

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
July 9, 1982

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. SWAN: — I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you 12 students from Quebec. They are sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They are an exchange group from the bilingual centre of the University of Regina. It is my pleasure to welcome them to Saskatchewan. I hope that you enjoy the deliberations of the Assembly and I would ask all hon. members to welcome this group to our province.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to the Assembly the Australian high commissioner to Canada, Mr. Barrie Dexter, who is sitting in the Speaker's gallery. I met with His Excellency this morning. I would ask members on both sides of the House to join with me in welcoming him to Saskatchewan. He will be here for another two days.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Royal Assent

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the House Leader. I ask him whether or not it is the intention of the government to have His Honor the Lieutenant Governor give royal assent to some bills today. It begins to look as if we are not going to conclude this portion of the session today. Some of the applicants for private bills are wondering when royal assent is going to be given to their legislation; doubtless other members of the public are wondering about Bill 1 and other legislation. Would the House Leader give an indication of whether or not the Lieutenant-Governor will be asked to give royal assent to these bills?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, it will be known by all members that we did in fact have the Lieutenant-Governor here last Wednesday (I believe it was) and ran into a bit of a procedural problem. Of course he couldn't give royal assent that particular day because the member for Quill Lakes was so much enjoying the debate that he refused to sit down. However today, Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant-Governor is, in fact, busy with Her Royal Highness, running a very tight schedule this weekend (as you might guess). The administrator is, however, being called in at 12:45.

Unemployment Figures

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member. The group whose private bill I sponsored asked me when it would likely receive royal assent. Accordingly, I thank the hon. member and direct a further question to him or to his seatmate, the

Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Labor, but perhaps more fittingly to the Premier or to the House Leader, the Deputy Premier. This concerns the unemployment figures which became public this morning . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'll direct it to the Premier then.

The increase in unemployment from June 1981 to June 1982 was an increase from 17,000 to 26,000, an increase of approximately 53 per cent. This produces a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 6.1 per cent, which is higher than any figure since 1966, when certain changes were made in calculations. And I suspect, if one adjusted for that (and I didn't have time) it would be much further back than that. So we have the highest unemployment rate we've had for many, many years. My question to the Premier is this: has his government taken steps to speed up government projects in order to provide additional jobs for people in all parts of the province?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, I would like to make a couple of comments. The first, Mr. Speaker, is that the unemployment rate from one month ago is unchanged in the province of Saskatchewan. When we look at it from last year to this year, I believe the members opposite realize who was in government over the last year. For the last month, there's been no change. We have the lowest unemployment in Canada — I believe it is at 5.6 per cent. In terms of creating jobs and economic activity, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the recent moves in terms of taxes and royalties in the oil industry are going to do an awful lot to create economic activity and employment. Similarly, the removal of the tax on gasoline has increased discretionary income, which will allow people to be employed; certainly when the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, help us provide the 13.25 per cent interest rates to home-owners, we will see a large increase in employment in this province.

Highway Construction

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the facts are that the unemployment rate, the seasonally adjusted rate, has gone up from 5.7 per cent in May to 6.1 per cent in June. The question I want to ask the Premier is: have any additional highway tenders been let and is the rate of tenders in 1982 greater or less than the rate of tenders granted in 1981?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to highway tenders I would defer the question to the Minister of Highways.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There has been one additional tender outside of the \$7 million that was announced previously by this administration. It has been advertised from Redvers to the Manitoba border where the road has completely failed. This tender will cost approximately \$1 million. Further information, Mr. Speaker, for the member opposite, is that we have spent in excess of \$9 million in northern Saskatchewan to improve the roads for the people in northern Saskatchewan. On the Redcoat Trail alone we have spent in excess of \$6 million, plus this other projected \$1 million; that will be over \$7 million on the Redcoat Trail in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the Minister of Highways. In

view of the fact that the highway capital budget approaches \$100 million and, in fact, exceeds \$100 million if one includes the amount to be provided by the heritage fund, does he believe that the granting of tenders to date . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the question for members who do not fully grasp it. Would the minister give his opinion as to whether or not a tender letting of the order of \$9 million or \$10 million is appropriate to get a \$100 million construction program off the road when he hasn't even let tenders by the middle of July?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member's question, it is quite obvious he doesn't know anything about highway construction in the province of Saskatchewan. For further information, Mr. Speaker, we have been reviewing the whole capital project array. We have not been playing politics. I have a graph in my hand to prove how the previous administration played politics.

We go back to 1975, of course an election year, when there was a 42.8 per cent increase in the highway budget. Why? Because they were going into an election. In 1981-82 — it goes along the whole way. There wasn't a consistent program by the previous administration of constructing roads in the province of Saskatchewan. When we had an election year, the budget was high. After the election year, the scale dropped right back below an average. This will not happen under the new Devine administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary question to the minister. It is a short and simple one. How many additional jobs for Saskatchewan people have been provided for by the minister's studies?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not in estimates in this Chamber. I can only say to the members opposite that the road builders in Saskatchewan have never been happier than under the administration they are now working with in the province, and they are looking forward to a bigger and better highway project array in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Closing of Great West Garment Company

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — A question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Some time ago he undertook to see what he could do to save more than 100 jobs in Saskatoon in the firm of Great West Garment. Can he indicate whether or not he has had any success or whether all of those jobs are lost?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's question, yes, we were in conversation with the company, which had previously made the decision to move. They have moved. Our department is assisting those employees that were affected in relocating.

Funding to Hospitals

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. In view of the very sharp increase in unemployment, as indicated by these figures which are the highest since 1966, and may well be the highest since the last Progressive Conservative administration, would you now reconsider and make additional funds available to hospitals so that they will not have to close beds this summer and will not

have to lay off staff?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — In answer to the question by the Leader of the Opposition, the government on this side of the House, as I said the other day, believes in consultation and co-operation with the health services boards in Saskatchewan (which again is something new). I have set up a meeting with the chairman of the Plains Health Centre to address the situation that has arisen there. With regard to infusing new funds, I would like to remind the Leader of the Opposition that the last-ditch attempt in 1981-82 in the city of Saskatoon by the government that you then headed was to put funds into the hospitals, which did not result in more beds being opened in the summer. So I say, once again, that it is not my idea to follow in the footsteps of the past minister of health — certainly not — and there is no assurance that if more funds were put into the system right now that more beds would be opened. I want to talk to the chairman of the board and discuss the situation with him. The plans are under way for such a meeting.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Just a supplementary. Could the minister give any indication of how many additional jobs for people in Regina have been provided as a result of his course of meetings?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — In answer to the Leader of the Opposition, the meeting is going to take place. The meetings I have had have been with the various people in the operation of the health system. Those meetings were designed to find out what the problems and concerns are, and were not necessarily designed to create jobs. The purpose of those meetings was to improve health care — something the government of the party opposite let slip from number one to number eight in the last 11 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hospital Renovation Project in Saskatoon

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — A new question to the Minister of Health. I fear that these drastically high unemployment figures are not something which are going to go away quickly. I am concerned about what projects will be on the boards or under way next year at this time. The question I ask the Minister of Health is this: what steps have been taken to discuss with City Hospital and St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon a major renovation project which would allow them to proceed with projects which would not only provide jobs but would also improve the level of health care in Saskatoon and in all of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — In view of the capital projects in hospital regeneration, our department is in continuous consultation with the hospitals involved, and although we are reviewing and studying all capital expenditures in the field of health, we are certainly discussing it with them and the decision will be made in due course as to the development of these capital projects.

Nursing Home Projects

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, this is a question to the Minister of Social Services. In view of the indication of discussions elsewhere, but not much to look beyond that, my question really concerns nursing homes and whether or not nursing home projects have been confirmed or cancelled, and whether or not they are in a position to go ahead without further consent by the Government of Saskatchewan? I

particularly ask about the nursing homes at Weyburn, Biggar, and, let's say, Birch Hills. I'll use three.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, there will be an announcement coming forth before the middle of August regarding the nursing home situation.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. May I ask her whether that means that no consent to proceed has been given to the nursing home sponsoring board at Weyburn? Has consent been given, or has it been withheld at Weyburn? I'll ask that simple question.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Let me give you a simple answer. There will be an announcement before mid-August on the nursing home construction projects that will go forward or will be cancelled.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — A supplementary, and I will try to make it simple. I am not asking when there will be an announcement. I am asking whether, on this date, an approval has been given to the board at Weyburn, or has not been given to the board at Weyburn.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Obviously if there has been no announcement yet, there has been nothing given to Weyburn one way or another.

Individual Item Pricing

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. As you may be aware, some of the retail stores have been departing from the standard policy of pricing individual items, and when this occurred (the departure from the policy of individual item pricing), the Consumer Association of Canada, in fact, the Saskatchewan branch, indicated considerable concern with the departure from that policy by the retail stores. I would like to ask the minister to indicate whether or not his department has enunciated a policy in respect to item pricing, and if so, what is the policy?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member opposite, we have received the report of the task force on item pricing. I am sure that he is aware of what the task force was all about, and what questions were to be answered.

We have the report in the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. It is being studied and reviewed by my department, and I can assure the member opposite that the report will be made public sometime later in this month. I don't have an exact date on it yet, but it will be sometime later this month.

MR. KOSKIE: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate within what time frame he expect to put forth a policy?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — After the report is made public, my department will be assessing the reaction of the public, of course. We are formulating policy at this time, but I am not ready to enunciate it at this time — not until the report is made public. I would say it would be later in the month of July.

MR. KOSKIE: — One further supplementary. I'd like to indicate to the minister that a number of the retail stores contemplating expansion or new stores are having a very

difficult time with the abeyance of policy. In view of that fact, will he assure the House that his decision to enunciate a policy will be forthwith?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Again, I cannot give the hon. member an exact date, but I assume it will be either later this month or possibly early in August.

Meeting with Beef Stabilization Board

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday, I was at a meeting with a number of farmers who represented a cross section of farmers in Saskatchewan, and the farmers' union in Saskatoon. They expressed a great deal of concern regarding the beef stabilization plan. Has the minister met with the beef stabilization board?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — The minister has not met with the beef stabilization board. I don't know with whom you met but you did indicate that it was at an NFU (National Farmers' Union) convention. I had a phone call from the president of the NFU, Mr. Ted Strain, commending this government for its action relative to the beef stabilization program in that we eliminated the 50-feeder option.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister planning any changes in the membership of that board?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Yes, the minister is planning some changes in the membership of that board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Possibility of Balanced Budget

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a question for the Minister of Finance. I hate to ask the Minister of Finance a question because, rather than an answer, one always gets a finger-wagging ministerial statement usually with respect to Saskatchewan being number one. I predict that Saskatchewan will be number one, in terms of deficits, in western Canada.

If I may, I'll preface the question, Mr. Speaker, with the comment that the member for Saskatoon Mayfair and I were at a meeting of chairmen and vice-chairmen of public accounts. We were joined by the auditors general. I will simply summarize their remarks by quoting the headline from the *Globe and Mail*: "Economy Near Collapse, Auditors General Warn." They gave as a prime reason for that collapse the deficits being run by provincial and federal governments. The minister has hinted about Saskatchewan having a large deficit. My question to the minister is: will you give this House assurance that Saskatchewan will make a contribution to Canada's economic recovery by running a balanced budget? The question, shortly put, is: is Saskatchewan going to continue to be part of the solution, as we have, or are you going to make us part of the problem?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated, I think, perhaps two Fridays ago, that the new government of the province of Saskatchewan assumed that it was inheriting a

\$200 million surplus. We in fact inherited a \$200 million deficit.

Now the commitment of this new government, Mr. Speaker, is . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. The hon. member on his feet cannot be heard by me or by anyone else. Could we have order?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The commitment of the new government of the province of Saskatchewan is as follows, Mr. Speaker: we intend to pursue a fiscal policy, over the next four years that we are in office, that will lead toward balanced budgets in the province of Saskatchewan over a four-year cycle. We cannot do it this year, Mr. Speaker, because we inherited a \$200 million, a \$400 million smoke in the ears, Mr. Speaker, from the members opposite.

We will be moving in that direction, Mr. Speaker. I believe the deficit of the Government of Manitoba this year is something like \$360 million or \$400 million and climbing, climbing, climbing. The other social democratic party in the country is that in Quebec, and its deficit is even worse than that. It's probably the most severe other than that of the Dominion of Canada, which is the only Liberal government in the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a question, if I might, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Finance.

If you people had bothered to read the annual report of the heritage fund, you would have known that the heritage fund did not consist of cash; it consisted of assets that were not liquid. You people never bothered to read the annual reports which we filed.

My question to the Minister of Finance is: are you now admitting that the basis upon which the Progressive Conservative Party campaigned was either fraud or stupidity, one of the two, that there never was the mountain of cash that you claimed, that the basis upon which you campaigned was false, and that the public of Saskatchewan was deceived? Are you now admitting that?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I think the members on this side of the House have faith that the people of Saskatchewan are not stupid, are not to be duped. On April 26, the people of Saskatchewan showed the members opposite that they were not going to be duped, that they were not going to be taken in any longer by the false promises, by the false numbers advanced by that government for the last 11 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Finance just explain in simple terms to this House how the deficit which he is promising is going to contribute to Canada's economic recovery? Will you just explain what your contribution is?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, the view of the new government in the province of Saskatchewan is that in order for us, as a country, to pull ourselves out of the deepest recession that we have been in since the Depression, we must deal with the productive sector of the economy to encourage productivity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the other governments in this country should address the question of productivity. We will never solve our recession simply by the governments' hiring more people or the governments' building more buildings. That's what we've been doing in this country for the last 20 years. It's time to change. If we're going to see a productive economy, we have to look in a new direction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I wish to raise a matter of serious importance. As you know, I have, this morning, filed with your office notice that I wish to raise a point of privilege.

It is my contention that in the course of his answers to this Assembly yesterday, recorded on pages 616 and 617 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Mineral Resources did commit a breach of privilege which is serious enough to be considered a contempt of this House.

I appreciate the important role that you will play, Mr. Speaker, in determining whether or not I am bringing a prima facie case of contempt before this Assembly. This role is made clear to me in reading Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, citations 80 and 84 on pages 25 and 26 which I would like to read now into the record. Mr. Speaker, procedure on a breach of privilege, distinctions between questions of privilege and questions of order. Citations 80(2) and 80(3) read:

A question of privilege, on the other hand, is a question partly of fact and partly of law — the law of contempt of parliament — and is a matter for the House to determine. The decision of the House on a question of privilege, like every other matter which the House has to decide, can be elicited only by a question put from the Chair by the Speaker and resolved either in the affirmative or in the negative, and this question is necessarily founded on a motion made by a member.

It follows that though the Speaker can rule on a question of order, he cannot rule on a question of privilege. His function, when a question of privilege is raised, is limited to deciding whether the matter is of such a character as to entitle the motion, which the member who has raised the question desires, to move to priority over orders of the day.

The above quotation was taken from *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom on Parliamentary Privilege*, February 20, 1967, page 108.

The further citation that I wish to quote, Mr. Speaker, is citation 84 on page 25, on the role of the Speaker:

Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a prima facie case can be established. The Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved

to justify him in giving such precedence (or as it is sometimes put, that there is a *prima facie* case that a breach of privilege has been committed); and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity.

It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege, is limited to deciding the formal question, whether the case conforms with the conditions which alone entitle it to take precedence over the notices of motions and orders of the day standing on the order paper and does not extend to deciding the question of substance, whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed — a question which can only be decided by the House itself.

I also refer to May, pages 346 and 347.

If, after hearing what I am about to say, Mr. Speaker, you feel that I have established a *prima facie* case of contempt, I will move a substantive motion along the following lines and the motion will read something like this if the case is established:

That it is the opinion of this House that in light of the letter of dismissal, dated May 17, 1982, to Mr. Shakir Alwarid and signed by the Hon. Colin Thatcher, in stating to the House on Thursday, July 8, 1982, on pages 616 and 617 of *Hansard*, in reply to questions from the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, that he had no personal involvement in the termination of any employee of the Department of Mineral Resources, the Minister of Mineral Resources was deliberately misleading the House, and this House therefore resolves that the matter of the deliberately misleading statement made to the House by the Minister of Mineral Resources on Thursday, July 8, be referred to the standing committee on privileges and elections, and that the committee on privileges and elections report to the House as to whether the statements of the Minister of Mineral Resources constitute a contempt of the House, and whether the conduct of the minister is consistent with that expected of a minister of the crown.

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize the seriousness of the charge that I bring before this House this morning. That is made clear for all parliamentarians in Erskine May, 19th Edition, page 142, under the heading "Misconduct of Members or Officers of Either House." That section in Erskine May is under the heading I have stated, subheading "Deliberately Misleading the House."

The House may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt.

In 1963 the House resolved that in making a personal statement which contained words which he later admitted not to be true, a former Member had been guilty of a grave contempt.

That's from Profumo's case, 1962-63. Members who are familiar with the history of that case will recall that it was not the particular personal involvements that Mr. Profumo had been involved in that resulted in the necessity of him resigning. It was rather that he had misled the House with regard to his involvements.

So I understand the seriousness of the charge, Mr. Speaker, but I feel that I must make

it. Yesterday in this House, you will recall that I asked a series of questions of the Minister of Mineral Resources, the Hon. Mr. Thatcher. In yesterday's *Hansard*, which I wish to quote from now, Mr. Speaker, page 616, it says as follows:

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. In the June 21, 1982 edition of the *Toronto Globe and Mail* the Minister of Mineral Resources, in responding to an allegation that he personally fired an employee, or employees, of the Department of Mineral Resources said, and I quote: "That's not true. I have not dismissed anyone personally."

My question to the minister is as to the accuracy of the quotation, and whether it is true that the minister has not personally fired or dismissed any employee or employees from the Department of Mineral Resources.

HON. MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I have to confess to becoming so bored with this question period, I wasn't even listening. Could I ask the member to repeat his question?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — My question to the bored minister is, and I repeat: has the minister personally fired or dismissed any employee or employees from the Department of Mineral Resources?

HON. MR. THATCHER: — No.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I just want to get this clear for the record, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister stating unequivocally that he has not personally, in writing, verbally, from the radio in his tractor, or by any means whatsoever, personally fired an employee or employees from the Department of Mineral Resources? Unequivocal?

HON. MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member has some difficulty with the English language. I believe I answered his initial question, which was the identical question to his supplementary. I used the basic English word known as no. I will repeat it. Perhaps if he requires the same answer in French I could ask my colleague to respond to it.

As the minister himself said, Mr. Speaker, he could not be more clear in his response. And he repeated his answer more than once. Since yesterday afternoon's sitting, Mr. Speaker, I've come into the possession of a letter. The letter is dated May 17 of this year. The letterhead is that of the Minister of Mineral Resources, Saskatchewan, Legislative Buildings, Regina, Canada, S4S 0B3, dated May 17, 1982. And it is addressed to Mr. Shakir Alwarid, 1830 Cowan Crescent, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Dear Mr. Alwarid: Your employment as assistant deputy minister, finance and administration, Saskatchewan Mineral Resources, is hereby terminated immediately.
Sincerely, W. Colin Thatcher.

. . . with Mr. Thatcher's signature.

I will table a copy of this letter, Mr. Speaker,. I think that anyone who reads this letter, and who heard the responses of the Minister of Mineral Resources in the House yesterday, cannot help but come to the same conclusion I have — that there is a prima facie case here of breach of privilege by the minister, and that the breach is serious enough to be

considered a contempt of this Assembly. Some of the members on the government side of this House may not be willing to take my word that this is a serious matter; that telling the Assembly one thing and doing another is not serious. Well, for the record, Mr. Speaker, let me remind the government members of these words:

If I cannot be satisfied that I can rely on receiving honest and factual answers to the questions that I raise in this House, then I cannot function as a member of this House and I cannot effectively serve my country, my province, or my constituency. It is as simple as that.

Who spoke those words, Mr. Speaker? That is from *Hansard* of the Parliament of Canada, page 17635, May 20 of this year. And the quotation is from Mr. James McGrath, the Progressive Conservative member of the House of Commons for St. John's East. He was speaking during debate on a similar question of privilege in the federal House, which had arisen as a result of certain statements made in the House by Mr. Chretien, the Minister of Justice.

This is just one more reason why, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Minister of Mineral Resources, with his answers yesterday, is in contempt of this Assembly.

I am prepared now to move the motion which I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, if you rule that the question I have raised constitutes a *prima facie* case of contempt of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Just a couple of words on the point raised by the hon. member. I, of course, can't speak for the Minister of Mineral Resources and since he is not here he is unable to speak for himself. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that before you make the determination as to whether this is in fact a *prima facie* case of privilege you wait for the Minister of Mineral Resources to have the opportunity to present his case, recognizing of course that privilege must be raised at the earliest possible opportunity by the rules of the House and all other authorities that you may cite.

I also want to cite a long-standing practice in the parliamentary system. In Erskine May, 19th edition, on page 170, "Complaints Against Members."

Before making a complaint against a Member it is the practice, as a matter of courtesy, to give him notice beforehand.

If a Member who makes a complaint against another Member has failed or been unable to give the Member notice of his intention to do so, or if although the latter has been given notice he neglects to attend, the more regular course is to adjourn further consideration of the matter of the complaint to a future day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that when you are considering the point raised by the hon. member you also consider Erskine May, page 170, chapter 10.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would like to thank the hon. member for bringing this matter before

the Assembly. It is a very serious matter, as you have stated. I would like to have the opportunity to review the record. I believe the comments of the House Leader should be taken into consideration. I will, therefore, ask the Assembly to give me the opportunity to review the record. I will defer my decision until after I have had that opportunity.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act

Clause 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the Deputy Premier introduce his officials?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Chairman, this is Ron Hewitt from the Attorney General's department.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments with respect to the amendment as we have indicated in the debate.

The concern which we have is what the amendment does — it completely eliminates any limitation on the number of legislative secretaries which can be appointed in the future.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, the most it can possibly be is 45.

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes. There is a concern because in the past, when this act was brought in, the purpose of it was to put a limit in. As a consequence, if the government in its wisdom wished to appoint additional members, it could, in fact, come before the legislature. We feel it is reasonable and proper that we, as members of this legislature share some of the responsibility as to the number which will be appointed. It should not be at the sole discretion of the cabinet.

Accordingly, as we have indicated, we feel that if the government can put forward a case as to why it needs to increase the numbers, the sort of plans the government has with respect to the numbers of legislative secretaries, we do not feel strongly that some increase may be appropriate. To date, it seems to me that we have not received any guidance as to the intention of the government. I think that leaving it open-ended certainly leaves the possibility of an abuse, the abuse which is also mentioned in that large numbers could be appointed. It really then becomes a method by the government to provide further income to that side of the House, to its back benches, separate and apart from what is available to other members of the House.

I think it is a concern which we have to share here. How much will this require as additional funding? Is it merely evidence of pork barrelling rather than, in fact, bringing together or effecting a more effective legislature in carrying out the duties of the government? I would like to hear the comments of the House Leader.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I don't disagree with everything you have said. I think an open-ended section could, in fact, be open to abuse, but little more than an open-ended section dealing with cabinet appointments. I think we have 17 cabinet ministers, including the Premier, today. The former government, I think, had 20 or 22. I

don't recall; you may. Quite simply the Premier doesn't have to come back to this House and debate every cabinet appointment, nor should he have to come back to this House and debate his legislative secretary appointments.

I agree with you that it could lend itself to those sorts of abuses. We don't think it will, because we think that we have a responsible Premier and a responsible cabinet. They will have to answer for that, for their actions. I think that it's fair and reasonable.

The very fact that we have brought this bill in is an indication, I suppose, that we intend to increase the number of working legislative secretaries. We have many, many, quality, talented backbenchers in our caucus who could make a very significant contribution to and for the people of Saskatchewan, without the burden on the public purse that a fullfledged cabinet minister would cause. I therefore don't out of hand discount what you said. What I'm saying is that I suppose we will be held to account for our actions.

MR. KOSKIE: — Just a further discussion on that point. I think the Deputy Premier indicates that it's open-ended in so far as the number of cabinet ministers that the Premier can appoint is concerned, and I acknowledge that. But I want to say that there is a fairly substantial difference in appointing a given number of cabinet ministers vis-a-vis appointing a given number of legislative secretaries. I say this, Mr. Deputy Premier, from the standpoint that when you appoint a cabinet minister, that cabinet minister comes into this House and is answerable for that department. He can be questioned as to his activities, his responsibilities, and there can be a public view of what he is doing and how well he is doing. Now, try to compare, as you did, legislative secretaries on the same basis. It's not really a very fair comparison, because the legislative secretaries do not come into this House outlining what duties the minister has given to them, and are not answerable to this House. So, there is a very substantial difference.

What I'm saying here is what we're looking at is a very considerable output of additional funds. I believe that the legislative secretary obtains something in the neighborhood of \$6,500 additional and that could be increased. I want to say that there are other perks that go with a legislative secretary, such as secretarial help and travel expenses. As a consequence, in essence what we may be seeing here is a cabinet which is responsible to this House, and, on almost another level, an unanswerable group of legislative secretaries. I want to say that this could be a very considerable drain on the taxpayers. You have a new government and I acknowledge that you have a large caucus. I acknowledge that the legislative secretary role is a legitimate way of giving, and immersing people into, further responsibilities, almost to the extent of grooming them for cabinet. I don't say that this is necessarily wrong. In fact, I agree with that concept. But I want, Mr. Deputy Premier, to say in all seriousness that here is a principle of open-ended appointments, without your having to come back to this legislature to justify the actions you have taken.

I think we established an excellent precedent here when Premier Thatcher established the concept of legislative secretaries. I want to say that while we were government, we used legislative secretaries, but the number was set out in the statute limiting them to six. So in view of the fact that there is a substantial difference, as I have so clearly pointed out to the Deputy Premier, between a cabinet minister and a legislative secretary, I would ask him to indicate what would be wrong with indicating to this House what his plans are. Come clean, let us know, let the people of Saskatchewan know what you have in mind. Indicate a number that you could work with initially and we will give you full co-operation in proceeding in a reasonable manner. If in the end you feel you need more, the legislature will be called again this fall or next spring, or

whenever you decide. Obviously, at that time we could take another look at it. I think that is in line with the procedure of this House in having the responsibility of curbing potential abuses.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I think the member is now arguing for us. He said that he would be reasonable, that reason should prevail. I agree with that. We are prepared to be reasonable. Okay, with surgical precision I will give you a "few." I don't know. It would be the member here who makes the determination as to who will be appointed, and to what department. I think there could be an argument advanced that health, for instance, is a big department and should have a legislative secretary. I think social services is a big department and should have a legislative secretary. There may be others. I don't know. You see, we talked about reason prevailing. Shall we go for two today, then come back for two tomorrow and two the next day? You see, reason sometimes breaks down in this place, as we noticed on The Interpretation Act. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we are going to make the amendment.

There are others. Now, as it relates to the comments earlier, in your little chat here a while ago you talked about legislative secretaries not having the right or not being able to be questioned in the House. The tradition is, in the House of Commons in Ottawa, that they can be. There's nothing in The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act that would preclude that here. However, I would argue very strongly that if we accept the principle of ministerial responsibility in this House, they should not be able to field the questions from members opposite, carry estimates or that sort of thing. Nothing except reason and common sense would preclude that from happening.

We are going to have some more legislative secretaries. We urge you to support this very good amendment. Then we can get on with the debate of that other very important piece of legislation, The Interpretation Act.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to make a couple further comments, Mr. Chairman. We have been asking the Deputy Premier to give us sort of an outline of the evaluation of the need for legislative secretaries. Obviously, he has been able to formulate some ideas, but he doesn't want to share the concept that has been developed by the Premier and his government.

He says that health and social services are very large departments. I agree. The number of functions that an individual minister is requested to attend in social services is almost overwhelming in terms of the number of times that person is asked to speak or attend functions, official openings or whatever. I agree with that.

What you're saying to this House is, "Yes, we really have looked at some of these big departments." We do know that maybe they could be used there. We aren't saying that that's wrong. We're saying yes. All we're saying is: set out to this House, to the people of Saskatchewan, what your intent is. Why mask it and leave it totally to uncontrolled discretion? We had a set-up so that it was accountable to the House through the legislation. You can change the number to reach the initial request at least. I think there have been six appointed to date. I know the quota is full. The Premier may want a little more running room to bring forward all this backbench talent. I don't disagree with that. All we're really saying is that it's the basic principle here of again circumventing this House. I think that that smacks of the arrogance, again, of your administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Unfettered lust for power.

MR. KOSKIE: — Right. Unfettered lust for power. That's why we're standing in this House debating The Interpretation Act. That's why we're asking to join with you, in a reasonable manner, to increase it. Then, if you want to come back and have more and can justify it, we could have the opportunity (when you come back before us here, say, having 10 legislative secretaries) to question the Premier and the Deputy Premier to determine whether it's just an additional payment, whether that legislative secretary is really earning that extra pay or whether it is just to pay the government side members more than opposition members.

As a consequence, I want to say that I have always shared the reasonableness of the approach of the Deputy Premier. I think, if he would just consider what I have said, that we will work reasonably with you. But certainly, as well as you, we want to be able to evaluate the functional purposes of legislative secretaries.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I suppose we can go around this horn again and again and again. I am not going to amend the bill. You may, but we will vote it down in our unfettered lust for power. *Hansard* is printing this, so while I quote the member opposite in his wild accusations about our unfettered lust for power, let me say, Mr. Chairman, I don't see that this would have nearly the impact on this Assembly that the creation of a crown corporation by the former government, without coming to this Assembly, had on the community at large.

I don't feel particularly bad about bringing in this amendment to allow our Premier to appoint legislative secretaries at his discretion. He is a reasonable man. There were a lot of people in Saskatchewan who thought so. That is evident here in the House today, and I am prepared to trust his discretion. I just can't understand why you people can't.

As I said, the bill is as it is, and it will, sooner or later, get through.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, just a couple of comments on the bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I was thinking about you for an appointment.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Were you? Well, that would be very nice, but I am so busy already.

I think in the past we have used a maximum of four legislative secretaries. I would like to ask whether or not doubling that to eight would give the opportunity to the new government to make use of a number of the backbenchers, whom I am sure are very useful and very ambitious to get more involved in the government of the province.

I would like to also comment that many of the problems I see facing health and social services will not be greatly alleviated by having more assistance in the area of legislative secretaries, because I think basically most of those problems will come in dealing with the Minister of Finance and cabinet in terms of getting more money for those departments.

Having been through that process, I know that it is never easy to get money from the

Minister of Finance because his job is to guard against running very large deficits. Therefore, the point of using legislative secretaries to solve the problems of major departments is not wholly accurate, because many of the problems which we see being created already in terms of the number of hospital beds being shut down would not be solved in any sense of the word by having a legislative secretary. In fact, those problems will be solved only in cabinet.

What I am wondering is why you would need more than a doubling of the amount of legislative secretaries compared to what has been used in the past.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Chairman, the bill which is before us, Bill No. 9, just says that you do away with a section entirely. The original legislation has been in place since back in 1964; there always was a ceiling there. I think even to make attractive that office for the members who are legislative secretaries, to know there is a ceiling on how many can be appointed . . . I think you are doing a disservice to what really a legislative secretary is supposed to be.

That never was designed to help pay them a little extra money. That shouldn't be the criterion used to take off the ceiling. I don't think the government, in all its arrogance, is really intending to pay each of its guys sitting around here \$6,500 a year more than the members opposite. Is that what you're really saying? You're nodding your heads. That's what you want to do — just pass blanket legislation so that all the backbenchers on that side can get a \$6,500 increase in pay. Is that what you're saying?

Or are you saying that there is a role that a member plays as a legislative secretary, where you have a limited number so you know how many can be appointed. I think I would like the Deputy Premier to explain. How can you convince us that you're not just trying to sneak in a piece of legislation here which will increase the pay for the members on your side of the House? That's basically what you're doing. I challenge you to explain it to me, please.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I am surprised that the member opposite after all our years of association hasn't developed a trust for the Deputy Premier. I've told you that we have brought the amendment in to provide for open-ended legislative secretary appointments. I don't know why we should be much different in that respect from other jurisdictions in Canada. I understand that the House of Commons, for instance, can appoint legislative secretaries until they run out of members. We don't intend to do that. We intend to be responsible and reasonable. It will be at the discretion of the Premier, and I know him quite well. I think he is very responsible and a reasonable man. I'm prepared to go with whatever his decision is on the appointment of legislative secretaries.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to move an amendment to Bill 9, section 2, and I want to just prepare it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We have an amendment to clause 2. That clause 2 be amended by deleting all the words after "is" and substituting the following therefor: amended by deleting a word "six" where it appears in the first line of subsection 78(2) and substituting the word "eight" therefor.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Chairman, all of the arguments that I advanced prior to the amendment are still valid. I will urge all members to vote against the amendment. Anyone who wants to hear the arguments again, if you pick up *Hansard* on Monday, they will be in there.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 6

Thompson
Koskie

Engel
Lingenfelter

Hammersmith
Shillington

NAYS — 35

Taylor
Andrew
Berntson
Muirhead
Sandberg
Hardy
McLeod
McLaren
Garner
Katzman
Martens
Duncan

Schoenhals
Smith (Swift Current)
Boutin
Weiman
Tusa
Sauder
Petersen
Glauser
Parker
Smith (Moose Jaw S.)
Hopfner
Caswell

Young
Gerich
Maxwell
Embury
Hepworth
Folk
Morin
Myers
Zazelenchuk
Johnson
Baker

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I regret that the government did not see fit to go with the amendment to increase the number of legislative secretaries to eight, which I felt was a reasonable number — a good increase, since in the past the government has used only four of those legislative secretaries, which would have meant a 100 per cent increase in real numbers of the number of legislative secretaries being used by the government. But, in light of the fact that they refuse to vote in favor of the amendment substituting "eight" for "six," I would like to move a further amendment increasing the number to 12.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — While you're deciding on whether that amendment is in order or not, I refer you to Erskine May, 18th Edition, page 362:

Matters already decided during the same session — a motion or an amendment may not be brought forward which is the same, in substance, as a question which has been decided in the affirmative or negative during the current session.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that the substance of the amendment is to put a ceiling on the number of legislative secretary appointments. I therefore urge you, Mr. Chairman, to rule that the amendment is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! I find the amendment not the same as the one previously defeated. Quoting from Beauchesne's:

An amendment already negatived may be put a second time if it contains additional particulars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The question before the committee is the proposed amendment by the member for Shaunavon to clause 2, Bill No. 9, that clause 2 be amended by deleting all words after "is" and substituting the following therefor: amended by deleting the word, "six" where it appears in the first line of section 78(2) and substituting the word "twelve" therefor.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 6

Thompson
Koskie

Lingenfelter
Engel

Hammersmith
Shillington

NAYS — 33

Birkbeck
Berntson
Muirhead
Sandberg
Hardy
McLeod
McLaren
Garner
Katzman
Duncan
Schoenhals

Smith (Swift Current)
Boutin
Weiman
Tusa
Sauder
Petersen
Glauser
Parker
Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Hopfner
Caswell

Young
Gerich
Maxwell
Embury
Hepworth
Folk
Morin
Myers
Zazelenchuk
Johnson
Baker

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I promise that I'm not going to take long . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right, thank you. I will do that then.

I do want my objections to this on record. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't take long. Cynicism and an egocentric approach to life are occupational hazards of being a politician, but they normally don't set in within six weeks of the election. It normally takes a little longer before arrogance, selfishness and a lack of concern for anything but yourself sets in. But that's what we are seeing, Mr. Speaker. There is no earthly justification for this, and certainly none has been provided. There has been no explanation and no justification for this provided to the House.

The cost of this is in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Add up the cost of the salary to the legislative secretaries, their offices, their travel — the cost of that is in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I may say it is also in keeping with the way you people have treated yourselves and your friends, and it's in sharp contradistinction to the way you treat many others in Saskatchewan. You people have hired your political hacks, your friends, and put them on at salaries that are unprecedented. I say, Mr. Chairman, unprecedented. The salaries that you people have paid your political friends are unprecedented.

I want to tell the member for Rosthern about an election. I'm wondering if he will tell me who won and who lost the election. The riding . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. You should keep to the topic. It's clause 2, Bill 9.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It does seem that it is, isn't it? I was just about to tie it in. You have hired your political friends and now you are starting to pay yourselves as well. And I may say that's in sharp contrast to the way you treat those at minimum wage. The people on minimum wage — oh, Mr. Chairman, they had to make a sacrifice. But not you people. Oh, no, it's everybody else who makes a sacrifice. You people sure don't believe in setting much of an example, do you?

Those on minimum wage, Mr. Chairman, have lost money in the last four years. The elected members, Mr. Chairman, have not. The elected members' salaries over the last four years have been indexed, not to the cost of living, but to a higher index, the industrial wage index. The members opposite have not just had their salaries indexed to a figure that is above the cost of living, but now they are going to pay one-third of their backbenchers an additional sum of money.

I really would like someone opposite to stand up and explain to me what kind of leadership that shows to date. I asked a question in question period about the leadership which this province is showing. I was out in Victoria. I think the member for Saskatoon Mayfair will agree with me that overhanging the whole conference was the near economic collapse which this country faces, and the need for everyone, particularly those in government, to show leadership — show restraint. What are you people doing? You are at the public trough. As I said, you people will need something the size of Lake Superior to serve as a public trough, because you are all there.

I want to say something about the explanation which has been offered for this as well, and it's part of the arrogance of this government. You do the most outrageous things with no explanation. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs introduced The Interpretation Act, with an explanation that was woefully inadequate. You people, following the same pattern of arrogance, have done the same thing here. The fleeting explanation of a few minutes suggested there is some need to communicate with the public, and that's why you are going from 4 to 12. I may say that that is a brand-new explanation for a legislative secretary. Heretofore that has never been thought to be the function of a legislative secretary. Heretofore it has been thought to be the function of the members — the function of the member for Kelvington-Wadena — to communicate with the public, not the legislative secretary.

I wonder what the theory is over there? Is it the theory that the backbenchers are not competent to communicate with the public? Is the theory that you have to have someone else to do it? I ask the member for Moose Jaw South: is the theory that you are not competent to communicate with your constituents and you need some additional resources? The function of a legislative secretary, heretofore, has been to liaise between the minister and the department. It has never been a function of a legislative secretary to communicate with the public. That is the function of your backbenchers.

I really wonder what the explanation for this is. Is the explanation that there are large numbers of people, like the member for Saskatoon Westmount, who are dissatisfied with the fact that they are not in cabinet? Is that the problem? This is some sort of a sop. Is that what it is? The Deputy Premier is nodding his head. I tend to believe that he is being accurate. They are probably shell-shocked into honesty by the crisis which has fallen on them through the member for Thunder Creek. They are all being honest now. Or is the explanation that the Progressive Conservative Party is in such dire straits that you need to put your organizers on public staff so the legislative secretaries will have an office, telephone and travel privileges all over the province for the PC party?

I may say, if you people keep it up, you had better have a lot of legislative secretaries, because you're going to need a lot of organizing to pull this mess out of the fire. You have only been in office three months. I tell you, it's slipping, really slipping, if you guys want to call an election, you won't get a lot of fuss from us . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I will get off the issue of Thunder Creek. It was clearly out of order. It's under advisement.

I will sit down with a simple request: would someone please give us an explanation as to why you're doing this? Would you please give us a simple explanation that isn't layered with the blather about needing to communicate? You have 55 people to communicate. Why do you need these extra people at the public trough?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — It was a simple request. That shouldn't surprise anyone. I'm going to try to keep the answer equally as simple so that it can be understood this time. I know that the member who just sat down wouldn't understand the function of communicating with the people. As a matter of fact, I understand that, while that member was on this side of the House sitting in cabinet for a short time, in his efforts to communicate with the people, he called on the services of speech writers far and wide at great cost to the public purse. I think it cost him in the neighborhood of \$300 to have a speech written that he could deliver at the opening of a court club. It was a good speech. It was an excellent speech. He has a good speech writer. Don't talk to me about putting a drain on the public purse. You guys are masters at it.

Also, Mr. Chairman, our cabinet today numbers 17. The previous cabinet, I think, numbered 19, 20 or 22. It was 50 per cent of the caucus. I remember that. It was 50 per cent of the caucus in addition to the four legislative secretaries they had. The budget in 1971 was about \$300 million or \$400 million. What is it today? We're still trying to figure out just what the numbers mean in all those cooked books that we inherited.

To get back to the simple answer that those members opposite should understand, we are going to have an increased number of legislative secretaries. It will be done at the discretion of the Premier. If the Premier decides that we should have 2, or 4, or 10. I think the maximum we can go is about 38 today. But it will be at the Premier's discretion. I am prepared to leave that discretionary power with him. The people of Saskatchewan are prepared to leave it with him, and I am very lucky I am from Souris-Cannington because it is the best little corner of Saskatchewan real estate that there is. With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would urge all members of the committee to vote in favor of this particular bill for the good of all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'll just be very brief, Mr. Chairman. It should be noted that the

Deputy Premier did not bother to get around to explaining why they need so many. All he did was talk about our faults, my faults, my expensive speech writer, but he didn't get around to telling us why they need 38 legislative secretaries. We still await that answer, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to make, Mr. Chairman, for the record a couple of comments, because we are dealing with a sizable amount of money — \$6,500 or thereabouts — to each of those who are appointed, plus expenses — if you take a secretary at \$14,000 or \$15,000, then it is \$20,000, plus travelling expenses, plus accommodation expenses. You are looking at an additional \$30,000 for a legislative secretary. I want to say we are looking at a very substantial drain on the purse for the politicians — over \$500,000. Close to \$1 million could be expended by this government for legislative secretaries. I want to say that this is an abuse of this House. This is an appointment of people costing as high as \$30,000 additional from the public purse, and the Deputy Premier is unwilling to come forward to map out a course even as to the duties that he is intending for the legislative secretaries, other than that they are going to be communicating for the Tory party. I want to say that on this side of the House we are not prepared to spend close to \$1 million of public funds to support the Tory party. I think the Tory party has its funding sources — the banks and the oil companies and the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway). I want to indicate here that this is a substantial cost to the taxpayer. I think it is an abuse of power. I think it is a refusal of accountability to this House. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 2 agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 34

Birkbeck	Smith (Swift Current)	Caswell
Taylor	Boutin	Young
Berntson	Weiman	Gerich
Muirhead	Tusa	Maxwell
Sandberg	Hodgins	Embury
Hardy	Sauder	Hepworth
McLeod	Petersen	Folk
McLaren	Glauser	Myers
Garner	Parker	Zazelenchuk
Katzman	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Johnson
Martens	Hopfner	Baker
Duncan		

NAYS — 7

Thompson	Lingenfelter	Shillington
Koskie	Hammersmith	Yew
Engel		

Clause 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council 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.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Lane that Bill No. 16 — **An Act to amend The Interpretation Act** be now read a second time.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to get involved in the debate on Bill 16. It's a bill which we have been discussing for some time. It's a bill which, I agree with my colleagues, does interfere with the rights of certain people who are on boards and commissions at the present time in Saskatchewan. I believe, in all, there are something like 116 boards that are involved, 35 or 40 of which are involved directly, where we would actually be changing acts from what they are to something different by using The Interpretation Act.

The Interpretation Act is a wide-ranging bill, which would give the cabinet the power to dismiss total boards and commissions, which are presently appointed through a very complicated and very meaningful relationship which exists between the public in Saskatchewan and the boards and the government. Certainly there are some boards which, I believe, the government should have the right to dismiss without notice, quickly, when it becomes the government. I guess we could go down and list those. There are the crown corporations such as Sask Power and Saskoil, and you can go down that list. For those sensitive positions on those boards (the crown corporations), the government does have and should have, I believe, the right to change those board members.

But what concerns the members on this side, and concerns them a great deal, is the number of boards and commissions to which other groups and organizations have, at the present time, the right to appoint members. I think that it's important to know that this is just another development — a rather defenceless trend — which is occurring in the Government of Saskatchewan today. It's a trend toward power based in the cabinet and one which I have talked about in the past — one where the caucus is not going to have a great deal to say about it, but the dismissals of members of boards and commissions will have to be defended by the local members, by the backbenchers and by the members out in the country.

I say it's a trend because I see it in other areas. The member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake referred to the lack of radio time in the throne speech debate. He alluded to the request to close the public gallery for the opening of the session by the government; he talked about Bill 9 which we just passed here in this Assembly. We attempted to make

amendments to that bill in order to make it more realistic, in order to keep the total control of that bill out of the hands of cabinet, but we were defeated. I say that the power going to the hands of the government, rather than remaining in the hands of the legislature or ultimately in the hands of the people, is a trend which concerns me a great deal.

I think we should look a little deeper, though, and look at the people who are bringing this arrogant, big-government aspect to this Assembly. I think, if we look at the members on the treasury benches and in cabinet, I can refer to a few of them who don't approach government this way. I refer to the Minister of Health. In the House, so far this session, he has not taken the approach that he is arrogant, has not taken the approach that he has disrespect for this Assembly and I can go down the list.

The member for Swift Current, the Minister of Social Services, I think, when answering questions does a good job and doesn't come on with answers that are arrogant and show disrespect for the House. The member for Turtleford, our good friend who sits on our side of the House, I believe, in the past two weeks since the throne speech debate was over (I don't say during the throne speech debate but since then I think) has learned some respect for this Assembly.

I think if you look at the people who have disrespect for this Assembly, I would refer to the member who is now the Attorney General and the member who is the Minister of Mineral Resources. I think the whole tenor of this Assembly (many of you won't know this because many of you weren't here in the last session) has changed since those two individuals have gained control of the government.

I think we should look at why that has changed. What has changed to make the tenor of the House so irresponsible? What about the arrogance which is shown every day in question period? I challenge you to tell me that it's not because two former Liberals are now controlling the Conservative Party and the Assembly here in Saskatchewan.

I would like to carry that point a little further. The comparison between what is happening in Ottawa at the present time under the regime of Pierre Elliott Trudeau and what is taking place here in Saskatchewan at the present time definitely deserves some comparison and some analogy, Mr. Speaker. I think we need only look at several things that have happened and passed over in the last few days to see that there are certain trends which are identifiable with the Trudeau government in Ottawa. I won't refer to Thunder Creek, and I won't refer to things that happened in this House today. Many of us will be aware of them, and because we are awaiting word from Mr. Speaker, I think that we shouldn't talk about it. On the other hand, if we look at the bill we are discussing at the present time, Bill 16, I think the case can be made.

It's a bill which is not dissimilar to a bill that was brought into the Assembly a few short months ago in Ottawa, an omnibus bill which would have changed a number of energy-related bills, 15 in all.

This bill, on the other hand, is truly an omnibus bill. It doesn't affect 12, 13, 15 bills; it affects 116, Mr. Speaker. I don't know where you are getting your advice on how to run the Assembly, but there are such striking similarities that I would almost be willing to bet that there is input coming from another cabinet in this country, that advisers are advising the former Liberals, the former Trudeau Liberals for Thunder Creek and for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, on how to operate the House. It's a very scary tactic which is being used at the present time — one of arrogance, and one of disrespect for the

House. And I think that will be shown in the next few days.

I think that every one of us, not only in the opposition, but many of the backbenchers, should be concerned about the arrogance shown by certain members in the cabinet, and I'm sure you are. I'm sure that there is concern by many of the members who are asked to explain about The Interpretation Act that people are reading about in the paper. How is it that an omnibus bill that affects 116 pieces of legislation written in statute would be affected by one interpretation act? How is it that in Ottawa, a few short months ago, the Conservative Party under the leadership of Joe Clark and Erik Nielsen, the great House Leader (and I believe he is that), were able to stop the omnibus bill and were able to stop, legitimately I believe, along with the New Democratic Party, Trudeau from dominating the House through the use of omnibus bills?

I challenge the members to have a look at what is taking place right now in the province of Saskatchewan. The arrogance that has come out in the Government of Saskatchewan, which it has taken Trudeau about 15 year to get to, has taken place in this Assembly in two short months. And I tell you that if this trend continues, the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan is doomed to the same fate it had the last time it was elected in this province in 1929.

I challenge the members to tell me how many members were elected in 1934. Tell me how many Conservative members were elected in 1934. Was it 10, 12? How many were elected? I'll tell you how many were elected that year. There were zero. They went from government in 1929 to zero members five short years later.

I'm referring to it because I would like to advise the members that the type of arrogance that they are showing in this Assembly, the type of disrespect they are showing for the legislature in bringing in an omnibus bill, Bill 16, will not be stood for by the opposition, nor should it be, and will not be stood for by the people of Saskatchewan, any more than it was stood for in the Parliament of Canada and Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

I think we need only look at it, and I'm serious about asking the backbenchers to look at the arrogance, in particular, of two members of the cabinet, and the light that they are throwing on the whole government. I believe it is not necessary. I don't think it is necessary for the member for Thunder Creek to influence what the press is saying about this new government. I think you were elected with a mandate of 54 per cent of the vote. We had 37. No question about it. Nobody is arguing with that. But it is not a mandate, as the Attorney General says, to do anything you want. If you've studied any history, or have taken history in university, you know that it isn't a mandate to do whatever you want. It is a mandate to do what the people want in conjunction with the legislature, bills having to be criticized in a proper manner.

Good or not, The Interpretation Act . . . The member for Meadow Lake says they are being debated in this House. I'll tell you how we can debate these bills in the House. There are probably 15 bills that you need some amendment to in order to cover your tracks of people who have been dismissed since May 8. I don't know how many. But if there are 5, 6, 8, 10 bills, bring them in. At least be large enough to debate those 15 bills, to tell us what mistakes have been made. We will look at them; we'll argue them. You can vote us down but at least it won't have been done in a sinister manner, the way it is being done at the present time. And the 15, 18, or 20 bills would take us one or two days and we would be finished. But I can tell you we'll be here a long time if you are going to insist on amending 116 pieces of legislation with one four-line bill. I can tell

you that the legislature is much too important a place to allow that sort of power to go on.

I would like just to refer to a couple of relationships which have existed over the last number of years with a couple of boards in the province of Saskatchewan. As I mentioned earlier, many boards do have people on them who are in sensitive positions. I can go down the list: SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance), Sask Power — the member for Yorkton will be well aware that these boards do have people in sensitive positions and we agree. The legislation is in place to remove those people, and you can appoint the people you want, and I agree with that. The people I question the removal of are on boards like the board of teacher education certification; the Speaker of this Assembly will be well aware of that board because he was a member of it in 1977, under the administration which was defeated on April 26. Mr. Speaker, is not unknown in Saskatchewan. He is a very well-respected person in the field of education. He was appointed to a board of an NDP government because we felt that he could offer something to the province of Saskatchewan. The board of teacher education certification is covered under The Teacher Education Act, 1972. If you want to remove people from that board, or if you already have and you didn't have the legislative authority to do it, bring that bill in. Simply bring it in — we'll debate it and we'll pass it because you have a majority. No question about it. I would like to read a list of the names of people who were on that board, and this list is a bit out of date: Dr. L. M. Ready, I. J. Wilson, people like Dr. W. Toombs, Mr. Swan, and the list goes on and on. But it is not a board that is at the whim of the Minister of Education. It's a board with a complicated formula, built on years of co-operation and understanding between the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, which Mr. Speaker represented, and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation.

I just want to read out the guidelines under which people are appointed to this board:

This board is comprised of, first, three representatives of the Department of Education designated by the Minister of Education. At the present time you have an opportunity to remove, today if you like, three members of this board. But what you're trying to do is remove people in the rest of this list, for example, two representatives of the University of Saskatchewan designated by the president of the university. Why do you want to do that? I can't understand it. Two representatives of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation designated by the executive committee of that federation — why do you want the power to remove them? These are two representatives of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association designated by the executive committee of that association. Mr. Speaker, you'll be well aware of the process involved in appointing people to that board.

Also, if it is deemed advisable, the Minister of Education may designate two other persons to be members of the board. So you can remove three at will. You also have the option of injecting two more. But the appointments of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association — why do you want the power to remove them? You don't need the power. You already have power. What you're doing is breaking a relationship and a trust with many people in the province of Saskatchewan, not NDP hacks and flacks (we went through that list the other day), but people like Mr. Speaker, and the member for Regina Lakeview, Tim Embury, who's on a board of directors. What I would like to know is why the cabinet, and in particular why the Attorney General and the Minister of Mineral Resources, want this kind of power. They assure us that they're not going to use it. If the legislature abdicates its power to the whim of a couple of ministers on the basis that they're guaranteeing they're not going to use it, I say it's a black day in

Saskatchewan.

There are other board that are similarly set up. You can go down the list. I know the Attorney General referred to the university. I find that it is very scary if the government is saying that it should be the one to appoint political people to these boards and commissions. The university I believe to be something apart from the government, something that shouldn't be tampered with by the Executive Council but which should be dealt with by the people of Saskatchewan. If there are people you want removed from boards and commissions, there's a way to do it. Already, I said that in crown corporations there is a mechanism in place. You just have a cabinet meeting; you dismiss them and they're gone; you appoint your own people, fair and square.

On many other boards, like the Saskatchewan university and places like that, there's a formula that's worked out where the minister has an option of appointing some and dismissing some. There's a complicated formula. Each board is different. You can do it this way. You can let the terms expire. Many of them have six months left in their terms. Simply let them expire and don't rehire them or reappoint them. Do it through attrition. The other way is to go to the individuals you want to get rid of and ask for their resignations.

I'll give you an example. I have a friend who is a reeve of R.M. No. 77 down in my corner of the province, Herb Wallis. He is on the farm ownership board. He is appointed until September of 1982. I'll use that as an example. There are a few ways you can do it. You can let his term expire which would mean six months until you get to appoint your own person to whom you may have promised something during the election. There's no problem. You can go to him, face to face. The Minister of Agriculture can talk to him or write to him and say, "Would you tender your resignation?" I know for a fact that that individual and hundreds of others would give their resignations tomorrow, simply because they're doing it because they feel that they're responsible and doing a favor to the province of Saskatchewan. But to do it through a bill, an omnibus bill, where you wipe out the positions of 1,200 or 1,400 people in one fell swoop, is not what the backbenchers or the members of the opposition should be doing in this Assembly. Simply treat people up front. Go talk to them and ask them for their resignations and I'm sure they'll resign.

There are many other areas that this bill deals with, many other boards and commission, and I can tell you that over the next week or two or three, we will be dealing with each of those boards and commission that you are attempting to change with this omnibus bill. I can tell you, right here and now, that this bill is going to be a long, long time getting through this House in its present form, because I contend that we will be dealing with this bill, if it's not changed, at the end of August, the end of September, the end of October — it really doesn't matter.

I'll tell you we're going to be working very hard to help the government, which has started out in a very arrogant manner, and assist it in taking a different approach to the people of Saskatchewan. As I mentioned earlier, tenure in government is very fleeting, and we know it very well. I refer to various governments that have appeared and disappeared. I refer to 1929 to 1934 where you held the government and, five years later, there were no seats left . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member for Lloydminster says, "We didn't hold . . . "I'm not sure what" . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I'm sure it is. If you look on the annals, you'll find that the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, later changed to the Progressive Conservative Party, did hold power from 1929 to 1934. And in 1934, that changed, and it

changed dramatically.

Members in this Assembly, in the government, may try to say that the rout on April 26 was the biggest in history, but I can tell you it wasn't. Talk to any historian, and he'll say the rout in 1934 was the biggest in history, followed by the rout in 1944 when Tommy Douglas formed the government, and probably, third April 26, 1982. And there's no sense trying to string the troops along; this is history. And somewhere along the line you have to get the grain from the chaff. Look back to 1934, if you haven't read about it. Look back to '44, if you haven't read about it. And check with 1982, and then make your decision. And I'll tell you that the third largest rout in Saskatchewan history was our defeat. And I accept it, and let's go on from there.

But I can tell you that if you're saying that this group of people here in this corner has no power, if you're saying that we represent — the 200,000 people — have no power, I can tell you that the Attorney General is wrong. And you may think when you're sitting in here listening to him late a night, throwing the ball back and forth in this Assembly, that that's how this Assembly works. Well, I'll tell you that this small group of opposition is going to make sure that the members in government learn what this Legislative Assembly is about.

I can tell you that we're not going to allow it to lower itself to what has happened in Ottawa under Pierre Elliott Trudeau. And we're not going to allow people like the member for Thunder Creek to take control of this Assembly, the people who elected at a nominating convention Pierre Elliott Trudeau, are sitting on that side of the House, who are in power in the province of Saskatchewan. I ask the press, and I ask the members of the back benches, and I ask the opposition to check out and find out who is in control of the Government of Saskatchewan at the present time.

Other similarities are very obvious as well: 11 balanced budgets in the province of Saskatchewan compared with what was happening in Ottawa and why we are in the economic straits we are at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I believe that when we get to discussing the budgets that we're a little out of the process of this bill, and I would ask the member to get back on track.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, in trying to establish what is happening in Bill 16, I'm using several references to the House of Commons. Maybe I did stray a little bit, but I think if we follow along the steps that I'm taking, you will find that there is a definite similarity between what happened with an energy bill in Ottawa and the bill that we're dealing with in this Assembly at the present time.

What I'm trying to do is establish where that omnibus bill in Ottawa came from and where the one came from in Saskatchewan. And I'm saying that they're coming from the same people. In Ottawa it's coming from Pierre Elliott Trudeau's crew, and in Saskatchewan it's coming from Pierre Elliott Trudeau's crew — the former members of that party who are now represented in the cabinet in a very high way. I want to know and check the members to find out who is getting the press and who is getting the control of this Assembly, who is being quoted by the press, and who is in the limelight. Have you ever done that? I think you should because I think it is a very important process we are going through at the present time. Is it the member for Estevan, who is the Premier of this province, who is capturing the headlines in the province of Saskatchewan concerning what is happening in this Assembly at the present time? Is it the member for Swift Current who is a very good member and, who, I believe is doing a credible job in a very

difficult portfolio? They are not getting the press and they are not making statements on behalf of this Assembly. The people who are getting the comments of press and representing this Assembly in the government are two — the member for Thunder Creek and the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden.

I say that it is a startling and scary process which is taking place at the present time, where we are quickly drifting into an area where balanced budgets are being replaced by deficits, where omnibus bills which are used in the House of Commons are now being used in the province of Saskatchewan. I just challenge every backbencher to take a look at what is happening in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time.

There are other areas which have startling similarities. One of the points in this bill, and I don't know if I can find it because . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Get your bookkeeper; he'll find it for you.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — We don't have bookkeepers any more. But anyway, the agreements that were cancelled, or which are proposed to be cancelled in this bill lead me to another whole area of discussion. Many members of my constituency come to me with complaints about land bank, FarmStart, and lease land. They ask me whether or not the leases are going to be cancelled by the government. I tell them, and I have been telling them, that no government, whether it is Conservative or Liberal or NDP, is going to cancel agreements with individuals in the province of Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What happened with that lumber plant you guys cancelled?

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, we did cancel a lumber plant with Karl Landegger, and Parsons and Whittemore. I was saying that we don't cancel them with individuals. We did cancel a lease with Karl Landegger, and Parsons and Whittemore when we came to power in 1971. That is true. I will tell you that I would cancel that tomorrow if we had a deal that was made like that forest giveaway to a New York-based company under the guidance of Karl Landegger.

But I want to tell you that I am talking about something quite different. I am talking about individuals. I am talking about individuals who are going to have agreements cancelled by the enactment of this bill. If we can cancel agreements with people on these boards and commission, what is to say that the precedents in dealing with lease land, crown land, tourism land and recreation land will not follow in quick order.

I will tell you that the reason you are attempting to bring in this bill is to set that precedent in order that you can cancel agreements with individuals in this province. I am going to be telling you and the members in this crew are going to be telling people when they come to us from now on about what this group of people in the government is doing with agreements with individuals in the province of Saskatchewan. We will use this as an example. We will write letters to them using this cancellation of agreements with board members as an example of what could happen with their crown land, with their cottage at Meadow Lake, or Cypress Hills Park. I will tell you, they will not tolerate that kind of domination by a couple of individuals namely, the Attorney General and the Minister of Mineral Resources.

I want to tell you that you should get involved in this debate. I am waiting; I am seriously

waiting for a few of the members in the back benches to get up to defend this bill. I can understand why they would get up and defend Bill 9, because that gave them a 30 per cent increase in pay. I understand that. There is also a weird relationship between the way Bill 9 and Bill 16 are coming through this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you the reason they are coming through at the same time is to buy silence from the backbenchers by using Bill 9.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I want to tell you that in using Bill 9 as a payment for the backbenchers, the Attorney General has bought silence. The Attorney General of this province has bought silence. Where is the Attorney General? Why isn't he here to defend this bill? I will tell you that what the backbenchers should be looking at is really really happening is that Bill 9 and Bill 16 are being brought in at the same time for a good reason, and one which is working. The only thing which is stopping it is this motley crew, as referred to by the Minister of Mineral Resources. I will tell you, if you continue on in your arrogant way, the Trudeau Liberal way of bringing in omnibus bills amending 116 acts, it will not be a motley crew here for very long. It will be a majority government over there in three and one-half years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I will tell you it has happened before, because if we go back to 1934 you will remember that very thing happened when you went from 34 seats to 0 in one election . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster tries to tell me that in the 1934 election, the party which was decimated to zero wasn't the same party. I can tell you that you could trick a lot of historians and a lot of political scientists with that kind of interpretation of history. I challenge members to get out the history books and look at who was defeated in 1934 and came back, not with nine seats as this motley crew came back with, but came back with zero — no seats, not one. I will tell you that in that election our party worked hard and by 1944, the second biggest rout in political history took place when Tommy Douglas came to power. I mentioned earlier, the third biggest rout was our defeat on April 26, and the member for Kindersley will know it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — They can pound their desks, but we have admitted it. The arrogance that is shown by members on that side of the House is not acceptable to the people of Saskatchewan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member will have to stick closer to what is being debated. We are not debating who wins elections and who loses elections but, rather, we are dealing with a particular bill. I would ask the member to kindly relate his remarks to that bill.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, your comments. I think I was straying from the bill a little bit.

What I would like to say in conclusion (because I know we have a large number of other speakers who want to talk on this topic) is that what I would like to see is this government, with the mandate it has — it does have a mandate of 54 per cent of the

vote — not becoming the arrogant group which Pierre Elliott Trudeau and his crew in Ottawa have become. In closing, I would like to say that the leadership of the Minister of Mineral Resources and the Attorney General should be rejected out of hand because they are cut from the same mould. I challenge every backbencher to take a look at the press in the past two weeks, the tenor of this Assembly, the omnibus bills which are coming forward, the cancellation of highway projects where tenders had been let and where actual agreements were cancelled.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who?

MR. LINGENFELTER: — He's saying that politics were being played with the roads. Agreement were cancelled with contractors, Mr. Speaker. Agreements are proposed in Bill 16 to be cancelled. I tell you that agreements will be cancelled in the land bank and lease land and tourism if this trend, this scary trend continues of Liberal-style government in the province of Saskatchewan, led by the member for Thunder Creek and the Attorney General.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a few words that I want to address on this. There is not much here to read; there are only half a dozen words on this page. I want to repeat something which I said under Bill 9. I must say it again, and again, and again, until you people start . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . At least I have a speech. At least I don't get up and avoid answers to questions like the Minister of Finance. At least I can address myself to what's at hand. I don't avoid the issue. I think I might try sticking to the topic. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I may have been a tad off the subject, I will admit. But I want to say that the arrogance which this shows is unbelievable. I would find it unbelievable if you people had been in office for 12 years, but, heavens, you've hardly made 12 weeks and look at what you are doing. Not only is this the most outrageous bill which I think this Assembly has seen for some time . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — If you will adjourn debate we will call in the Administrator and get this thing done.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I may adjourn debate. Before I do though, I want to move an amendment and I'll move it now since we may be running out of time. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the member for Cumberland:

That this bill not be read a second time because it would authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to abrogate agreements unilaterally, and to do this on a retroactive basis; and it fails to make any provision for fair and reasonable compensation to parties to any agreements so abrogated.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few words on the amendment, and I would like, because of the Administrator arriving almost immediately, to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 12:49 p.m. the Administrator entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the following bills:

Bill No. 01 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the North Saskatchewan Bible Society, Auxiliary to the Canadian Bible Society

Bill No. 02 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Bible Society, Auxiliary to the Canadian Bible Society

Bill No. 03 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Canadian Theological College

Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Regulations Act

Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act

Bill No. 1 — An Act to establish a Mortgage Interest Reduction Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bill No. 26 — An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act

Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Senior Citizens School Tax Rebate Act

Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Renters Property Tax Rebate Act

Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Property Improvement Grant Act

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act

His Honor retired from the Chamber at 12:53 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:54 p.m.