded.

The new municipal employees superannuation makes it compulsory for all municipal employees to become participating members of the plan following one year of actual service with a municipal employer or employers. The act also provides for other groups or organizations to become participating members of this plan as well. At present, all rural municipalities, school divisions, school districts, villages, town and cities, with the exception of Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Weyburn, are employer members of this plan. On January 2, 1979, the city of Yorkton also became an employer under

this plan.

There are several significant important amendments which are being proposed to this act and I would like, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize that all associations representing the employers and respective employees, have endorsed the necessity to amend specific sections of this act to ensure that equitable benefits will be made available to all participating employees at normal retirement age.

It is equally important to consider the fact that representatives of commissions and staff who are responsible for the administration of this plan, make it their duty and responsibility to meet and discuss with groups of employees, rural or urban, all details in respect of this plan. These representatives attend and speak at annual conventions, outlining in detail the benefits that will be made available at retirement to municipal employees. As a result, proposals are submitted to the commission requesting desirable changes that would have to be made to the plan without detrimentally affecting the financial solvency of the plan. Evidence to that effect has been made available to my department. The commission, all associations, members, staff of the plan and my department work in close harmony toward achieving improved benefits on behalf of municipal employees who are members of this plan in this province.

As I stated earlier, there are several very important amendments which are proposed to this act. Because of the numerous changes involving the names of municipal employers that are subject to this act, it was considered important the amended definition should contain correct terms as used in respective acts that are applicable to these employers. You will note that the rural health region as a municipal employer has been deleted by this amendment because health regions as employers have never been participating members of this plan.

You are probably aware that rural telephone companies are being gradually assimilated into the Saskatchewan telecommunications system. Therefore, the need for representation on the commission has become negligible. The amended sections now provide for representation on the commission from the community colleges association.

It should be noted that subsections (5) and (6) of section 14 of the act are being repealed because these subsections tend to discriminate against employees of certain age. It is desirable, Mr. Speaker, that the act provide equal consideration to employees of all ages in respect of services rendered to municipal employers. Section 16 of the act, comprising of subsections (3), (4) and (5), is amended for the very same reason.

I should emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that based on requests received from respective employee associations, it became imperative that the vesting schedule as applicable to employees previously, had to be amended to ensure that pensions earned by municipal employees after five years of service would be available to such employees at retirement. You will note that employees now will obtain vesting rights to employer contributions for retirement purposes after three or more years of service, rather than the former minimum of six years of service.

Deferred allowances which are covered under section 35 of the act had to be amended to comply with the newly-established vesting rights under this bill and because subsection (2) serves no purpose now, it is being repealed. Because full vesting rights to employer contributions have been amended from ten years to five, section 37 which deals with refunds, had to be repealed and a new section has been drafted to take its

place.

Provisions contained in the act under 'postponed retirement' are unclear. Section 42 in that regard has been repealed and a new section 42 clarifies whether or not an employee may continue making contributions to the former plan with a matching contribution which may be made by his employer. You will note that an employee who postpones his retirement may use the salary earned during his postponed retirement for his five calendar years of highest average salary when he actually retires.

Finally the act in question provides for an executive secretary to record minutes, sign investment vouchers and make other payments including pension payments. Any absence due to the illness or annual holidays makes this phase of work extremely difficult or inconvenient to administer if no such person were available.

The amendment proposes in subsection 6 of section 9 and section 60 of the act, remedies to present difficulties in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – Both of us have done the work on this thing and that's what we have been trying to tell you. We now know why the government wanted out. They didn't want to listen to the long speech of the minister opposite.

As the minister has indicated the various associations have in fact supported it. We had checked with them knowing full well the government wanted to get this particular bill through this session. It's the same thing with the teachers I might add, when you bring that forward this afternoon.

The opposition has checked with the various organizations and we will be supporting the bill.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – Just a short comment to substantiate what the member for Qu'Appelle has said.

In principle we do support this bill. We are prepared that this bill be made into law this session. There are, however, a couple of points raised by the urban municipality association concerning the qualifications, but that question is better put in committee of the whole investigation on this matter.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary) moved second reading of Bill No. 11 – **An Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to have an opportunity, unexpected as it is, to introduce this particular piece of legislation.

I must say I have enjoyed some of the things which have been going on in the House today. I note that members opposite are living up to their name, which in itself is an anomaly. The member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) never wanted the session to start and the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) doesn't want it to end. I do hope they will get together on this sometime in the next month or two and let us know what they

would like to see happen.

Mr. Speaker, what I am introducing is a bill to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance act. This bill adds triticale, lentils, canary seed (for the members opposite) and potatoes to the kinds of crops that may be insured by the Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association.

The association has received request to insure these kinds of crops and desire to make this protection available to farmer.

Further, the bill enables the association to fix the period during which insurance coverage is to be in force. The period need not be the same for each kind of crop.

Under the act the basic amount of insurance is \$10 per acre but the board may provide an additional \$25 per acre referred to as additional indemnity. This bill increased the amount of additional indemnity from \$25 to \$40 per acre, thus increasing the maximum indemnity to \$50 per acre. The amount of additional indemnity is determined by the board but may not exceed the amount stated.

The Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association remains in a sound financial position. Its surplus and reserve as at January 31, 1979 exceeded the \$19 million. These reserves provide the association with an annual investment income of over \$1 million. The income from reserves tends to stabilize hail tax assessment while the reserves provide protection in the event of a bad experience in any year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that I think the Municipal Hail Insurance people would like, if possible, to see passed at this session so they could make the necessary preparation for the upcoming crop year.

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to move second reading of a bill to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): – Mr. Speaker, on this Bill No. 11, the Municipal Hail Insurance Company has been around for a long time and I think it has been an excellent company. This is indeed a good bill and it's a pleasure to have a good bill come from the government side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time that this bill came forward because the cost of production is up and with our increased prices from grain, I think it fits right in with our times. We will be supporting this bill. However, when the bill comes to committee of the whole, I will have a couple more questions for it at that time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 1 – **An Act to amend The Attachment of Debts Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the request for this amendment initially comes from the Law Reform Commission of Saskatchewan. The commission has undertaken an extensive study of consumer credit legislation. As part of the study, they have examined The Attachment of Debts Act in detail. In the opinion of the commissioners, the exemptions

were inadequate the they recommended legislative action to remedy those. Section 22 which set out the exemptions was last revised in 1973. Since that time the value of the dollar has dramatically decreased, as we all know. In addition, in comparison with other provinces, Saskatchewan exemptions are low.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that we regard this amendment as an interim measure. The law reform commission realizes that the method of providing for exemptions requires revision in some way or other and we need seem further policy study about this. However, the law reform commission is in the midst of its study on unsecured creditors' remedies and is not able to make a specific recommendation to us at this time and thus, the interim measure.

The amendments set out in section 4 will increase the basic exemption to \$500 and allow an additional \$100 exemption for each dependent a person supports. Although the increase may seem large. I am sure all members will agree that this amount is essentially the necessary amount for goods and services at today's prices. The amount of exemption is kept above the amount of social assistance payments to ensure that an employee, whose wages are garnisheed, is not induced to quit his job and thereby seek social assistance payments.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act to amend the Attachment of Debts Act.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – Just a comment. We have no objections to the particular bill. But the Attorney General didn't advise the Assembly of the need for the speedy approval of the interim measure. I'm not sue that the amendment couldn't have awaited the full report of the law reform commission. Again, I really see nothing that seems to be pressing on this particular matter and could find nothing which would indicate it is a matter of pressing public importance. I wonder if the Attorney General would, when he's losing debate, indicate where the pressing public importance came on this particular amendment?

MR. ROMANOW: – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The thrust for this amendment as I indicated in my second reading remarks resulted – I don't want to say exclusively – primarily from the law reform commission and their survey of other legislation related to the attachment of debts in other parts of the country. The survey revealed, for example, that in May of 1979 it required approximately \$1.90 to purchase the same goods and services that would have been purchased in 1973 for \$1.13. Another aspect of the survey indicates that the exemptions in Saskatchewan are really among the lowest in Canada.

The amendments here would increase the exemption in Saskatchewan and elevate them, placing them between Manitoba's which are slightly higher still than ours – even with these amendments passed – and Alberta's, which would be slightly lower than ours once we passed the amendments. Now we could have withheld this particular aspect until such time as we'd gotten the comprehensive report from the law reform commission on the larger policy aspects of the attachment of debts. But that report is not expected until at least next fall, so our choices are to do nothing until we get the report and keep at low levels, maybe among the lowest in Canada, or to try and move up and find a median there which is reasonable between Alberta and Manitoba. We felt, for the reasons I articulated in my second reading speech, that it's better to move for the median approach, and await the report in the fall. I think that makes eminent good sense, and I hope it answers the member's question.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 2 – **An Act to amend The Attorney General's Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this amendment to the act is of relative housekeeping or minor importance. The section is necessary in order to give the Attorney General express legislative authority to make grants to justice organizations. Each year, as members opposite would believe, my department receives a number of requests from organizations for grants. Last year we paid money to organizations much as – and this is a category of grants we are looking at – John Howard Society, the Saskatchewan Association of Provincial Court Judges, the Canadian Association of Police Chiefs and the Saskatchewan Human Rights Association, voluntary citizens groups.

The section as set out in section 2 of the amending bill is substantially the same as those which allow the grant-making powers in other pieces of legislation for other ministries. The Attorney General may make grant for purposes of his administration for which he is responsible to an amount of \$10,000. If it is over \$10,000 then, of course, the Attorney General would have to go to the cabinet to seek approval for this. All of the grants of course, I hasten to add before I take my place are dependent upon budgetary approval. You can't give grants without having a budgetary allocation for the grant which comes up in the normal treasury board and budget bureau mechanism. Accordingly to a large extent, this is really an academic exercise because you have to get the approval financially first, and then legally, to be able to make the authority for the grant. There are many organizations of this kind which are petitioning us for funds. We need to sift this out in the budgetary process. I'd like to have the opportunity to be able to make those grants to the individual organizations to assist them as we all struggle in this question of improving the justice system in Saskatchewan. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 2.

MR. LANE: – The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) by his comments indicates a surprising lack of comprehension as to the expenditure process. My understanding is that historically it was the legislature that approved expenditures and not treasury board. In fact that was the reason for the existence of parliament at one point. Now the Attorney General makes a surprising statement that all of his justification for his expenditure depends on treasury board, now what the elected representatives say. That attitude is a matter of concern. I think it should be a matter of concern to all of us. Not only did I read the bill to the newly appointed Deputy Speaker, but, in fact, we want to start indicating to the government opposite that the absolute discretion members of the executive council have been getting over the last few years to spend amounts as they see fit is contrary to the parliamentary tradition. Secondly it is not a practice to be condoned.

So, as a matter of record, we are opposing the blanket granting of expenditure powers to any cabinet minister. We will assume all of the supplicants for grants are in fact deserving. It still should be a matter of approval by members of the Assembly and for that sole reason we will be opposing the bill. We will be opposing such general blanket powers of expenditures. It's obvious for all members to see when you start with this which may be well and good. I have great faith in the Attorney General's ability to spend the moneys wisely. I don't have the same confidence in the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Smishek) or the new Minister of Health (Mr. Rolfes).

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member to, once again, peruse the proposed amendment particularly sub (3) of the amendment, section 3 which says grants authorized (the grants of which I seek approval) under this section shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by the legislature for the purpose. This is obviously the situation. It comes to the House for an appropriation. It'll come up during my budget consideration. The hon. members opposite may say under vote 1 – do you have any grants appropriated for John Howard or whoever? Give us the list of grants you seek to appropriate. I've got to pony that up and explain it. If I don't, then obviously they pursue their own estimates. That is the case. The reference to treasury board is purely a reference in the situation that before a payment is finally made out as a check and control to make sure that proper spending is carried out by government, it requires budget bureau and treasury board approval. It is not intended or meant in the way the hon. member has interpreted it. In any event, the effective answer to his interpretation is subsection (3) which says it's got to be voted on and appropriated by this House.

So I really do suggest to the hon. member opposite that there will be an awful lot of people in Saskatchewan who will be disappointed if the PC Party takes the position that the Attorney General's department, or any other ministry department . . . presumably we should do away with the Department of Social Services and other departments which had have this for a long time, which have had this authority. We should do away with this and out of all the various grants that are existing to the organizations. I really invite the hon. member to reconsider because I think that is a bad argument in the light of the fact that subsection (3) is there. Perhaps he just overlooked it or forgot it in his remarks.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I beg second reading of Bill No. 2.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 24 – **An Act to amend The Administration of Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons Act.**

He said . . . This amendment is necessary to solve a problem the administrator of estates experiences from time to time. While a husband wishes to sell, lease or mortgage land, The Land Titles Act requires that he comply with The Homesteads Act. This amendment, as all members opposite know and this side of the House as well, I intended to deal with a situation where the land being sold by the administrator of estates is not the personal homestead. The administrator does not possess the personal knowledge necessary to swear an affidavit pursuant to The Homesteads Act. Therefore, this amendment is intended to permit him to go to the Court of Queen's Bench on the facts known to him and thereby request an order to the effect that the land being sold to the Court of Queen's Bench on the facts known to him and thereby request an order to the effect that the land being sold is not a personal homestead.

The amendment does not limit in any way the rights the wife may have under the planned personal property security act. It merely facilitates the transfer of property. It will be necessary to get the wife's consent still to transfer the homestead and where the wife refuses, the administrator of estates will then have to apply to the courts which I think would be an adequate safeguard in order to allow the administrator to discharge his duties under the bill. I move second reading of Bill 24.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – I am sure the legal profession initiated this bill. With the implementation of this bill, and I hope all the members of the legislature appreciate that, there are going to be a lot of people in this province who are going to be happy with this type of legislation because it goes toward keeping the costs of legal fees down

December 12, 1979

for people in the community. I'm sure the legal profession is indeed trying to do that and for that reason I think everybody should support it.

MR. ROMANOW: – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is hardly worth making a major point about but I want to correct the hon. member for Kindersley. Indeed this has not been suggested by the Law Society of Saskatchewan or members of the profession. The amendment has been suggested to us from the administrator of estates. I don't want to make a big issue out of it because I have respect and support in my profession as well, but the fact of the matter is that it ought to be known the recommendation comes from the administrator and not from the hon. member for Kindersley or other members of the profession.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:00 p.m.