

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
July 6, 1982

The Assembly met at 7 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

**Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting Elections in Urban Municipalities and School Divisions and
repealing The Urban Municipal Elections Act.**

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce the deputy minister of urban affairs, Mr. Dave Innes; also from urban affairs, Kevin Hayes and Lou Hudson; since education is involved, from the Department of Education, Mr. Bill Wells.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 44 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 45 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 46 to 57 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 58 as amended agreed to.

Clause 59 agreed to.

Clause 60 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 61 to 73 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 74 as amended agreed to.

Clause 75 as amended agreed to.

Clause 76 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 77 to 83 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 84 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 85 to 107 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 108 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 109 to 111 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 112 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 113 and 114 agreed to.

Clause 115 as amended agreed to.

Clause 116 as amended agreed to.

Clause 117 agreed to.

Clause 118 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 119 to 133 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 134 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 135 to 162 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 24 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Local Government Election Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 3 — An Act to provide for the Imposition of Taxes on and the Collection of Taxes from Certain Purchasers of Certain Fuels and for the repeal of The Fuel Petroleum Products Act.

Clause 1

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I'd like to introduce Alan Carr, the deputy minister, (inaudible) and R.A. St. Michael of the planning bureau.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — We just have a few questions, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the minister for bringing in her officials. I understand that she is not feeling well and we will try not to make it worse. Can the minister tell us what the total amount collected under this act in 1981-82 fiscal year was?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — \$138.5 million.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Can you tell us what portion of that was collected from interprovincial trucking companies?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Do you mean national trucking firms?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Yes.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — \$20.2 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That includes the Saskatchewan ones that are interprovincial, Jerry?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — What portion of that is from Saskatchewan firms that are interprovincial, in order to satisfy the query of the Attorney General? Thanks Gary!

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — \$10.1 million for Saskatchewan.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — What portion of that total amount in 1981-82 was paid by Amok Ltd. Or Cluff mining, Key Lake mining, Gulf Minerals, for starters?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We don't break down the figures that way. It's taken as a lump sum and we don't have returns for individual truckers. It's all massed together as the returns come in.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — What lump sum category? What do you call them?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Revenue from all trucking firms is \$30.3 million. Our own provincial ones are \$10.1 million, which leaves \$20.2 million for national firms. The total for all types of trucking firms is \$30.3 million.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Is there no way of breaking out the amount for large companies, such as the examples I gave, which are not in the main trucking firms but do a considerable amount of trucking under their own banner?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Not realistically. It would have to all be done manually on monthly returns.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 11 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 17 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 19 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 20 as amended agreed to.

Clause 21 agreed to.

Clause 22 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 28 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend the Statute Law

HON. MR. LANE: — I'd like to introduce Mr. Ron Hewitt, acting co-ordinator of the

policy and legislation branch of the Department of the Attorney General.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 24 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 25 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 26 to 70 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 71 as amended agreed to.

Clause 72 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act

Clause 1

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to address a couple of questions to the minister with respect to this bill.

As indicated in the bill, there are provisions for the appointment of an associate chief judge or more than one. I wonder if the Attorney General could outline, in a general way, his plans for the disposition and the allocation of the chief justice and associate justice as it relates to the various centres in the province.

HON. MR. LANE: — I think I have already indicated to the hon. member the reason behind the legislation. It is our present intention that there be one associate chief judge in the city of Saskatoon, and that's as far as it goes. You'll notice it says one or more, but certainly our present intention, in the foreseeable future, is for one associate chief judge.

There is on-going debate whether the chief judge should be in Saskatoon or Regina, and I believe that matter has been debated in this Assembly in the past. There seems to be a pretty strong indication that the chief judge should, in fact, be in Regina, given that the superior court chief justices are in this city.

MR. KOSKIE: — Just a couple of other questions, Mr. Chairman. I note that when the bill was being introduced the Attorney General indicated that consultation is very high on his agenda. Certainly when it comes to the appointment of additional justices to the court of appeal, he felt that consultation is a very meaningful thing. I just wonder, in introducing the amendment of establishing an associate chief judge, whether the Attorney General had an opportunity to discuss the proposed changes with the bar society and with the chief justice of the Queen's bench for the wisdom he may give. Did he also discuss it with the chief justice of the court of appeal?

HON. MR. LANE: — I am a little surprised that the hon. member is not aware that each of the judges of those courts believe that the courts operate independently one from the other. I had a lengthy discussion and as a matter of fact the reason for the change came from the chief judge of the provincial court. Ample discussion took place.

MR. KOSKIE: — Could I specifically repeat a part of my question? I wonder whether the minister had any

discussion with representatives of the bar association of Saskatchewan vis-a-vis the addition of an associate judge and vis-a-vis whether the chief justice should be in Regina or Saskatoon. Does the minister have any views from such a discussion?

HON. MR. LANE: — No, I felt that the argument put forth by the chief judge of the provincial court was sufficient to sway me as to the need of the appointment.

MR. KOSKIE: — Obviously, the Attorney General will in the future be appointing (he said in the immediate future) one judge to a position — either chief judge or associate. I wonder whether or not there will be any consultation process prior to the appointment of such judge or legal representative to that position?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, I would certainly give the undertaking to the hon. member that when the vacancy becomes known I will take representations from any interested parties as to suitable appointments. And prior to making such appointment, I would undertake to discuss that with representatives of the bar and perhaps of the provincial court. I can give the assurance that we are obviously looking for lawyers of the highest calibre who are well-regarded in the bar and by the bar. The normal consultation will be undertaken by me in my office as Attorney General and the judicial counsel of the provincial court will also be consulted in the normal manner.

I would suggest to the hon. member if he is advocating his own appointment to let us know as soon as possible so we can deal with it in the appropriate manner.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, I don't have any more questions but I can assure the hon. Attorney General that I certainly can come forward with some highly qualified individuals and accordingly will look forward to receiving your every consideration. I hope that in his capacity of Attorney General that he and I will have an opportunity to discuss the qualifications vis-a-vis those I put forward vis-a-vis the one that he decides on.

HON. MR. LANE: — I would have thought after the last election that the hon. member would have been looking for some job security and perhaps had his application in already. If the hon. member has names of barristers he wishes to submit, I would be more than pleased to consider them.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act

HON. MR. HARDY: — I would like to introduce to you Stan Wilox, general manager of Sask Housing Corporation.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to present the president of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Robert Moncur.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act

Clause 1

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I would like to introduce Mr. Al Palmer and Ken Orr.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned in second reading, we are supporting this bill, but there are a couple of questions I would have before we whip through it. It won't take a minute. When this bill was originally thought about and worked on by a previous minister, there was an amendment to clause 38 which would allow the option of transfer from the old plan to the new plan of employees. What I am wondering is why that was deleted, and if it is not possible to include that in the bill, because there is a large number of employees who in 1977, for one reason or another, didn't transfer to the new plan by the deadline in 1978.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — In response to that question, that option has not been available, as I understand, since 1978. It seems to me . . . I question the panic. It has not been available since 1978. Now all of a sudden you want to have it available going into an election campaign. I can advise the hon. member that we haven't ruled that option out. We will be looking at it in the next fiscal year and we will be looking at bringing in amendments with regard to that question.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, the minister indicates that he is wondering why the panic now. I don't consider it to be a panic. It was something which came to light in 1980 after the deadline was reached. The situation has been building to where there is a large number of people out there (when I say a large number, I don't mean thousands) who are interested and concerned that they should be allowed to transfer to the new

plan. If it is considered to be a good idea (and the minister has, in a sense, indicated that), I am wondering why we can't move with an amendment now in order to allow that number of employees who would like the option of transferring to the new plan to be included in the bill at this time. I know it is a concern; they have raised it with us.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What I am simply saying is that we are not necessarily committing ourselves to that particular program. I think the hon. member can recognize the fact that pensions are a rather complex issue. We simply want to look at that particular segment. We came into an early session of the legislature and we wanted to ensure that the people out there, the retired civil servants and the spouses of those civil servants, would in fact be taken care of. We've brought in the legislation to take care of them, with regard to part one and part two. The third part we want to have a look at. That's basically what we are saying. At this point in time we are not prepared to proceed with it.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I wonder if the minister could indicate whether or not they have had time to look at that area. How many people could possibly be affected, if that number is available?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The advice I have is that it could perhaps be in the neighborhood of 100 to 200 people out of a potential 10,000 people who would be interested in qualifying.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Now, just let me get it straight. There are 100 or 200 who would want to move to the new plan. How many would be eligible to move to the new plan?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I take it all of the 10,000.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I suppose the next logical question, as I understand that under the old plan the government didn't contribute to the pensions, is: what would the estimated cost be if those people were to move to the new plan?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Again, this has to be a very rough estimate. We are not aware of just exactly how many would pick it up. The rough estimate would be about \$500,000.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Wildlife Act

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, this is Ross MacLennon, the director of wildlife of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources.

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 14 — An Act to establish the Department of Energy and Mines and to repeal The Department of Mineral Resources Act

Clauses 1 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 15 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Department of Energy and Mines Act

Clauses 1 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act by eliminating the Mortgage Interest Tax Credit as a consequence of the establishment of the Mortgage Interest Reduction Plan

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Education Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting Elections in Urban Municipalities and School Divisions and repealing The Urban Municipal Elections Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I move the amendments now be read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, with leave, I move the said bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 24 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Local Government Election Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, with leave, I move the said bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 3 — An Act to provide for the Imposition of Taxes on and the Collection of Taxes from

Certain Purchasers of Certain Fuels and for the repeal of The Fuel Petroleum Products Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division and bill read a third time.

YEAS — 52

Devine	Currie	Young
Muller	Duncan	Domotor
Birkbeck	Schoenhals	Embury
Taylor	Smith (Swift Current)	Dirks
Andrew	Boutin	Hepworth
Berntson	Weiman	Folk
Lane	Tusa	Morin
Rousseau	Sveinson	Myers
Muirhead	Sauder	Zazelenchuk
Pickering	Petersen	Johnson
Sandberg	Schmidt	Baker
Hardy	Parker	Thompson
McLeod	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Koskie
McLaren	Hopfner	Engel
Garner	Klein	Lingenfelter
Katzman	Rybchuk	Hammersmith
Martens	Caswell	Lusney
Yew		

NAYS — 0

Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend the Statute Law

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, with leave, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Wildlife Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 14 — An Act to establish the Department of Energy and Mines and to repeal The

Department of Mineral Resources Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 15 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Department of Energy and Mines Act

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act by eliminating the Mortgage Interest Tax Credit as a consequence of the establishment of the Mortgage Interest Reduction Plan

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division and bill read a third time.

YEAS — 42

Devine	Garner	Hopfner
Muller	Katzman	Klein
Birkbeck	Martens	Rybchuk
Taylor	Currie	Caswell
Andrew	Schoenhals	Young
Berntson	Smith (Swift Current)	Domotor
Lane	Boutin	Embury
Rousseau	Weiman	Dirks
Muirhead	Tusa	Hepworth
Pickering	Sveinson	Folk
Sandberg	Sauder	Morin
Hardy	Petersen	Myers
McLeod	Schmidt	Zazelenchuk
McLaren	Smith (Moose Jaw)	

NAYS — 7

Thompson	Lingenfelter	Lusney
Koskie	Hammersmith	Yew
Engel		

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Berntson that Bill No. 9 — **An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act** be now read a second time.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments with respect to this particular bill.

As members will have appreciated yesterday, the former premier commented on the extent of this legislation and also indicated a possible modification of it but not with the total delineation of a limit as to the number of legislative secretaries that can be appointed.

I want to say that I was rather surprised at the Attorney General, who rejected any limitation with respect to the number. He tells us to eliminate any of the numbers. That's right, he says we're responsible, that we don't need the legislature of this Assembly to put any limitations on this government. I want to say that I suppose, if you follow his logic, you might as well, with respect to the various boards and commissions (because their numbers and methods of appointments are set out), eliminate them and just say that the minister shall appoint a board of the size that he wishes.

The minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation came forward today asking for an amendment to the act with respect to the amount of borrowing. I suppose you can start following the Attorney General's crippled logic (and I think that you could come to the same conclusion) and say, "Oh, let's allow the minister who's running the power corporation to set the limit, because, after all, he is responsible."

The thing that I see in this particular bill, Mr. Speaker is a trend developing. It seems to me that this government is on a course of unfettered power grabbing. Unfettered power is the direction of this government. I think we can look, with respect to this legislation, at total non-accountability, at no limitation. Certainly, if they wanted to increase it, and they put forward their case, we in the opposition would agree with a modest increase. But, no, they are above this legislature now. They have that vast majority and, as a consequence, they don't want to be bothered coming back here to debate the merits of whether or not it should be increased.

I want to tell the backbenchers of the government side to be on guard. Don't sit idly by and watch a course of development of unfettered power by a few in the front benches.

Let us look at this legislature, too, during this session. I will say that there is evidence of a shift to unfettered power, including mass firings with no accountability or reasons, and The Education Act, with the repeal of an act that already had support and had been investigated. I look at further indications of direction such as gross overpayments of political hacks who are brought in from other provinces. They have the power. That's where the power is. I want to tell the members of the backbenches to take a look at the mass firings which were done for no reason, to look at the total abrogation of civil rights, and at The Education Act repealing the provisions. Look at The Interpretation Act and the provisions of that. Then ask yourselves, in what direction is this government going?

I want to say that this government is seeking unfettered power. I want to say to the members of the backbenches that unfettered power leads to misused power. I want to

say that, in the end, it's going to lead to the defeat of the vast number of the boys and girls in the backbenches. With respect to this bill, as I've said before, if the Attorney General had come forward, presented a case, indicated some direction as to numbers, we would not have to be here debating it. Exactly what he is saying is that he will have no control on him, that he is supreme. I want to tell the backbenchers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I just want to say to that member who keeps opening his mouth while nothing comes out that the empty barrel makes the most noise. You seem to qualify for the empty barrel on that side.

I want to tell these backbenchers not to sit idly by and get sucked in, because this government is heading on a course of self-destruction.

I want, therefore, to seek the intelligent support of all of those honorable people on that side of the House who believe that the legislature still has a function, who believe that the Attorney General does not have total control. I call out to the backbenchers (and there are some intelligent ones among you) to take a look at what is happening. The empty barrel raises his hand. I tell you that this is not a laughing matter. We have seen evidence, here, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the amendments to The Interpretation Act, they laughed, and now they laugh with respect to The Executive Council Act.

The people of Saskatchewan are concerned and will be concerned. I'll tell you that the legal profession across this province is concerned.

I think of the university and the legal professors, who see the unfettered power growing, and I will tell you the trend that is developing is that the power has gone to their heads and they no longer want to make their cases before this legislature. And I want to say to these hon. backbenchers — way back — to make sure that when you consider these bills consider them carefully, because I want to say that every time this legislature no longer has a right to make a determination or review power is taken away from the public. It's taken away from the public, first of all, because they don't want to justify their actions. They don't want to justify their actions, and I want to tell those hon. people in the back benches to join the concerned people in Saskatchewan, and I'll tell you that your political careers could last longer.

I want to say that each and every one of you can laugh; you did yesterday on the interpretations, led by the Attorney General. You have a lot of fun, but I'll tell you there are people out there who do not want a dictatorship and unfettered control by a few members in the front benches. I want to say that you were given an opportunity and a trust to carry out in good faith a type of government that upholds the democratic process.

I want to say to each and every one of you that this is, indeed, a serious matter. I think that, coming back to the main portion of the bill, obviously there is a possibility that additional legislative secretaries can in fact be deployed. But I want to say that it is our position here, clearly, that a limit should be installed in respect to the number that can be appointed.

AN HON. MEMBER: — There is a limit.

MR. ENGEL: — Where?

AN HON. MEMBER: — One per cabinet minister.

MR. ENGEL: — Yeah, isn't that great? Maybe you'll start having two. Yeah, keep talking.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to say I realize, Mr. Speaker, that with the cabinet material they have over there obviously they need one or two legislative secretaries to help them carry out that role. But I want to tell you that here, today, we are witnessing again an Attorney General and a few members in the front benches wanting to eliminate the basic function of this legislature to review, to act as a check in order to evaluate that which the government is performing.

And I want to say that the Attorney General's logic did not impress anyone. Either he was ill-prepared in putting forth his case or his lack of concrete, well thought out reasoning was lacking.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I think I convinced about 90 per cent of the House, Murray.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, I'll tell you that you haven't convinced this side of the House. And I'll tell you in respect to the abrogation of the rights of this House, the rights of citizens of this province, that we're prepared to continue to stay in this legislature to debate it, to send forth what is happening with respect to The Interpretation Act, and with respect to the unfettered power that is requested here. Certainly we are prepared to continue to discuss the principles that are at risk here. I won't be hurried in formulating a conclusion to my remarks. In fact, I'll have a drink.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Kill the clock. Is this a filibuster?

MR. KOSKIE: — I'll tell you, Mr. Attorney General, that we should obviously have a filibuster for legislation of this nature. I want to say that the Attorney General did not come into the House and indicate to the House any of the precedents which are followed in other legislatures. He did not come forward here to indicate that there is an unlimited number of legislative secretaries who can be appointed in other provinces. He probably didn't look it up or doesn't know.

But certainly, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that here indeed is a principle. I think that we, on this side, would be prepared to consider a modest increase tied (as the former premier indicated) to the number of cabinet ministers plus a number of legislative secretaries adding up to a total of 26 or 27. I think that would be a step forward, and I think it is reasonable that we as an opposition request that the government indicate the specific number which it has in mind.

I do not think that we, as an opposition, can in fact sit idly by while the Attorney General and the Premier seek further and further unfettered control. It seems to me what is happening is that very clearly the government, overwhelmed by its electoral success, has suddenly decided that because of that success it no longer needs to come before the legislature to discuss the merits.

I want to say, as has been said, that we indeed in this House when we were government, had a large number of members: 45 in number. I want to say that we indeed operated within the allowable number within the legislation. In fact, the most we ever had was four. I don't necessarily say, Mr. Speaker, that it is magic, but the principle about which we are speaking here is whether or not the basic control of numbers should be subject

to the approval of the legislature, or whether it should be left totally in the hands of the Attorney General.

I also want to say that, with the apparent movement toward the amendments in The Interpretation Act and the concern that it has created, I am equally concerned with respect to this legislation.

I want to urge the Attorney General, in his concluding remarks, to take seriously what the Leader of the Opposition and I have been urging here tonight. It is that, yes, we are prepared to agree with an amendment increasing the number. Of course, we will have a legislature, presumably, open this fall. If it can be demonstrated to this House that additional numbers are needed, then what is the problem with coming back with an amendment? Certainly, at least in that way, it gives accountability of government to this legislature and to the people of Saskatchewan. So I urge the Attorney General to seriously consider the representations which we have made on this side.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I also want to make a few comments on Bill No. 9. I think it's important that some of the areas are aired regarding legislative secretaries and positions that relate to being a legislative secretary. I would like to take just a couple of minutes — maybe two — to indicate what I saw as the role of the legislative secretary, Mr. Speaker.

I wish the Premier were here so that he could spell out what he thinks and what he sees as the role of the legislative secretary. A legislative secretary will sit in this House. He tactfully asks questions from the opposition as to his goings about. It's possible to go as the legislative secretary on behalf of the government. I know that.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How did you know?

MR. ENGEL: — I did. I reviewed; I studied; I did things. In that role I was on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, and you couldn't ask any questions about that person.

How many of those positions do you want? The question I really would ask, Mr. Speaker: is an appointment as a legislative secretary a little deal where you have a chance to provide a little extra turkey feed for some of your people that may be hurting? Is that what the part really is? That's what I wanted to hear, there. That's what I wanted to hear the Deputy Premier talk about. He's speaking as the — he's the Deputy Premier. He says, Mr. Speaker, so that *Hansard* records what he's saying, that they want to provide some turkey feed here. That's what it's all about. That's what he's saying . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I hope you do.

Tell us, really, what role do you see that you need more than six people for? I felt that it was a good role to be responsible for a certain area. I was given an assignment to look after Saskatchewan's International Development Program. I went to council meetings with the SCIC (Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation). I sat in on meetings on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture. I listened. I carried a message to the cabinet. I did a good job. I figure it was an excellent job.

I haven't heard a report yet on whom this government has put in charge of international development. I don't know which one of you is going to be . . . Are you responsible for international development? I'd like to visit with you about that. We could talk about the role that this government has. I hope the Tory government here doesn't do what

Sterling Lyon did in Manitoba with international development, for example. When you get around and you see the need in the world and you see what you can do with a couple of million dollars . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Maybe you're asking: what has this got to do with the role of a legislative secretary? It has a lot to do with the legislative secretary. That's what the role is. How many of those positions do you want? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, sir, I did.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're starting to get to them, Al.

MR. ENGEL: — I'm starting to get to them. I don't know how many of those positions you want. Do you want 20 positions like that?

Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier says that he would require 30. That's why they want the ceiling raised: so they could have 30 legislative secretaries, 30 people getting an additional \$6,000 a year. That's the role. They have these people sitting behind them. The member for Moosomin is one of them. If he can't get into cabinet, at least give him a legislative secretary job. That's what he's saying. That's why they want the ceiling removed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that six is an ample number. I'm going to raise my objections to raising it beyond that limit. I'm going to indicate that I can't support a wide-open ceiling so that they have a pork barrel where they can blatantly . . . (inaudible) . . . the funds that are available. They can freeze the minimum wage but they don't want to do it for their members who are sitting here. That's why the backbenchers are so anxious to see the ceiling taken off, because that's going to give all of them an opportunity get one of those jobs.

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, in closing debate, I want to raise a couple of matters. We had a very shocking principle proposed by members of the opposition tonight. They proposed an amendment to limit the size of the government's cabinet. That was a suggestion that they made. Let me remind . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh yes, you did, when you said that there should be a fixed number of 17 plus 8 to 28 — I think the figure was that you gave. Let me tell you something; you people are going to have to learn something that you haven't learned yet through this whole session. That is, you lost the election, fellows. You aren't the Government of Saskatchewan anymore. You don't call the shots anymore. You lost. On April 26, you went from this side of the House, all along here, to a little corner on that side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — On April 26, you went from 47 per cent of the vote down to 37 per cent, and I suspect that in reality it would have been a lot lower than that, if you had had a smaller plurality going into the election.

Mr. Speaker, they are sitting over there as they have been since the day this session started, figuring they are still the government and that they are still calling the shots and still running the province of Saskatchewan. Now they propose, probably for the first time in any of the British parliamentary jurisdictions, that it is the opposition's priority and prerogative to establish the size of cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, do they ever have a lesson to learn! They didn't learn it on April 26, and I suspect they are going to learn it again in 1986 and 1990 and 1994 and the year 2000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, we were given a mandate on April 26 to give a government to the people of this province that started to listen to the people of this province. That former government quit listening, and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, if the former government had listened to some of these members now that are criticizing this bill — had made a couple of them legislative secretaries — then maybe they would have had some input into that very closed cabinet they had before. Maybe they wouldn't have embarked upon the policies that led to their defeat on April 26.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — It has been a commitment of the new Premier of Saskatchewan, and it has been a commitment of this party, that we were going to listen to the people of this province. And anything we can do to make cabinet more responsive to the people of this province we will do, and we won't apologize to anybody.

Mr. Speaker, the more members of this Assembly who become aware and confident in the administration of government, the better off this Assembly is, and I suggest to the hon. members that's an argument they did not address.

Mr. Speaker, as well, the more the cabinet ministers can stay out in touch with the people of this province, the better government this province will have. I think the people of this province will be well satisfied when they see the action we propose to take as a result of this bill.

Let me tell the hon. members something; let me give them a bit of advice. You lost in a very big way on April 26, and one of the reasons you lost, as I say, is you quit listening. You should learn. You should learn that in fact if you had kept listening to the people, you might not be in that rather embarrassing position you are in today. Let me tell the hon. members we are going to do everything possible that we can to make sure we don't make the embarrassing mistakes that you made and not bring in the embarrassing policies that you brought in. Above all, Mr. Speaker, this bill is proof that we intend to listen to the people of this province and we are going to ensure that the members of the treasury benches listen to the people of this province. In fact this bill will guarantee better government for the people of this province.

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 — 43

Devine	Schoenhals	Caswell
Muller	Smith (Swift Current)	Young
Birkbeck	Boutin	Gerich
Andrew	Weiman	Domotor
Berntson	Tusa	Maxwell
Lane	Sveinson	Embury
Roussear	Sauder	Dirks
Muirhead	Petersen	Hepworth

Pickering	Schmidt	Folk
Sandberg	Parker	Morin
Hardy	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Myers
McLeod	Hopfner	Zazelenchuk
McLaren	Klein	Johnson
Garner	Rybachuk	Baker
Katzman		

NAYS — 7

Thompson	Lingenfelter	Lusney
Koskie	Hammersmith	Yew
Engel		

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Lane that Bill No. 18 — **An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Public Utilities Review Commission 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 9:43 p.m.