

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 26, 1981

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and all members of the Legislative Assembly, 34 students from grade 8 from the Cudworth School. Cudworth, as everyone knows, is in the centre of the Kinistino constituency. The students are here with their teachers, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Ronning. I know that the members will want to welcome them. I hope they have an enjoyable time in the legislature today and in the city of Regina, and have a safe journey home. Welcome to the legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the House, 30 grades 1 to 6 students from Togo, in my constituency. They are here with their teacher, Ernie Brutniak and Arlene Brutniak and their chaperones, Ida Gawley and Rose Hamell. I'd like to wish them a very informative and interesting visit here to the legislature. They'll be visiting the Museum of Natural History later today. I will also be meeting with them after question period for some refreshments. I know all the members will join me in welcoming the students and I wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you a group of 37 students from Hague, grades 11 and 12, who are seated in the east gallery today. I know that they are going to be around all day today and tomorrow morning. I hope you have a good time. I'll be meeting with you later.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Proposed Restrictions on Freight Trains

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, question to the minister in charge of transportation. Mr. Minister, recently the Canadian Transport Commission, in a subsequent investigation of the 1979 train derailment in Mississauga, Ontario, proposed restrictions on train length of about one-third less, to a maximum of 4,000 feet and also proposed restrictions on the speed of freight trains to 25 miles per hour. CN (Canadian National) in a presentation to the CTC indicated that this held dire consequences for the commodities deriving the least revenue. Mr. Minister, since the Canadian Transport Commission is holding hearings in Ottawa on April 21, my question to you is this: in light of the very serious ramifications in store for the western Canadian grain industry, is your department preparing a brief for this hearing?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I share with the hon. member the problems

that this decision or this hearing has provided. While I can't indicate today to the hon. member whether we will be making a submission to the CTC hearing on the date he indicated, the transportation agency is looking at the situation very seriously, and will make a decision as a result of that examination.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question in the absence of the minister of transportation, I guess to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, in the CN brief it was pointed out that a train reduction of 30 per cent would mean 800 additional trains would have to be run in the course of a year. CN went on to point out that it simply did not have the kind of facilities to do this. It also pointed out that the people who would bear the brunt would be those who drew the least revenue. Mr. Minister, that means grain. Is it not a serious dereliction on the part of your government, when these sorts of ramifications are being thrust upon the grain industry, when already a crisis is being predicted for 1985 in transportation, that your department is not intervening and preparing a brief on this very, very urgent question?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I will inform the hon. member for Thunder Creek that as well as my responsibilities as Minister of Agriculture, I am also the minister responsible for the transportation agency. It is the transportation agency that is doing the work on this issue.

I indicated to the hon. member that I share the concerns. Certainly it has implications for grain movement, as it will have implications for the movement of potash and all major bulk commodity movement from western Canada.

I did not say that we would not be submitting a brief. I said the matter is under consideration, and we'll be able to announce our intentions very, very shortly. Certainly if we present a brief (and I think there is merit in doing so, although I will not commit myself today) we'll be glad to provide to the legislature the brief we intend to present.

MR. THATCHER: — Final supplementary to the minister. Since you apparently don't deem a very, very serious situation to be of any concern to the grain producers in Saskatchewan, and since you refuse to commit your government to the obvious course of submitting a brief on this issue, would you at least give the commitment that you will join with the province of Alberta in its brief and show a joint western front, at least demonstrate the depth of the concern which western Canadians feel toward what could be a very, very serious economic issue?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, we have yet to arrive at a decision whether to present a brief so far as Saskatchewan is concerned or whether to jointly present a brief with our colleagues from Manitoba and Alberta. That is yet to be decided upon. I may indicate to the hon. member for Thunder Creek that we have difficulty getting together with the province of Alberta on issues relating to transportation. As a matter of fact we held a very important meeting in Yorkton on Monday, relating to Churchill, and the Alberta ministers did not attend. We did not have an opportunity to raise the issue of the length of trains with the Manitoba people, but certainly that will be pursued as we develop our strategy here in Saskatchewan.

SGI Accident Surcharge

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the minister in charge of SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). On two separate occasions this year you have assured the people of Saskatchewan that the \$50 deductible established in 1980

would not be retroactive to 1979. Mr. Speaker, so that there is no misunderstanding, permit me to quote the two separate occasions. Back in January, on the radio, you said:

It is not retroactive. If the individual had an accident in, say, November, and the actual payment covering that accident did not go out until February, and in the interim the change was made with the surcharge going from \$25 to \$50, you have an appeal procedure and you can get your \$25 refunded. And many people have already got their \$25 refunded.

And from *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, I will quote also. On March 4 of this year, your said:

Mr. Speaker, the statement I made was related to the fact that if SGI were responsible for a delay in relation to the claim then the surcharge would be appealed. The fact of the matter is that in many instances there were accidents near the end of the year. The repair items for that particular accident did not come through the system and were not into the system until a change had been made in the surcharge, and that's what I said. The surcharge was picked up by the payment system when the payment was made and the surcharge as applied. Finally, you said they can appeal and some have; and some have had the money refunded.

My question is, Mr. Minister: are you now prepared to direct your officials to implement, without question, the commitment you made to the people of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, obviously the officials cannot implement anything without question. They have to look at the merits of each and every individual case, and they do. Appeals are made and refunds are also made.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I would like to ask the minister if he has been in touch with his officials, who tell me that they have checked the regulations. In fact, you are wrong, Mr. Minister. The regulations do call for retroactive surcharge back to 1979, and that information has been given to me, through the regulations, by the officials of SGI. Now are you going to stand up and assure us once and for all that you'll change the regulations? You have committed yourself; you have promised the people of Saskatchewan that the refunds will be made, that it was not, in your words, a retroactive charge, when, in fact, the regulations say it is. Which way are you going to go with that problem, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I repeat, people can appeal if they feel they have been aggrieved. They do, and some have had refunds.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the minister that people cannot appeal.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think what we are having here is a difference of opinion. If the member has a supplementary he can give it; otherwise we'll have a debate.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I would ask again of the minister, who obviously will not admit that he is wrong and will not admit to the fact that the regulations are there, are you prepared to meet with your officials and either go one way or the other? Will you either live with the regulations the way they are written or will you change them according to

the promise you have made to the people of Saskatchewan? One way or the other, Mr. Minister, I'd like an answer and a promise to the people.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, people have the right to appeal under the regulations and they do.

Legalization of Marijuana

MR. TAYLOR: — A question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, I see that the Government of Canada is going to reduce the penalties for marijuana. The maximum penalty for the possession of marijuana will be \$200 under the narcotic control amendments, and smoking marijuana will no longer be an indictable offence. I see also in the article that the only strong opposition to this has come from the Government of Ontario. I would like to ask you today, what is the position of the Government of Saskatchewan concerning this legalization of marijuana?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, when the proposal for decriminalization — as opposed to legalization — of marijuana was first made by the administration of then Prime Minister Joe Clark and the Conservatives at a conference I attended in October of 1979 (Mr. David Crombie being the proponent of that), I took the position, as did my colleague from the province of Ontario and as did, my recollection is, all of the attorneys general, that we oppose the thrust which was being made at that time by the Conservatives in Canada.

I maintain that position today. I believe there is correspondence on record from me to the appropriate federal people. I oppose the proposal, whether made by the Conservatives or by the Liberals.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Attorney General, I am sure you would be willing to table the correspondence with both the Conservative and Liberal governments in Ottawa concerning this. I would ask you at this time, as a supplementary: the other day I raised with the Minister of Education the matter of the head shops in Saskatchewan. I believe your response was that you would outlaw them or something along this line: "I would, if I could, but I can't." What I'm asking you, Mr. Attorney General, is: will you, as the Attorney General of this province, express in the strongest terms to the government in Ottawa that the people of Saskatchewan want to see the head shops in this province outlawed?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. member would communicate, with as much vigour as he does in this Chamber, his objections in this matter to his federal Conservative Party cohorts. No doubt the member will be pleased to table his letters to the former prime minister, Mr. Clark, which he wrote at the time that the proposal was made in October 1979, outlining his opposition to the Conservative head shops proposal. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these places have been tested by judicial interpretation under the Narcotics Control Act, and have been determined by the judicial rulings to be legal.

I'm advised that federal justice officials have looked at the decisions to see if they can somehow amend the appropriate narcotic control and drug legislation to cover the difficulty. They have not been able to do so, I'm advised. The point is that provincially there is no jurisdiction for us. Marijuana is exclusively federal. It is policed primarily, if not exclusively, by federal force. It is prosecuted exclusively by the federal prosecutors. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle would support me on that. So, accordingly, I will raise

my concerns and objections here, again, as I did a few days ago, and as I did at the time of the conference in October, 1979. I know the member raises this question in sincerity. I hope he does not raise it in the spirit of trying to, somehow, misrepresent the concern of this government on this subject, which is as great as his, if not greater.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Final supplementary, Mr. Attorney General. I think you will know, from my remarks, that I do not look at this as a political topic in any way, shape or form, but as a moral issue. I would ask you: will you table in this Chamber the correspondence, which you have had opposing this legislation?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would have to check the correspondence, and I shall do it. The hon. member will, of course, give me a commitment that he will table his correspondence and that of the Leader of the Liberal Party — of the Conservative Party (they're the same thing, Liberals and Conservatives, in the province of Saskatchewan). The temporary guardians for the Liberals of Saskatchewan currently sitting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I'll take the member for Qu'Appelle.

Ed Broadbent's Constitutional Position Paper

MR. LANE: — I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney General. A wire report indicates that a constitutional position paper prepared by Ed Broadbent was, in fact, ghost-written by the Liberal government or Pierre Elliott Trudeau's staff. This would confirm, of course, what most of Saskatchewan believes. Would the Attorney General please be prepared to advise this Assembly whether or not he has received confirmation of that fact, and the name of the Saskatchewan official who allegedly leaked the information that Broadbent's position paper was written by the federal government?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member selectively chooses news reports as being authoritative. Indeed, I have seen him on many occasions, when we have sometimes fallen into that trap ourselves on this side, dispute the authenticity of press reports. I simply say that this is a source which is unnamed by a Canadian Press report. Albeit CP is a reliable news agency, but this report is one which I do not accept. I don't reject it. I have no information on it, one way or the other. Quite frankly, whoever authored the paper, such as it is, really is of not as much concern to me as it would be to the hon. members opposite. I take the position that the positions and the documentation of this government with respect to the constitution are more important than rumoured or factual circumstances surrounding somebody else's documentation.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary question. Well the allegations, of course, that the Leader of the New Democratic Party's constitutional position is, in fact, ghost-written by the Government of Canada is a very, very serious one. It indicates an extremely close relationship between the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party, of which the Attorney General is more than readily aware. Does the Attorney General not believe that he has a very serious obligation to make a detailed and aggressive check of his officials to determine the accuracy of the statement, but more important, to determine the authorship of Ed Broadbent's position paper?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — No, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the hon. member. I have no obligation to determine the authorship of Ed Broadbent's paper, no more than the

hon. member would accept his responsibility to determine the authorship of any papers which may be produced for Mr. Joe Clark. I have a responsibility to this House to determine the authorship, as appropriate under public circumstances, of papers which the government advances on constitutional or other issues. I do not answer for the New Democratic Party federal leader's papers. He will have to answer to those, presumably at council meetings of the party, at the federal convention or other appropriate times. He is not a member of this House and so far as I know there is no obligation on me in that regard. I would simply say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that is yet another example of the kind of divisiveness which the unilateral action of the Prime Minister is unfortunately wreaking upon the country when we, as Canadians, should be getting together around a conference table and doing it all together by consensus and compromise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Coal-fired Power Generating Station

MR. ANDREW: — My question is to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation (SPC). The Saskatchewan Power Corporation regardless of what it is doing, is proposing to build a coal-fired power generating station in the Gravelbourg area of Saskatchewan. Given the fact that one of the great scarcities in this world in the near and certainly distant future is going to be fertile, arable farmland, can the minister advise the Assembly as to why SPC is desirous of building that station in a fertile farming region, taking fertile farmland out of production now and for a long time?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I again point out to the hon. member that what has happened is that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has identified some possible alternative sites for future power generation projects in Saskatchewan. There are a number of things which go into identifying even potential sites, much less final decisions. In choosing potential sites, if you are dealing with coal-fired thermal plants, you must deal with the question of accessibility to coal supplies; you must deal, as the hon. member will understand, with a thermal plant with the accessibility to water supplies. There are other factors which must be taken into account.

What SPC does, of course, is to select a number of alternative sites, then subject those to extensive examination to determine the impact, including the impact of loss of agricultural land. That has to be compared to other options and alternatives.

The hon. member will well know that yesterday he raised the question of building a major transmission grid across the province, and he knows quite well the amount of agricultural land involved in that kind of development. So we must make comparisons of that sort. That is what the current studies and examinations are undertaking to do. When we have completed the comparisons of all of those projects, some decisions will be made with respect to what projects should proceed when.

MR. PICKERING: — Supplementary question. In 1980, our 75th year as a province, many farmers in this area received family farm heritage awards. Would the minister not agree that on the first hand you give them an award for being settlers in their communities, and on the second hand you plan to take their land away?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I certainly expect, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members will be joining with me in putting into place all possible kinds of measures to conserve electricity consumption and conserve the need for new power plants. Certainly, I know

the hon. members have taken an inconsistent position in demanding, for instance, that demand meters not be used to cut down on the demands that are placed on the system periodically in terms of capacity.

But setting that aside, I would point out to the hon. members that there are projects which will have to be developed. We know that we have to have additional supplies of energy. It is regrettable that will mean you must use water and land as part of those developments. It's a fact of life, however, that that must happen. We will examine all projects to try to ensure that we minimize to the maximum degree possible the impact on farmers, the impact on people living in towns and cities, the impact in terms of the environment, and so on. But there is simply no way, I would point out to the hon. member, of developing any kind of electrical generating capacity without having some of those impacts.

Sale of Prince Albert Pulp Mill

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the minister responsible for CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan). It has been drawn to my attention that the Prince Albert pulp mill has been sold, and I understand it has been sold to Great Lakes Forest Products. Would the minister advise this Assembly what interest was sold and what price was paid?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — It's news to me, Mr. Speaker.

Storage of 1980 Calendars

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday during my absence, the member for Wilkie raised a question with regard to SGI calendars for 1980. I think his questions were as follows: SGI has a pile of 1980 calendars in storage at Regina Cartage and Storage on Dewdney Avenue. The pile is four feet wide and twenty feet high. Why is SGI paying storage for 1980 calendars: He also said, "I understand those 1980 calendars have one month — April — with 31 days. Is this why SGI is losing money?"

SGI is not paying storage for the calendars; SGI does not own those calendars. The pile of calendars stored at Regina Cartage and Storage are, in fact, the property of Crown Zellerbach Corporation. They are part of a print run ordered by SGI. The paper, however, was defective; the ink and colour registration was poor. Due to these problems, SGI refused to accept delivery from the printer. The printer, in turn, sent the paper back to Crown Zellerbach, which acknowledged the defect. We believe that Crown Zellerbach intends to recycle the paper at some later date. In short, SGI paid for neither the defective print run, nor for the storage costs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the press gives as much publicity to those facts as to the questions when they were originally asked. I can't account for the 31 days in April, except to say the printer felt there should be an April Fools' Day at the beginning and the end to accommodate the opposition.

Awarding of Contracts on Key Lake Project

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the minister responsible for the letting of contracts on the Key Lake project. I'm not sure whether it will be the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan or the minister of energy, mines and resources, or who it is.

I have had a complaint from an electrical contractor about the process used in bidding on the Key Lake project. They raised the concern that when they bid, even if they are the low bidder, they don't get the contract, but that the bid they give is used to establish a price for a northern contractor to use to get the job. Is this in fact the way the bids are awarded on the Key Lake project?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the contracts for the Key Lake project are awarded by KLMC (Key Lake Mining Corporation) which is 50 per cent owned by the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation.

As members will be aware, the terms and conditions of our operation in northern Saskatchewan are subject to surface leases etc., which we have or are in the process of negotiating with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

With respect to the tendering process, I do not believe that they are used as a basis for getting a contract with someone else. Northern contractors do receive some preference. However, I would like to be absolutely sure of my facts. I will take notice of the question and endeavour to provide the member with an answer tomorrow.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 46 — An Act to amend The Highways Act

HON. MR. LONG: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Highways Act.

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

Bill No. 47 - An Act respecting Dental Therapists

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting dental therapists.

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

Bill No. 48 — An Act to amend The Residential Tenancies Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Residential Tenancies Act.

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

Bill No. 49 — An Act respecting The Consequential Amendments resulting from the change in the name of the Department of Consumer Affairs to the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs.

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting The Consequential Amendments resulting from the change in the name of the Department of Consumer Affairs to the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs.

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

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a point of privilege.

Yesterday, in this House, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle indicated that I misled the people of Saskatchewan by saying that I would not divulge the information for agreements which Sask Tel had with Chartwood Developments — the corporation which is doing the downtown development project.

MR. SPEAKER: — I wonder if we could have some order in the House. The members should regard the matter of privilege, and anything flowing from that, as a very serious matter. Apparently it was serious yesterday. The member for Qu'Appelle has raised the matter and everyone accepted it at face value. Now, the member for Kinistino has a statement which apparently has something to do with this. We should hear the member out.

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, this statement is corroborated by the March 25, 1981 *Hansard*, page 1441. I just want to have the record clear that I did not in any way mislead this House or the people of Saskatchewan. I want to state, unequivocally, that I think the record should be cleared and for proof to clear this record, I would like to read from a letter which we have from Chartwood, from Mr. Charles J. Magwood, president. This letter was written to Mr. D. M. Innes, associate deputy minister of municipal affairs. He says:

You have asked that the Cornwall Centre joint venture consent to your delivering copies of the development agreement and ground lease to third parties who are not direct parties to these documents. Our view is that these agreement are private documents between Sask Tel and the joint venture and as such should not be made available to third parties. We can appreciate that Sask Tel may feel obligated to advise third parties of certain aspects of the arrangements such as loan amounts, terms, etc., but we are most concerned that the agreements themselves remain a matter of confidence as between the parties.

I also have another letter from the T. Eaton Realty Company Ltd. which I will not read. However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to table both of the letters today so that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle will have them in his hands and so the people of Saskatchewan will know what the facts are. I also think that all hon. members in this Assembly should, from time to time, realize that statements of this nature are very serious and I would hope that all hon. members would see that the record is straightened away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! There is no opportunity provided in the rules for a person to speak to a matter of privilege.

MR. LANE: — I rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the matter of privilege?

MR. LANE: — The matter of privilege is the question and the ability of governments to

selectively . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! If the member has a matter of privilege, he must state what the matter of privilege is, not debate an issue of whether someone has an opportunity to table certain documents at certain times.

MR. LANE: — The question of privilege very simply is, Mr. Speaker, whether or not members of the treasury benches have the right to selectively table only certain documents and not table . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think what we're dealing with here is very clear. Beauchesne and parliamentary practice have established the procedures that are used in cases such as this and there should be no doubt about it in members' minds. Just to refresh the members, so everyone is clear, I will cite Beauchesne:

Statements by Members — Section 322.

It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a Member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted, . . .

I think that should close the matter off.

Is there anything further under orders of the day. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BERNTSON: — I maybe missed something here, but did you in fact accept the point raised as a point of privilege and rule that it was in fact a point of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: — What I accepted the member as saying was that he was making a statement to correct the record. Apparently he felt that something that was said yesterday was not correct and he has an opportunity according to Beauchesne to correct the record and that's merely what I was citing here. That sounded extremely like what it was like. The member was correcting something that occurred in the House yesterday and Beauchesne says that those matters within the member's own knowledge must be accepted by the House.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Yesterday it was very clear to at least the members on this side of the House that you ruled that there was no point of privilege and that it should have been raised in the committee of Crown corporations and that they then refer it to the House. Now after having made that ruling (and the member for Qu'Appelle, unfortunately, wasn't able to attend the committee today where he would have in all likelihood raised it), the matter then can't be raised in the House until it's referred to the House by the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: — Whether the point of privilege made by a member (in this particular case the member for Qu'Appelle) is a valid point of order or not has nothing to do with this. The fact of the . . . Order, order!

If we can just have one person making rulings at a time it might clarify the situation. The fact . . . Order, order! The fact that the member for Qu'Appelle said certain things in this House yesterday is apparently what the member for Kinistino is responding to. Whether it was valid at the time or not has absolutely nothing to do with it. The remarks were made in the House. They are on the record. I read them myself, as a matter of fact.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I suppose I am asking you this question for future clarification. Are you telling us (excuse me if I get hypothetical, but I would like this for future reference), if I don't like what the Attorney General says to me today, I may get up before the orders of the day tomorrow, and under a point of privilege . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will save the member for Thunder Creek from spending more time of the House, because I don't intend to deal with hypothetical situations. I will deal with the situations as they arise and not before.

MR. THATCHER: — All right, Mr. Speaker, then let's get a little bit specific. We had a situation which was clearly a question of debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member is debating my ruling. There is no opportunity to debate the ruling . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order! The member is debating my ruling. He is doing it in a very unparliamentary manner. I would ask him to cease and desist on the matter. Is there anything further under orders of the day?

MR. THATCHER: — You are the worst Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will ask the member for Thunder Creek to withdraw the remarks that he just made.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, you are not the worst Speaker that they ever had.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will give the member for Thunder Creek one more opportunity to withdraw those remarks, unequivocally, and apologize to this House — one opportunity.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, obviously I withdraw the remarks. I think you are not the worst Speaker that they ever had.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I name you, Mr. Thatcher.

MR. LANE: — I would like to raise a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The point of privilege is that the hon. member for Saskatoon Centre, I believe it was, the party whip opposite, referred to the hon. member for Thunder Creek as a "spoiled brat," and he shouted in this House. I would ask, on behalf of the hon. member who is not able to defend himself to have a retraction and an apology from the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I am sorry I didn't hear any such comments. I am sure there was a lot of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order! There seems to be a problem in this House. The problem is this: the Chair of this House is to be recognized, otherwise why have the Chair? That means when the Speaker is on his feet, regardless who he is, we should have some quiet in the House so that we can hear what is going on. I didn't hear what any member said. I heard what this particular member said. I have had enough of that over the last short while to last me for quite some time. And I don't intend to take any more of it. Therefore, I named the member. What the member said today was sufficient to have him named.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I move, seconded by the hon. member for Moose Jaw South,

the Minister of Labour:

That the member for Thunder Creek be suspended from the service of this House for the remainder of today's sitting.

Motion agreed to on division.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 2:48 p.m. His Honour the Administrator entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the following bills:

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Student Assistance and Student Aid Fund Act

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Oil Well Income Tax Act

Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Association of School Business Officials of Saskatchewan Act

Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

Bill No. 40 — An Act respecting the Establishment of the Wakamow Valley Authority

His Honor retired from the Chamber at 2:50 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I will make a brief second reading speech with respect to Bill No. 39, regarding the proposed amendments to sections 6 and 8 of The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs Act. The proposed amendments are fairly routine ones, so I will not spend a long time explaining them.

First, the proposed amendment to section 6 of The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs Act provides authority, under the act, for the office of the agent general in London. The office was transferred from industry and commerce to the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs in June 1979, and until now, the actual legal authority for the office was provided, I am advised, in The Department of Industry and Commerce Act.

This transfer of authority is, of course, in keeping with the role of the department, part of which is to co-ordinate the international contacts of the Government of Saskatchewan.

For example, this department is the first provincial line contact with the Department of External Affairs. It is envisaged that the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs would be given similar responsibility for any offices that might be opened in the future, for the purposes of representing Saskatchewan's interests abroad.

The second amendment to this act is to section 8, and it concerns the protocol office.

By way of background, responsibility for the protocol office was transferred from the Provincial Secretary to the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs in June 1979. Until now, grants paid by the protocol office to assist non-governmental agencies with the sponsorship of social functions, such as banquets and the like, have been made under the authority of section 8 of the bill. The proposed amendment simply clarifies the wording of this section to ensure that appropriate legal authority.

As I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, these are fairly routine amendments of a housekeeping nature and I, therefore, move second reading of them.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, we are somewhat concerned about the amendments to section 8 of the particular bill. I frankly am not aware of any other piece of legislation in which one minister has taken upon himself the power to make any grants of an unlimited amount to anyone whom he sees fit, anywhere in or outside the province. In all other acts, the limitation is put at, now, about \$10,000; this is the common limitation.

I am very, very surprised that the Attorney General, in his statements today would not give an explanation to this Assembly why he, as opposed to any other member of the treasury branches, needs the right to give unlimited grants without any reference back to this Assembly. The Attorney General, as well, in his role of House Leader, knows the ramifications of that particular section. Frankly, I am shocked that he would come before this Assembly and take that power upon himself. I am surprised, as well, that no explanation was given.

What is the government coming to, if cabinet ministers are going to come before this Assembly and ask for carte blanche to write cheques in any amount, make payments in any amount, to anyone that they see fit, in or outside of the province. What has happened to the issue of responsibility and accountability back to this Assembly? It has been completely ignored and the principle which the Attorney General is proposing here — I would hope that he is not serious about it and will, in fact, agree to a House amendment that those grants be limited to \$10,000 as in the other cabinet statutes. In that regard, to give the Attorney General time to prepare the House amendment, I will beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Robbins that Bill No. 29 — **An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act** be now read a second time.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Just a few words on the bill before the House at this point in time, The Automobile Accident Insurance Act . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is that what you call stalling it out, Mr. Attorney General? That's what you call stalling? Are you suggesting that perhaps the members opposite have no right to speak on the bill? Is that what you are saying, that an elected member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I wonder if the member for Regina South could be given

the opportunity to proceed on the bill he was speaking on.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that opportunity.

I would like to say at the outset that we will be supporting the bill and letting it go through today. If the Attorney General had waited he would have found that out.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I wonder if both sides of the House could contribute to this opportunity for the member for Regina South to speak. I would welcome his remarks, but I can't welcome them if I can't hear them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you once again, Mr. Speaker. It is interesting to note that these amendments which are coming through on this bill reflect dollars being expended by the act and really it is money going out. What I find interesting about a bill like that is when it is a cost to the treasury or a cost to SGI or a cost to The Automobile Insurance Act, that it's always on the day of assent, or as the bill is brought down. But when it's revenue to the department, or revenue to the treasury, the coffers, at the expense of the taxpayer, then it's always made retroactive. That is something which I find disturbing and abhorrent. There is no reason why you can't play the game the same way in both instances. Why should the taxpayers of the province have to pay a retroactive charge when it's to the benefit of SGI, but have to wait when it's going to cost SGI money?

We were informed in January of this year that the new act would provide for \$100,000 in liability and certain other benefits, such as a \$150 a week indemnity to beneficiaries. This is March and it still hasn't gone through. It hasn't gone through committee of the whole or had final reading, so all of those people who have been promised this increase are having to wait. Yet when they (SGI) make a charge against a taxpayer, it is made retroactive for one year.

Now, I'm looking at some of those benefits that the minister says are (and perhaps I'm not quoting him exactly) as good or better than those in any other area in Canada. I would indicate to the minister that obviously he hasn't compared them with other provinces. For example, you're increasing your disability income benefit to \$150 per week. That is not the top; in some instances it is based on a percentage of wages. You indicate \$75 for the partial, which is up from \$30, with 104 weeks maximum. In some provinces it's for a lifetime. You indicated a \$75 increase for the housewife for partial disability; in some provinces it's much more. For example, in Manitoba, I see it is \$120 weekly, not \$75 as SGI is putting out, and it's a lifetime total.

Then we carry on to the death benefits. Yours, of course, is for death within two years of accident for claims. In many other provinces, not just one — in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec — it is for death any time after the accident. In New Brunswick, it is for death within three years. I'll give some more examples.

In the head of the household age limited, none. Amount for the married male, \$7,500. Some other provinces are \$10,000. I don't want to take up any more time of the House; however, there are other examples, and I think the minister knows what I'm talking about. The \$100,000 liability is another area I would like to comment on. We've had \$35,000 for, I believe, at least 25 years, and perhaps longer. The \$100,000 is long past due; many of the other provinces have had it for some time. I believe that the minister, because of his delay in establishing that amount of \$100,000 after so many years, perhaps should have looked at, instead of \$100,000, \$200,000. If he waits as

long to improve that amount as he has to bring it from \$35,000 to \$100,000, we could be waiting another 25 years or longer.

Then the last point I want to make on the insurance is on your deductible where you've now raised it to \$350. This is one area where the government has been behind times in the deductible, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that in the case of an accident where no one is at fault, or both are at fault, both parties in Saskatchewan have to pay \$350 deductible. Now that's a pretty good way for the government to make some money.

In Manitoba, for example, that deductible is split. First of all it's only \$200. But in the case where there is no fault, or both are at fault, either one, the deductible becomes \$100 for each party, not \$200 each. In this case SGI has the \$350, which means in fact a total of \$700 deductible. I believe that to be grossly unfair because in many cases it leaves it to the adjuster to make that decision that both are at fault, or neither one is at fault. Only too often this happens, and I've had many complaints from drivers of vehicles who have claimed that this is the way the adjuster has made his decision. The only recourse that the claimant then has is to go to the courts to seek a different assessment, or a rule on the blame for the accident. However, when both accept blame or neither does, the government then comes in and makes a decision that they are both at fault, so they collect the deductible from both. I say that is grossly unfair. I would ask the minister to consider the Manitoba system of splitting the deductible between both parties in a case where neither or both are at fault.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will advise the minister that we will support the bill in its present form. However, we are supporting it with the reservations that the benefits are not sufficient, and that the minister should, in fact, take a second look at it in those areas that I have mentioned, and in particular the deductible portion of it.

As well, I would ask the minister again, as I've done many, many times in the past, to reconsider the retroactive feature of your surcharges and other charges which are made to the motorists; instead of making that charge retroactive, make it effective the day you announce it. And you have, in fact, indicated that to us many times, Mr. Minister. Your officials assure me that the regulations call for that surcharge on drivers' licences for 1980, that it is in fact retroactive. I won't even go so far as to say that you did this intentionally, so let's say that you did it unintentionally, but you have led people to believe in Saskatchewan that those who had accidents . . . I can tell you of individuals who had accidents in February, 1979, the bill was paid in March, 1979, and in 1980 when they renewed their licence, they were surcharged the \$50. You continually advise the people of this province that they have an appeal procedure when, in fact, they do not have an appeal procedure. It is totally false. They do not have an appeal procedure based on the regulations that you have under this act.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I will not take too much time because I've covered this bill quite thoroughly in terms of second reading. But I would like to answer some of the criticisms of the hon. member for Regina South, and make reference to some of his remarks just recently concluded.

I think he mentioned that weekly disability payments were permanent in some other places, but they were not in Saskatchewan where they only go for 104 weeks. That is an error. We have some 53 persons in Saskatchewan who will draw the weekly indemnity payment as long as they live.

When he talked about the disability payment on a partial basis, obviously it's related to

the \$150 payment. The \$150 weekly payment is approximately the minimum wage without taxes. No taxes are applicable in terms of this payment. Therefore, that person is roughly at the minimum wage. The member mentioned (and he's very critical; I heard a lot of criticism from opposition benches) that we should be increasing these amounts even more than we are. But they're extremely critical of an average 28 per cent increase in rates. The 28 per cent increase in rates covers these estimated costs, raising the public liability from \$35,000 to \$100,000, raising the weekly disability payments from \$60 per week to \$150 per week, payable for 104 weeks, raising the partial disability from \$30 per week to \$75 per week, and also, making the payments retroactive, once this bill goes through, to people already in receipt of some of those payments.

I want to discuss the public liability range. He says we should have gone higher than \$100,000. Ontario, I believe has since gone, or is proposing to go, higher than that, but it is the only province in Canada which is above \$100,000. British Columbia is at \$100,000. Alberta is at \$100,000. We're going to \$100,000. Manitoba is at \$50,000. He neglected to mention that. They happen to have a Conservative government. He should have some influence on them. Then, he says that he hopes I will not wait another 25 years before I raise this. Well, 25 years from now, I'm not going to be here. I assure you that is by choice — not by electors' choice, but by my choice.

He talked about the deductible of \$350. I want to point out that in inflationary times, the deductible should gradually rise as costs of repairing and looking after the needs of people related to insurance rise. I should also point out that when we increased it from \$200 to \$300 last July, it should actually, if you looked at the price of automobiles, automobile parts and repairing them, have gone to \$508. We are doing it on a gradual basis in line with the inflationary trend.

I want to also point out that every person in Saskatchewan has complete protection above the \$350 on a no-fault basis. Those items are simply paid to the actual cash value of the vehicle. The fact is the \$350 deductible is payable by the person found to be at fault. He argues that you can't always determine that. He thinks the adjuster makes the determination so that it is favourable to the automobile accident insurance fund. I point out that all those persons involved in automobile accidents have recourse to small claims court. They can site their case to a magistrate. Both of them state their cases to the magistrate. The magistrate makes a decision based on the facts as he sees them.

There is always going to be a dispute with respect to who is responsible in intersection crashes. But I would also like to point out to the hon. member that one-third of the claims related to collision damage last year in Saskatchewan were single-vehicle accidents. So it is pretty easy to determine who is at fault in that case, although it may only be the fault of the road condition. Who knows? The fact remains that in one-third of all those accidents, only one vehicle was involved.

Admittedly, if the cost of living continues to rise, the \$150 per week will have to be looked at again in a rather short period time. I think the member agrees with us (and he has said that he will support the bill) that going from \$60 a week to \$150 a week is a big improvement. The fact that homemakers or housewives (as they are sometimes referred to) get the payment for up to 104 weeks where they are disabled and unable to perform their regular duties, has been a long time coming. We admit the 12 weeks was a discriminatory clause and should not have been there.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this House fully understand the implications of this bill. What they are simply seeing is a very great increase in the benefits. In fact, if you look at the 104 weeks, assuming the person is rehabilitated in that period, the coverage is extended from a maximum of \$6,200 to \$15,600, or more than doubles. If you look at the relationship with respect to housewives, and the fact that it goes from 12 weeks to 104 weeks, it is coverage many, many times greater than it was previously. If you look at the public liability going from \$35,000 to \$100,000 (and I know that people are immediately influenced when they see a situation that arose recently in this province where there was an adjudication of a claim of \$1,300,000, and incidentally that is the only claim in this province that has ever exceeded \$200,000, and there have only been two or three that were above \$200,000), most of the claims are in the \$100,000 or below in terms of public liability. That large one, \$1,300,000, is the only one that exceeded \$200,000 ever in this province. It is true that people have the right, capability, and privilege, if they so wish to do, to buy additional public liability insurance very, very cheaply. You can buy \$500,000 for in the range of \$25 to \$30 a year.

Frankly, I think we have a tendency to worry about collision damage to our own car (the \$350 deductible) when we should be worrying about the public liability at the upper end in much greater measure.

I want to point out another part of this bill (which the member did not mention, although which members opposite have been after us for a long time with regard to surcharges). We intend to make the surcharges much more severe. I will give you a specific example of how it might work. If any individual bought his licence, was involved in an accident the next day in which he was held to be 50 per cent or more responsible, he would have a surcharge of \$50 on his driver's licence when he went to renew that licence a year later. However, should he be involved in a second accident say, a month later, he would get a second surcharge of \$100. The \$100 would be added to the \$50. When he went to renew his licence, he would have a surcharge of \$150. If he were unfortunate enough to be involved in a third accident six months later, preceding his date of going back to renew his license, he would then have a further \$150 surcharge, bringing his total surcharges to \$300. If he suffered a fourth accident in that period (in every case he would have to be 50 per cent or more responsible) he would have a \$200 surcharge, and he would end up actually with a \$500 surcharge on his driver's licence in the succeeding year. Now, that is on a rolling period over three years and they drop off as you go along, but those surcharges will be, we hope, some deterrent in attempting to alert people to the fact that they should show more courtesy on the roads and take some care with the operation of their vehicles.

I want to point out to the member that we anticipate surcharges of \$5.4 million in the current year. That's a very tiny proportion of the total amount of money that flows into the automobile accident insurance fund. I also want to make very clear to the members opposite because they persist, despite the facts, in saying that SGI is the one which suffered these losses, that SGI did not. It was the automobile accident insurance fund which is administered by SGI, on behalf of the government.

I read a pamphlet from the hon. member for Qu'Appelle which says that SGI lost \$28,575,000 in 1979. SGI did not lose \$28,575,000, SGI made \$1,023,000 profit in 1979. The automobile accident insurance fund did lose \$28,575,000, but it is merely administered by SGI. We should be able to separate in the public mind, despite the fact that the opposition likes to pour them together all the time, that they are two separate functions.

I should also point out to the hon. member (maybe this is the place to do it, I don't know whether it is or not, but the Speaker will call me to order if it isn't) that I am reading literature put out by the Progressive Conservatives which is totally inaccurate, totally misleading, which says that I looked at Mr. Rousseau's file. I did not look at Mr. Rousseau's file. I never looked at anyone's file. I have no intention of looking at anyone's file. I want to put on record the story. Mr. Rousseau came into my office. Mr. Rousseau discussed with me . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I was about to rise on a point of order myself. Perhaps I can settle the matter; maybe I am dealing with the same thing as the member for Regina South. I think the observation made by the member for Saskatoon Nutana was right, that it may be out of order to raise that matter here. I don't think it bears directly on the principle of this bill. The member for Saskatoon Nutana will have the same opportunity, for example, as the member for Kinistino, to rise and correct the record if he feels that the record is wrong in this House. He doesn't have an opportunity at this time to do it.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your ruling. I will certainly take the opportunity to rise and put the record straight with respect to this particular matter. Mr. Rousseau will then have an opportunity to debate it with me, and I would be pleased to debate it with him at any time.

In concluding my remarks with regard to The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, I again want to stress the fact that one-third of all the accidents were single vehicle accidents, and obviously in those cases you cannot apportion blame. I know I run into cases where someone will say to me, "I was in an accident but I wasn't at fault." But the adjuster takes the measurements and he comes to the conclusion that the individual was at fault. If that individual feels aggrieved, as I said before, he has access to the small claims court. It costs him little or nothing to get the other individual in there and to present his case. Obviously, that is the course which should be taken.

In submitting this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out again that approximately 6 per cent of the cost related to the rate increases put out for the automobile accident insurance fund in the year 1981 is directly related to the benefits that are being increased in the automobile accident insurance, which is the universal insurance program across the province of Saskatchewan. We anticipate \$2.3 million in expenditures related to the public liability increase from \$35,000 to \$100,000. We anticipate \$3.3 million annual costs related to the increase of the disability benefits from \$60 a week to \$90 a week. We know that we already have a \$900,000 cost related to those people who are permanently injured and receive the payment weekly as long as they may live.

Mr. Speaker, The Automobile Accident Insurance Act is an important act for the people of Saskatchewan. It assures universality; it ensures coverage for everyone. It ensures that the revenue flows with respect to that insurance are staying in the province and are used in the province. It creates jobs in the province related to claims. We have 13 claims centres built around the province and it is important for the people of this province to realize that the automobile accident insurance fund has been copied in whole or in part right across Canada.

It was another case of this province pioneering in one of the very vital and important

approaches in terms of income protection for people of Saskatchewan and incidentally because it has been copied across Canada for the people of Canada.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Cody that Bill No. 38 — **An Act to amend The Credit Union Act** be now read a second time.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking on this bill. I adjourned it to start with and Mr. Thatcher spoke on it later. I have strong feelings as to how this bill will affect the membership throughout the province of Saskatchewan of the credit unions. As we well know, the farm credit corporation does not supply sufficient funds for the young farmers to get started within our province and the government opposite does not have any programs in place at the present time to help these farmers to get started or small businessmen.

If Crown corporations and government departments are allowed to borrow from credit unions, it could quite well eliminate the small business people and the young farmers from being able to borrow funds to operate or to expand their present operations.

What about the home-owner? Many home-owners go to credit unions to borrow money to build new homes and perhaps they could be eliminated also because of the lack of funds. I know there is a limit to the funds available through the credit unions throughout the province in a year.

Some of the credit unions I have contacted have voiced deep concern about the government being allowed to become members of the credit unions. It could quite well jeopardize them from funds. They have been able to borrow from credit unions up to this point in time. Many people certainly rely on them. There is something like 500,000 plus membership in the province now and I think the government taking out a membership in this and borrowing moneys . . . They are actually picking on the little guy and not allowing him to proceed and better himself. Mr. Speaker, I therefore oppose this bill.

At 9:30 p.m. the Assembly took the vote on Bill No. 38 — **An Act to amend The Credit Union Act.**

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

YEAS — 34

Pepper	Allen	Kaeding
Snyder	Romanow	Smishek
Bowerman	Tchorzewski	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Rolfes	Mostoway	Banda
Vickar	Kowalchuk	Dyck
Thompson	MacAuley	Engel
Feschuk	Byers	Koskie
Lusney	Poniatowski	Prebble
Johnson	Long	Nelson
White	Solomon	Chapman
Miner		

NAYS — 10

Berntson	Birkbeck	Duncan
Lane	Rousseau	Swan
Hardy	Pickering	Muirhead
Katzman		

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. What is the purpose of the member for Qu'Appelle rising?

MR. LANE: — I'm going to ask leave to move a motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — We are on government orders. The member has asked leave to move a motion. Is leave granted?

Leave not granted.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. The member for Qu'Appelle has specified that he wishes to proceed under rule 39 and I will allow the member for Qu'Appelle to proceed.

MR. LANE: — Thank you. Rule 39, of course, reads that:

A motion may, in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover . . .

And I would like to explain, Mr. Speaker. The actions today, I think, indicate the need, in

the strongest terms, and also a desire on the part of the people of Saskatchewan that an office of a permanent, independent speaker of the Assembly be appointed and created . . . I am not going to respond to comments made opposite because I think the matter is more serious. The matter, of course, proposed by the Hon. Stephen Lewis . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I've heard what the member has said is urgent and pressing. Now I want to hear the motion. I don't want to hear debate.

MR. LANE: — I move, seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington:

That the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan urge the creation of an office of a permanent, independent Speaker of the Assembly for the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: — The members of the Assembly have heard the motion. Is leave granted? Leave is denied.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Bowerman that Bill No. 33 — **An Act to amend The Water Power Act** be now read a second time.

MRS. DUNCAN: — I would like to say that this act is asking us to give the government opposite the legal right to break contracts that were assigned at one time in good faith. I think that is a terrible thing to ask and we on this side will not be supporting the proposed amendments.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

YEAS — 34

Pepper	Allen	Kaeding
Snyder	Romanow	Smishek
Bowerman	Tchorzewski	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Rolfes	Mostoway	Banda
Vickar	Kowalchuk	Dyck
Thompson	MacAuley	Engel
Feschuk	Byers	Koskie
Shillington	Lusney	Poniatowski
Prebble	Johnson	Long
Nelson	Solomon	Chapman
Miner		

NAYS — 10

Berntson	Birkbeck	Duncan
Lane	Rousseau	Swan
Hardy	Pickering	Muirhead
Katzman		

March 26, 1981

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill No. 42 — **An Act to amend The Local Improvements Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:53 p.m.