

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Twentieth Legislature**

**Wednesday, July 14, 1982.**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.  
Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**QUESTIONS**

**Apology of the Minister of Energy and Mines**

**MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Last evening, in your absence, the House disposed of a prima facie case of privilege by accepting the unequivocal apology of the Minister of Energy. According to radio reports and newspaper reports this morning, the Minister of Energy then went outside this House, denied that he had committed a breach of privilege, and stated that he only apologized because he was forced to. My question to the Premier is: do the statements attributed to the Minister of Energy outside the House last night reflect the views of the premier and the Government of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, in response to the member's question, I cannot speak for the member but I would suspect, or I know, that the member has a statement to be made before the House. With leave, I would ask if he could make that statement.

**STATEMENT BY MEMBER**

**Apology to Mr. Speaker**

**HON. MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for leave. Mr. Speaker, my apologies that I was not here at the start of question period. I cannot hear the bell in my office.

Mr. Speaker, last evening in the corridor I made an off-the-cuff remark that was stupid, inappropriate, and inexcusable. Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no excuses for this because someone with my experience knows better. I acknowledge full responsibility for it. Mr. Speaker, I repeat the words "stupid, inappropriate, and inexcusable," and I genuinely and sincerely mean those.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere wish that you accept my apologies with my additional assurances that such will not be repeated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Thank you for your apology. I will accept your apology if the House does.

**QUESTIONS (continued)**

**Friggstad Manufacturing, Frontier, Saskatchewan.**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I am replying to a question which was asked two days ago in this House. I believe it was on Monday that the member for Shaunavon directed a question to me with respect to the closing of Friggstad Manufacturing in

Frontier, Saskatchewan, for a period of two months. I have to report today, information being accurate, that the manufacturing part of Friggstad will indeed close for a period of two months; however, the sales office and shipping personnel are being retained, and the company itself is remaining open for deliveries and sales.

The reason for the closing of the manufacturing at this point, for that period of time, Mr. Speaker, is based on lack of sales, sales being very slow at this point in time, particularly in the United States, which is the big selling arm for Friggstad. The sales in Australia are okay at this time, but they only represent 10 per cent of their sales, and the sales in Canada remain okay.

I have instructed my officials and the people at the Department of Industry and Commerce to discuss with the firm whether or not any assistance can be provided, and furthermore (this was some time ago) to explore ways of assisting smaller firms, small, local manufacturers, and, in particular, the farm implement manufacturer, with marketing studies. It is an area that the previous administration had paid little attention to.

I believe that if we are going to be successful in the manufacturing of small farm implements in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the first thing we must do is assist in locating and developing those markets, worldwide. We are going to direct our attention in that area, and, in the long run, that will prove to be very beneficial to those manufacturers, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I know that the minister is working on a conference where he will be inviting a large number of manufacturers to take a look at investing in, and building plants in Saskatchewan, and I can assure all members that this is a laudable approach. But what I'm wondering about is whether or not long-term funding arrangements are being looked at, at the present time, to deal with the many difficulties that are being faced by small manufacturers in the province of Saskatchewan. This would include Friggstad Manufacturing. Is the government looking at some type of a commitment to long-term funding which would help them through these difficult times?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the member's question, we certainly are looking at debt in general, with all of these companies in Saskatchewan. The subject company, for example, has already a debt (an outstanding loan) with Sedco. It's information that I'm not prepared to release in this House. It's confidential information to the company. Sedco has already, as a matter of fact, changed and restructured some of the financing for many companies which have had similar difficulties in the province of Saskatchewan, since I became the minister back on May 10. We've looked at many of them. Many of them have been restructured and financing has been extended. We will go to the wall to assist any manufacturing company in Saskatchewan to maintain its position, to keep its doors open and continue employing the people that it has on staff. There comes a time when the closing of some manufacturing plants becomes a necessity because otherwise losses would be incurred that those companies couldn't possibly stand.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the minister would now, at this point in time, give a commitment that the promised 9,625 per cent interest rate for small businesses will be brought in, in light of the fact that many manufacturers are facing difficult times and in light of the fact that he is now suggesting that what we need are many more manufacturers in

Saskatchewan at the present time. I'm wondering if he can give this commitment to the existing manufacturers that the type of incentive they talked about during the campaign will be delivered forthwith to protect these people against the very type of competition that he's talking about and bringing into Saskatchewan and giving priority to.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, yes, we are working on the proposal of the campaign promise that was made by our government. I think it has been mentioned in this House many times before that we have a four-year mandate. We will be implementing many of these programs which we talked about during the campaign, that being one of them. Certainly we will be living up to our commitment.

I want the hon. member to realize, Mr. Speaker, that a \$25,000 loan at 9.625 per cent is not going to save the manufacturing establishment of Friggstad. If we were to implement that program, today, it wouldn't change the position of Friggstad in Saskatchewan. As the member very well knows, the limit that we put on that amount during our campaign was \$45 million. We will deliver that promise. For example, Ipsco (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation) could use all of it if you wanted to take that as an example and say, "Well, we'll provide that amount of money." The promise was made and intended for small businesses in Saskatchewan of which there are probably 30,000, and certainly we cannot see extending the limit that we indicated at the time where it could be used up by one company in the province of Saskatchewan. We'll stick to the promise that we made and we will deliver it as soon as the proposal is put together and we have it available.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **Increases for People on Social Assistance**

**HON. MRS. SMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question from the member for Shaunavon and I wish to reply today. The member, I believe, had asked what kind of increases in money were going to those on social assistance, and also asked what I was doing about increases going to the people on social assistance.

The increase to those on social assistance, as of April 1, 1982, is approximately 12.3 per cent.

In reply to the second question, what I was going to do, I would like to state that further increases will be considered in the '83-84 budget.

I would also like to say that sometimes studying pays off. In looking at the problems of unemployment right across Canada and asking for studies from other provinces, we found that approximately two years ago the province of Newfoundland started a job creation program for those on social assistance, an employment support program only to reduce the numbers of people on social assistance, and we have asked for the information from that province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the comparison that was made (I believe it was with Newfoundland) is a very interesting one. A report done by the federal government would indicate that Saskatchewan has the lowest number of people on social assistance in the country at the present time. Newfoundland, on the other hand, has 9.6 per cent of its population on social assistance and if this the kind of approach

**July 14, 1982**

we are going to take .-.-.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The hon. member realizes that he can ask a question or a supplementary question but is not allowed to make speeches. Would the member get to the question?

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Excellent point, Mr. Speaker. The question is to the Minister of Social Services. Is it this government's intention to take the approach that the ESP (employment support program) which we have had in Saskatchewan for the past number of years (an employment support program which has worked very effectively) be cancelled, that program which has resulted in 3.6 per cent of our population on social assistance, and for the Newfoundland approach, which has meant 9.6 per cent of its population on social assistance?

**HON. MRS. SMITH:** — The intention of this government is, hopefully in particular for people who are employable and now on social assistance, to provide some kind of job-creation program, not just to keep increasing expenditures simply to keep people on social assistance, but perhaps to put the dollars into job creation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the minister that the programs which existed under the former government did a good job of keeping people at work. I ask the minister whether she is aware of a statement made in *Maclean's* July 5 edition which reads as follows:

Just take a walk through the waiting rooms and you'll get the message. (This is the regional director in Saskatoon for the provincial service department.) You'll be absolutely shocked at the young people applying for social assistance. We have become a second level of unemployment insurance.

My question to the minister is: when is she going to make some decisions on which nursing homes are going to be built (if you want to talk about some job-creating programs) and when are we going to start building nursing homes such as the one promised during the election by one Mr. Ben Boutin? I read:

Therefore, Grant Devine and myself, Ben Boutin, your PC candidate, in consultation with the Birch Hills nursing home committee, have committed ourselves to building an up to 32-bed nursing home.

This is a commitment made by the Premier and the candidate and now you're studying it. When is the decision going to be made for that job-creating program?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MRS. SMITH:** — If the member had been listening when I answered a question from the member for Regina Elphinstone with respect to nursing homes, he would have heard that there would be an announcement out on a nursing home package in mid-August. You wave a message in front of me, somebody's signing a letter, which is no different than a letter of intent out of the Shaunavon constituency signed April 21.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **Building of Birch Hills Nursing Home**

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of the statement just made by the Minister of Social Services, I would like to know about the commitment made by you and the member for Kinistino, and I read again into the record:

Therefore Grant Devine and myself, Ben Boutin, your PC candidate, in consultation with the Birch Hills nursing home committee, have committed ourselves to the building of an up to 32-bed nursing home in Birch Hills to meet the needs of the community.

Does that commitment stand today or is it under review?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, as the minister has recently said, we will be announcing our complete package of nursing homes in mid-August and you'll know at that time.

### **First Reading of Bills**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I have a question to the acting House Leader. It's a simple question having to do with the blues and the orders of the day, asking whether or not the bills which stand on the order paper under "Introduction of Bills," bills 1 to 15, are likely to be read a first time shortly. I have in mind the desirability of having the text of the bills available to the public before we adjourn, so that when we pick up in the fall we will be able to move to those bills, the public knowing what the contents of them are.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, the bills on the blues will be read at the appropriate time, when we come to that on the order paper, on the day that we so desire to do that. I can give the assurance to the Leader of the Opposition that it would be our intention that these bills on the blues would, in fact, be left for the hon. members to study over the adjournment period, between whenever it is we are going to adjourn and this fall.

### **Sharing of PCS Contract**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd like to direct a question to the chairman of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan (PCS). In view of the fact that the minister has ordered the layoffs of some 1,200 employees of PCS, and since increased sales would certainly help to alleviate these layoffs, will the minister explain why he has ordered PCS to share with the private producers a \$7 million contract which he had negotiated with the Philippines?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — I'll take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker. I haven't heard of it.

### **Government Support of Farm Organizations on Freight Rates**

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, if I may. Has the government made any plans to support the farmers and their organizations in their attempt to prevent the implementation of the Gilson report? I don't know if you've seen the article in today's *Leader-Post* where the farmers' union called a meeting including delegates from the Saskatchewan Wheat

Pool, and Manitoba R.M.s, Federated Co-operatives and beef people.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I can't speak for the Minister of Agriculture. I can say that I've been personally involved in meeting with the Sask Wheat Pool, for example, and its delegates — or three or four of them, including the president — talking about their position and the Government of Saskatchewan's position with respect to changing freight rates. Indeed, there seemed to be unanimity that we can't afford to pay any more. There's no question that there should be money put into it — no question at all.

But who should pay? The consensus was that the federal government should be paying, particularly in the light of such things as the fact that the Canadian National Railway, for example, is complaining a little bit because it has to pay tax on fuel, buying it from Saskatchewan. On the other hand, the farmer, as you know, here in Saskatchewan has to pay something like 55 cents a gallon just in tax to the federal government. So the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Government of Saskatchewan had some degree of consensus, saying it was a little bit interesting to note that the CNR, for example, which is a federal government crown corporation, was asking to have its tax removed, while at the same time was increasing the tax here. In general, that's one meeting I've been involved with, and there seemed to be a fair amount of consensus of opinion with respect to farm costs and, indeed, transportation. As for others that the minister may be involved with, I couldn't speak for him, but it was a relatively good meeting that I had with the wheat pool.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Premier missed my question with the preamble. My question is: are you making representation to Ottawa, to the Prime Minister and Pepin, on behalf of the farmers and the farm groups (and I appreciate your getting that information from the wheat pool) to prevent the implementation of the Gilson report?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — As I understand it right now, the Minister of Agriculture, the Deputy Premier, is now negotiating or visiting and talking at a conference in Halifax on agricultural issues. One of the issues obviously, because there are least four western agricultural ministers there, is the whole issue of transportation. We presume to speak for the entire agricultural community in the province of Saskatchewan, and we accept that responsibility. There are some different views within the agricultural community, but I suspect that we will be in discussion with them all trying to gather their points of view and we will be prepared to defend ours.

We haven't said that we now represent everybody and have a consensus; that would be news to me. Maybe the minister has pulled something like that together, but he certainly has been open, from my understanding and under my directions, to discussing it with as many people as he can and saying, "All right, let's make sure we represent as broad a view as possible on behalf of as many organizations as we can."

**MR. ENGEL:** — I'm having trouble getting the Premier to answer the question, Mr. Speaker. My concern is that we pressure the federal government not to implement the Gilson report. Now, I've been listening for news reports and watching the paper closely to see if something is coming out of the meeting in Halifax. The Deputy Premier is silent as far as I'm concerned. Would you contact him before the conference is over so that he will take a stance? There is a consensus in Saskatchewan that the Gilson report would be detrimental to us and it should not be implemented. Will you give us that assurance?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I can give you assurance in two respects. First, when I met with the Prime Minister, I said that the people of Saskatchewan cannot afford to pay any more for transportation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I said we found it extremely inconsistent having to pay more for fuel going into our tractors, which doesn't pay for roads or doesn't pay for anything and are just to drive on our own property, and, at the same time, being asked to pay more for transportation.

Second, I can give you assurance that the Minister of Agriculture, the Deputy Premier, to the best of my knowledge, will be meeting with the federal transport minister, Mr. Pepin, after the conference in Halifax. So, at his meeting with the federal representatives he will be taking our position, which is that the federal government should pay. He will be presenting our position very clearly and precisely on behalf of everybody in Saskatchewan early next week. While he's down East he is going to be stopping in and visiting with the federal transportation minister and laying out our views very clearly to him.

### **Employment of Graduate R.N.s**

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, the other day, in my absence, the Leader of the Opposition asked a question to the Premier regarding the employment of R.N.s in the province of Saskatchewan, of which the Premier took notice.

I believe the Leader of the Opposition's figures (I don't know where he gets them) were that there were 125 graduates and that only 25 had obtained positions in Saskatchewan. He wanted to know if there would be more funding made available to the hospitals to employ our graduates here in Saskatchewan.

In regard to your question, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, my information is as follows. In Saskatchewan this spring we have graduated the following number of nurses: from the college of nursing, University of Saskatchewan, 66, and also 18 extras who graduated from the upgrading program; from the Kelsey Institute in Saskatoon, 209; and from the Wascana Institute in Regina, 102. Disregarding that 18 would make it 377 in total, so adding on the 18 you would get 395.

I would like to inform the Leader of the Opposition — my figures are somewhat different from his, and I believe them to be accurate — that at this point in time, in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina alone, there have been 91 nurses offered positions, and that isn't taking into account all the regional and union hospitals which I am sure will be looking for people in the near future.

Adding to this, yesterday I was in the city of North Battleford and did take the time to drop into the Union Hospital in North Battleford, and I was informed by the assistant administrator that they had just hired 19 nurses in North Battleford.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — So, Mr. Speaker, I would think that certainly any infusion of money at this time to create employment for nurses in the hospitals would not anymore guarantee that that's going to take place. I think it is taking place, and I feel sure that the

R.N.s in this province will be being employed over the next period of time by the hospitals in Saskatchewan. I think the figures of approximately a third of them at this point in time augurs well for that employment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Health. I had some difficulty following his figures. I wasn't interested in the number of nurses hired, but of new nurses, of the graduating class, and my figures indicated that at this time, over this June period, the spring period as I called it, some 125 had graduated. I don't know whether his figures are for the same period or for the calendar year, and if they are for the calendar year, that obviously explains some of the difference.

I would like to ask the minister, and he may well not have the answer here, whether or not he can tell me how many nurses have graduated from the university and from Kelsey and from Wascana during the period from, let us say, April 1 to now? And, so far as his department has the information, how many of those have obtained employment in Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I would want to take notice so that I am exact on that period of time and on how many have graduated from April 1 to the present. With regard to the 91 jobs in the two cities, it is my information these are new graduates. I think, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, that in view of that they are getting employment and it will come about over the next year.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **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, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Thompson.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to get into this debate. It is a debate which is of grave concern to many of us. I am deeply disturbed by this bill, and disturbed that this legislature and its members should be asked to enact it. I am disturbed by the many aspects of this bill and I know many other people are disturbed as well.

I will not go over all of my concerns, Mr. Speaker, but let me mention a few. First, I am disturbed and upset by the approach this government has taken in this matter. We on this side of the Assembly, and I am sure many members of the general public, are prepared to consider the case the Attorney General and the government want to make to justify changing some of the appointments to the boards and commissions. Of course, there are established procedures already in place which the Attorney General could follow in order to make these changes. He is a lawyer and he knows that much better than I.

All appointments are made under legislation, and in each case that legislation provides



mechanisms for terminating members of boards and commissions. In some cases, a minister can make the changes; in some cases, cabinet can make those changes; in some cases, changes must be referred to this legislature. There are good reasons, in any case, why the changes must be handled in a manner established by this legislature. Generally, where changes require cabinet or legislative approval, the purpose is not first and foremost to protect individuals from unfair dismissal, it is rather to protect the public. It protects the public by ensuring that members of such boards can exercise their responsibilities free from day-to-day and hour-by-hour direction from cabinet ministers and civil servants. It is a protection against cabinet members and civil servants becoming dictators, telling everyone what to do and how to do it. If a cabinet member is dissatisfied with a person in one of these positions, he or she must follow that established process. This, in turn, protects the public by protecting the right to know. With a majority of the size of this government (and let's face it, it has a very large majority), that is the only real protection the public has. The right to know what is being done puts some pressure, at least, on the government to explain why it is doing so. In a democracy, the pressure to give reasons for what is being done provides some protection against a government such as this one from becoming a virtual dictatorship. This concern is made more compelling, I think, given the record of this government to date. I doubt if this legislature has ever seen a more arrogant government, made mad with the power, and determined to steam-roll over anyone who gets in its way. We see that in the way it deals with the civil servants. We see that in the way it is playing fast and loose with the promises and commitments it has made. We see that in this legislature. I think yesterday was a very good example of that.

Now we see that in Bill 16. What could be a better illustration of that arrogance? Here we have an omnibus bill attempting to affect some 116 acts of this legislature. Some of you will recall when the federal Liberal government in Ottawa attempted to shove its omnibus energy bill through parliament a few months ago. The Conservative opposition in Ottawa demanded that that bill be withdrawn, and rightly so. They said it was a flagrant and arrogant affront to parliament and the public. They were right. The public demanded that that bill be withdrawn. Even that arrogant Liberal government in Ottawa withdrew its bill and broke it down into separate parts. I thought we would never see another government in Canada as arrogant as the Trudeau government. But the members opposite have proven me wrong. The Devine-Lane-Thatcher government needed only two and one-half months to prove that it could be even more arrogant. This government doesn't care. It believes its huge majority justifies any of its actions. This legislature can be disregarded, in its opinion, and so can the public. These are the makings of a dictatorship, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, my first worry is that this bill is a flagrant denial of democratic principles and this is unacceptable. The members opposite know that. Many of them, I am sure, would be willing to quite openly agree to that. If they agree, they should be doing something about it.

My second worry, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe this bill raises some serious questions about individual rights. One of the basic principles our society adheres to is the belief that the rights of individuals should be respected. Among other things, that means that people should not be treated arbitrarily by government. Acts of government are supposed to follow certain steps and processes in order to be sure that people get a fair hearing and that what is done is done with cause and according to principles of justice. This bill, Mr. Speaker, raises some grave questions in this regard. It attempts to give governments the authority to dismiss people from appointments with the single stroke of the pen. Their rights as individuals are set aside by this bill.

**July 14, 1982**

I think, Mr. Speaker, one can draw a very close parallel between the present government and some of the governments we have seen in the past in this province. An article in the *Leader-Post* of November 8, 1929, gives a very good example of what a Conservative government is like, what they have been like, and the parallel we can draw between that and the present government that sits in this House. Just to quote here, it says:

Plain hypocrisy — from all parts of the province come the reports of dismissal of civil servants and the appointments to the vacancies of those who have been Conservative workers or supporters.

Mr. Speaker, that was 1929. You would almost think that that would be an article that would appear in the *Leader-Post* of 1982. Mr. Speaker, some of the members are a littler concerned about whether this was a paid article in the newspaper or not. Well, I can inform them that it was an article by a news reporter similar to those done today.

Another article in there says:

For several years, and particularly before the election of June 6, charges were made by the Conservatives, Independents and Progressives that numerous members of the Saskatchewan civil service were wrongly engaging in politics. It was stated that the service was a partisan service and in the public interest it was necessary that this state of affairs should be corrected.

And we see much of that happening today. We see a government which during the election said that it didn't matter what party the civil servant belonged to as long as he did his job. They would not want civil servants to be partisan. And yet, in 1929 the Conservative government removed people because they weren't partisan. In 1982, we see much of the same happening. This government of today, another Conservative government, is removing people from the civil service, or from boards and commissions, simply because it feels that they are partisan.

Another interesting little article here says:

The people do not have to look far for the facts. Without an investigation of any kind, without putting into force the principles of any partisan civil service, the government is firing government employees right and left.

Again, that is something similar to what is happening today. Mr. Speaker, in this province and in this country, we pride ourselves on our respect for the rights of individuals. Why the government should want to make a break with that tradition I really don't know. Why the Attorney General would want to lead the onslaught puzzles me even more. After all, he is supposed to have taken on the awesome responsibility of protecting people from injustice, and that is what his position is all about.

We can go back to 1929. Just about a week later, Mr. Speaker, we have a little article in there that says:

The ordinary political party attempts to find jobs for its friends, and while there may be much talk of appointments being made on merit, it is usually found that

men of the necessary merit can be found among the supporters of the party in power.

Mr. Speaker, the members are saying that what they are trying to do with this act is remove some political people, some political appointments. We have not totally disagreed with that. True, in some areas there are political appointments, but there are methods of dealing with them. The government has only to indicate in which areas it feels those appointments are, and it can use this legislature as a means of getting rid of the people it thinks are political appointments. But to bring in a bill that is virtually going to unilaterally remove all the appointments to boards and commissions, Mr. Speaker, I think is a very flagrant attempt on the part of this government — an attempt that will reveal to the public that its main concern is not the benefit of the people but to do what was done back in 1929 by a Conservative government — to put in its own political appointments.

Mr. Speaker, another nice little article here says that ministers and heads of departments are unable to tell dismissed members of the civil service why they have been dismissed, without going outside and finding out from Conservative committees that such and such a man has been marked for dismissal on political grounds and because someone else was pushing for that position.

Mr. Speaker, we see much of that happening today. We see ministers dismissing members on different committees and boards without giving them any indication of why they are being dismissed. It says here:

Hypocrisy is one of the greatest sins and it is having full play today in the Saskatchewan cabinet and back through the ranks of legislative supporters of that government.

Mr. Speaker, when one reads some of the articles from 1929, he would definitely think that he could be reading an article in today's *Leader-Post*.

Mr. Speaker, my third worry about this bill is that this bill will basically and drastically alter the way in which certain members of boards and commissions function. Let me explain. Not all boards and commissions simply implement government policy and administer activities of government. Some (not all, but some) are established to make judgments and decisions on claims or grievances that a person may have. Others are established to make decisions on matters that are deliberately separated from government. Examples of these kinds of boards are: the workers' compensation board, the labor relations board, the agricultural implements board, the boards of governors of universities, and the like, Mr. Speaker.

These appointments are deliberately set for a specific term so that, once appointed, the members can make decisions free of any danger of immediate reprisal from government. Such reprisals are not outside the realm of possibility. After all, many of the boards must make tough and difficult judgments and these judgments can often involve the government or the interest of government members. A decision that goes against the government or the interests of one of its members will naturally anger the government and that, in turn, will often inspire the government to want to do something. It's not that these are decisions about policy; these are judgments about conflicting claims which the legislature has determined should be resolved without pressure or influence from the government. The only way that can be done is to appoint such people for fixed terms and to protect them from arbitrary dismissal during that term.

That is why many of the acts that will be affected by Bill 16 are worded as they are. They provide for fixed terms so that the members of those boards and commissions do not need to deal with each particular case under the possible threat of dismissal if the decision is unacceptable to the government. This bill changes all that. It means that all members of the boards and commissions who are on fixed terms must now worry. If they make decisions the government doesn't like, they may be fired — not because of their politics, not because of the policies they support, but because the government doesn't like a specific decision which they are supposed to be making outside of any government pressure or influence.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what will that do to the decision-making process? I think the answer is clear. It must influence the nature of that decision. Mr. Speaker, this bill must and will thwart the original intent of many acts of this legislature. That intent was to separate decision from immediate government pressure by protecting members of many boards and commissions from possible dismissal at the whim of ministers and cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined three basic concerns. I am concerned that this bill will run counter to the basic principles of democracy. I am concerned that it will infringe the individual rights of members of many boards and commissions. And I am concerned that it creates the real likelihood that the objectivity of board members will be on their minds, and that where the original acts tried to protect against this very possibility, this bill needs to be looked at very carefully in order to protect the rights of people of Saskatchewan.

I think it needs to be looked at, not only to keep board members on there who are dedicated, members who are working for the public and who have made a commitment on many of the boards, not only to please government, but mainly to please the public and to do what the public would want them to be doing. Those, Mr. Speaker, are members who have a concern about Saskatchewan as a whole, and not about a political party or a government in power.

I was just looking at a little article here, back in '29 again, Mr. Speaker, and I think the articles in many of those papers reflect quite closely on what is happening today. It says here:

In looking around in its efforts to reform the civil service, the co-operative government lets its eyes fall on the doorman of the parliament building now he is gone and another is in his place, a support of the government, we presume.

I look back at that article and I think back to some of the people who were in this legislature as janitors or whatever their capacity may have been. Six months ago, three months ago or two and a half months ago, when we left this legislature, I used to see some different faces walking through the hallways, and not faces that I recognized as political affiliates of the New Democrats; to me they were nothing more than employees of the Legislative Assembly, working within the legislature, and it appears that somehow this new government thought that many of these people must have been New Democratic individuals who were somehow going to create some problems for them in this legislature, because I don't see many of those people there now. That reflects much on the article of 1929, where a doorman who didn't appear to be the type of individual that the government (the Conservative government of the day then) thought it wanted,

or who didn't have a membership card, was removed and replaced with another individual. That, Mr. Speaker, is something, I think, the people of this province will not accept.

They will not accept it because many of the people of Saskatchewan are above playing politics. They are above those kinds of actions, and I think they will deter this government taking action against people simply on political grounds.

There is a nice one here on the case of Dr. Amos, and I quote:

A statement issued this week by Dr. Amos, late chairman of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board, has been read, no doubt, with interest. Dr. Amos, a gentleman of excellent reputation in the community, was dismissed from his post by the present government. He leaves the position with the respect of all, and with the reflection of dismissal falling on those who did the dismissing, rather than on the late occupant of the office.

It can be said that the late chairman of the liquor board was a public official of the highest type, of sterling integrity, capable and active and conscientious in the carrying out of his duties.

Why was he dismissed? This is a question for the people of the province. The reasons given by the government were that the liquor board was being reorganized. This reorganization does not yet appear to have been made. The public will take note of whether the proposal, or the proposed reorganization, consists merely of the dismissal of the chairman of the board who was appointed by the late government, and the appointment of a successor from the ranks of the Conservative Party. If a well-trying worker in the Conservative Party is given the chairmanship, the public will know that the change was made purely for political reasons, and in conformity with the co-operative government's plans for reforming the civil service.

Mr. Speaker, again we have an article that reflects very much on what is happening in this province today, and what this government is attempting to do. And it would indicate that what they are doing today is no different from what they did in 1929. And, Mr. Speaker, one can only wonder if we are in for the same fate as the people after that government was elected in 1929.

Mr. Speaker, some members find it a little amusing that we refer to 1929. To be honest, Mr. Speaker, I found it rather interesting to go back to 1929 and see what did happen then. As one member has mentioned, maybe we should go back to 1800. Well, I don't remember the 1800s, but I'll tell you I do remember some of the years after 1929, and what we see happening here today is a good reflection of what happened in 1929. I think that we can't allow a similar fate for this province, and I don't think the people will accept it. I think this government is mistaken if it thinks that, because it has a large majority, somehow the public is going to accept many of its actions. I think that what it should do is consider what it is doing carefully, and it will really realize that some of its actions will not be tolerated by the public. It is going to be criticized for it. It will realize that some of the dismissals it made will not be a benefit to the different boards and commissions out there, because it has dismissed people — people that I know on different boards — who were dedicated to the board that they were serving on.

On many of these boards there were members of the Conservative Party, members of

the Liberal Party, and members of the New Democratic Party. There was a mixture of members on many of those boards and they all worked to serve one purpose; to make sure that they acted carefully and honestly and in the best interests of the public of Saskatchewan when they sat on those boards. And I did not see the former government of this province taking action to remove every Conservative or every Liberal from those boards.

**AN. HON. MEMBER:** — It was pretty difficult to find them when they weren't there.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — And one of the members says it didn't happen because they were difficult to find, that Conservative members weren't on the boards. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if we went down the list in the book of boards and commissions, and the members who were on them, I think we would find in many cases that on some boards you would probably find more Liberals and Conservatives than New Democrats. And it was important that there was that kind of mix in there, because it made those boards function a lot better. As I said before, if this government feels that there are some political appointments on some of the boards, then what it should be doing is indicating to this legislature that this board member or that board members is very political and that it wants that member removed. I think it would find that this opposition would accept that type of approach. But that is not what we are seeing Mr. Speaker. What we are seeing is an attempt to make a unilateral decision on every board and commission, and to remove every member and appoint people it feels are going to be dedicated to its party. That, I think, Mr. Speaker, is wrong.

This bill needs to be thought out very carefully. It needs some sober reflection so that all of its implications can be considered by the members of this Assembly, by professionals, and by the public. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment that was introduced. Let's not make a hasty decision. This is a very important matter that we are dealing with. It is an important matter of principle, and I think they should ask themselves, "Do we want to move ahead and, as a government with a large majority, get this bill through regardless of what the public thinks?" .-. (inaudible interjection) .-. Some of the opposition members to my left, Mr. Speaker, are saying that they are prepared to sit here all summer, but they are going to get this bill through. And they are asking if we are prepared to sit here all summer? Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the very arrogance that I was talking about earlier exists. They have the power. They are arrogant enough to say that it doesn't matter what the public thinks, or what the opposition thinks, but they are going to go ahead with this bill and they are going to give themselves the power to remove every member on every board and every commission in this province. That is what the government of the day is saying, Mr. Speaker. And I find that very interesting.

I can only say to the members, Mr. Speaker, that they should be supporting this six-month delay on this bill. Then, after giving it careful review, and after hearing from the people who are interested and concerned about it, the members can decide whether they wish to proceed with it.

I think that is a reasonable amendment, Mr. Speaker, and because I think it is a reasonable amendment, I know that all the hon. members in this House will see the merits of supporting this amendment.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the amendment and, as you will know, the amendment is for a six-month hoist, that is, that the bill be not now read a second time, but it be read six months hence. A six-month hoist is something used

when the mover of that particular motion believes that proceeding with the bill at the particular time in which it is sought to be proceeded with would be unwise.

I find myself in that position, feeling that this bill is unwise and ought not to be proceeded with. I believe the bill needs to be reviewed in some detail by the government so it might indicate to us what particular boards and commissions it feels should be subject to this particular bill, and what particular boards and commissions it feels should not be subject to this bill.

It has, as of now, introduced a piece of legislation which applies to all boards and commissions with the exception of a very small group. It appears to exclude the Clerk of the Assembly, the auditor, the ombudsman, very possibly members of the local government board, very possibly the members of one or two other boards. There are a number of other boards which I am going to ask the government to consider very carefully as to whether they should be subject to the particular and all-embracing powers set out in Bill No. 16.

There appears to be a belief on the part of some hon. members that the bill is needed in order to deal with, let us say, membership of the boards of crown corporations. That is simply not the case. If members believe that, for example, the membership of the board of .-..

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I found myself replying to some of the comments which were being made when the hon. member for Pelly was making his remarks. The particular thrust of my remarks is that the government should review the list of boards and commissions which would be affected by this bill, or could be affected by this bill, and in order to provide it with the time to do this, we think that the bill ought not now to be proceeded with.

If I may give some examples, and I would pick, let us say, a list I have before me commencing with the letter C. By my reading of the bill it would affect the legislation covering the cancer foundation; would not affect legislation covering the Carlton Trail Community College Board because that can now be dealt with; would not affect Consumers Oil Ltd. or the co-operative guarantee board, each of which, by my reading, can be dealt with by the government without Bill 16; would affect the co-operative securities board where the members have some sort of a statutory term. I have not had a chance fully to check the legislation, but perhaps it would affect the two government appointments to the council of the College of Dental Surgeons of Saskatchewan; would not affect the Coteau Range Community College Board appointments; would not affect the crimes compensation board appointments; would not affect the crown investments corporation appointments or the Cumberland Community College or the Cypress Hills Community College.

That, as a sample of the boards commencing with the letter C, will indicate that there is really only a small number of boards for which this particular legislation may be needed and, accordingly, it is likely that the particular acts could be identified in Bill 16 without any difficulty if the government would indicate which boards it has in mind.

Let me just take a couple of those to see whether or not it is right and fitting that the government have the power to change the boards, and of this group I indicated that the cancer foundation was one. The members of the cancer foundation (and I believe I have an up-to-date list) include Mr. Elmer Schwartz of Saskatoon, who is the chairman and who can be changed under the current legislation because he is an appointment at pleasure, Dr. Dick Baltzan and Dr. Jim Blackburn. I doubt whether the government opposite would have serious objection .-.-. (inaudible interjection) .-.-. There is Mrs. Florence Clarke; she is, I believe, the wife of the United Church clergyman at Meadow Lake, and Mrs. Sandra Fowler, who is not known to me. Dr. Peter Glynn, who I believe is an employee .-.-. (inaudible interjection) .-.-. I am corrected with respect to Mrs. Florence Clarke, but I confess I do not know all of these people. Dr. Peter Glynn, who I believe is an employee of the department and if the department wishes to get his resignation I'm sure it needs only ask for it. Mr. George McCallum, who I do know and who is the Saskatchewan manager, I believe for James Richardson & Sons, and I do not believe is a New Democrat; Miss Kay Coates and Mrs. Dianne Iverson, and Dr. R. G. Murray, whom I know to be the Dean of Medicine at Saskatoon. That is a board that the government seeks to be able to change. For a goodly number of them, they will be able to make changes very soon, in any case, because the appointments expire within the year.

I think what we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not this type of board should be regarded as a political board, whether the appointees to it should be regarded as, in a sense, agents of the government. We have three or four types of boards, and I would like the government, during the six-month term which we are suggesting, to consider the classification of the boards as such. Some of them are clear instruments of government policy. The crown investment corporation is perhaps an outstanding example of that, and the government of the day should be able to change that forthwith. Certainly no one would quarrel with boards in that category, or that classification, being subject to change by the government of the day.

I think if the government will examine the lists (and I have gone over what I think to be a fairly comprehensive list), it would find (and if it would use the period we are suggesting) that there are some other classes of boards, where, at least in our judgment, it is inappropriate to think of them as boards where the appointees are agents of the government. And those I would call the arm's length boards. There is a further category of quasi-judicial boards where rights of citizens are being dealt with. And I have touched upon that in my earlier remarks, so simply wish to identify that category. I talked about the local government board and, as I recall, perhaps the workers' compensation board, and an analysis of those acts may not support all of the statements which are made concerning them.

The point I wish now to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the cancer foundation is, in my judgment, one of those boards which ought not to be regarded as changeable by a new government when it comes to power, without coming to the legislature. Clearly, if it is strapped, it can come to the legislature, because we ought to be striving to see that the board of the cancer foundation is not thought of as an agent of the government, but as an autonomous board. Indeed, that was the purpose of establishing the cancer foundation, to take the old cancer commission and integrate it with some other people, particularly representatives of the Canadian Cancer Society, to make a broader cancer foundation. The idea was to create a body which was not an agent of the government in a direct sense, even though all of the people are nominated by the government, but was an independent body. You cannot start out to create an independent body which is at arm's length from the government, and then bring in a piece of legislation that says,



"but when the government changes all the members can be swept aside," particularly when it is clear that the members have been selected not to represent the political view of the government in power but to represent the Canadian Cancer Society, and the University of Saskatchewan College of Medicine, and the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan, and the Department of Health. It is a group which does not correspond to a body selected for its political complexion.

I think it is important in our society that we have some bodies like that. We don't have an easy way of creating bodies like that. About all we have found are ways in which we appoint all these people, by order in council, but by tradition we adopt a method of appointment which makes these people virtual nominees of other organizations. In that way, we create an arm's length organization; that's what we were trying to do with the cancer foundation. That is what will be undermined by Bill 16. That's why I'm asking the government to take additional time and give it additional study to see whether that category of board ought not to be excluded from the operation of Bill 16, assuming it wishes to proceed with Bill 16.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Meaning there were some political appointments.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Some members are suggesting that for me to make a statement such as I have just made is to admit that with respect to some boards and commissions there were political appointments. To that my answer is I freely admit that. I freely admit that the members of the crown investments crown corporation were selected because they were New Democrats. I freely admit that we weren't going to put many (and I don't mean this in any derogatory way) Dr. R.B. Baltzans on the board of the crown investments corporation. It was meant to be an agent of government policy in a direct sense. Not so the Saskatchewan Cancer Foundation, which was meant to carry on a function at arm's length from government. The government of the day, whatever it is, will have an interest in the success of the cancer foundation. But it is highly unlikely that there will be issues arising in the Canadian Cancer Foundation or the Saskatchewan Cancer Foundation where the issues will be decided on the basis of party loyalty or of party position.

Those arguments go for a good number of organizations. I have before me the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan. While its history is slightly different from that of the Canadian Cancer Foundation, there has been a real effort on the part of successive governments to have the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan be a board which was not an instrument of government policy, in the sense that all of the appointees should reflect the view of the government of the day. Many, many issues with respect to alcoholism do not divide people on the basis of party loyalty. It was felt by the previous government (and I earnestly suggest it will be felt by the government opposite when it gives this matter a little more time) that with respect to the alcoholism commission, it was unwise to politicize that board and unwise to suggest that you are going to pass legislation permitting the dismissal of all of the members of the board of the alcoholism commission.

I look at these, and I see this is a list which is somewhat out of date, but the complexion of the people has not significantly changed. The chairman, who is changeable at pleasure, is a Dr. Saul Cohen, who is an outstanding medical practitioner in Regina. I doubt whether he is a supporter of our party. I have never asked and it would be irrelevant. He is dedicated to grappling with the problems of alcoholism and has an outstanding career in that field. I look at Mr. Allan Mitchell and Mr. Robert Stewart and, frankly, I note that they are at-pleasure appointments. Accordingly, they are probably

employees of the Government of Saskatchewan, and I don't know what role they play. There is a Dr. W.E. Code. There is a John Ursan who had an association with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and I suspect he is on the board on that account. There is Rev. Ross McMurty from Weyburn, who may well be a supporter of our party. That I am not sure of. There is a Sister Bernarda Gallinger of Humboldt. I do not know the Sister's politics. I suspect nobody has ever asked because that is not the purpose. There are a number of others — a James Boschman of Langham, and he may well be a supporter of our party. There are a number of other people.

My point is that, so far as I am aware, none of these people was selected primarily, or even secondarily, because of his political complexion and political leanings, and the whole purpose was to see if we could get an alcoholism commission which was at arm's length from the government and which was able to operate in the very difficult field of alcoholism with groups as diverse as the medical profession, Alcoholics Anonymous and the native alcohol council, many of which have different approaches to the problems of alcohol. It was the view of the previous government that the best progress could be made if we attempted to have people chosen purely for their knowledge of, expertise in and interest in this field. I regret that Bill 16 will, if it is not studied and revised by the government, have the effect of politicizing this board. You cannot announce that all the people on a board should be changed if the government changes without, at the same time, politicizing that board.

I pick up another class of board. Here is the co-op securities board. It's a small board and, I believe, they are virtually all nominees, in effect, of Credit Union Central or other central co-operative organizations. This is, in effect, a securities commission with respect to co-operative securities. A look at The Securities Act of Saskatchewan will indicate that securities issued by co-operatives are not covered by The Securities Act. But it is, of course, useful that co-op securities be vetted so that people who buy them will have some assurance that there is some merit and that they are not defective.

I ask the government to take some time to look at this piece of legislation and ask itself whether it needs to amend that act by Bill 16. Is it necessary to say that the co-op securities board must change, that Mr. Leslie R. Tendler or Mr. Eric Rasmussen or Allan Mulholland or David Calibaba or Ron Kasha must be changed because the government has changed? These are de facto nominees of central co-operative organizations and I think that if the government takes time to look at this it will reach the conclusion that that board does not need to change, nor is it wise to suggest that a securities commission of this kind, operated by the co-operative movement, ought to change simply because there's a change of government. It may well be that they will not change, but there is no point in legislating a power to change if you are not going to change.

I think that a simple review of the legislation would indicate that very many of the acts which will be affected by Bill 16 could be excluded without, in any way, impairing or impeding the objectives which the government of the day apparently seeks to achieve by Bill 16. I am at a loss to know what these objectives are, because no one has stood in his place and indicated what they are. But it is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that if the government opposite would, in fact, take a bit of time to go over the hundred or so acts (and get some staff to do that), it would find that the vast majority of acts do not need to be changed and, accordingly, could be excluded from the ambit of Bill 16 without, in any way, impairing the objectives which it seeks to achieve.

The next board that I want to call to the attention of the government and ask it, particularly, to look at during this six-month period which I am recommending, is the dental technician review board. Here is a board under The Dental Care Act of 1974. It has a Dr. Doug Phillips as its chairman. He can be replaced at pleasure. It has a Dr. Janzen, a Dr. Riekman, a Dr. Hartsfield, a Dr. Henderson and a Dianne Moore. I very much suspect that these are de facto appointees of the college of dental surgeons. I very much suspect that it is they who have put these names forward, and that there is no call for saying to them that their appointments can be struck down, simply because there has been a change of government.

I have said this before but I will say it again: this is not the first change of government in Saskatchewan. Changes were navigated in 1971 and 1964, without the necessity of legislation of this kind, after a long period of a CCF government and after a relatively long period of a Liberal government. It was found not at all necessary, for example, to change The Dental Care Act and to change the dental technical review board. I think that if the government of the day takes some time, during the period that we are suggesting in this amendment, it will find that this act, too, could be excluded from the ambit of Bill 16, making it that much more palatable. For reasons that I have stated at other times, I do not think this sort of bill, the format of it, is in any sense appropriate. But I am not now dealing with that. They wish to have an omnibus bill, changing a large number of acts in The Interpretation Act, but I think they would find that they simply do not need to apply it to an impressive number of acts if they would look and I think that is what they haven't done.

I call to their attention the education relations board. I wonder whether the government of the day feels it is necessary to change the educational relations board. I note that these people have four-year appointments, as it appears, up until 1985.

As I look at it, it looks very much like there are two de facto nominees of the school trustees' association, a Mr. D.J. Phillips of Yorkton and, I think, David Kydd of Wolseley. I'm not sure of that. I note two others who appear to be de facto nominees of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. Again, I may be confused. They are Karen Rongve, and I suspect that's an STF name, and a person by the name of Goodfellow from Neilburg. It may be that I have two of the names transposed. I recognize Phillips as a trustee and Rongve as a teacher, and I believe the other two are in effect also teachers and trustees. I note the chairman, and I wonder whether anyone will suggest that the chairman is a strong supporter of the New Democratic Party. He is a lawyer from Regina and his name is R.L. Barclay. I suspect that he will be known to some members not to be a supporter of our party.

I think that on reflection they will find that this does not need to be changed. There is a relatively delicate situation that has been dealt with under the educational relations board, and this deals with tenure of teachers and matters of that nature, wherein an effort was made to see whether one could find a forum whereby teachers, particularly of those who have some experience and where tenure issues are controversial — to put it at its lowest. And we, the previous government, sought a board and sought a chairman who would be able to bring a balance to that, and we arrived at a chairman who I think has done a good job, and who, I think every fair person will acknowledge, was not appointed because of his adherence to the New Democratic Party. And I don't see any reason for changing that.

We have something that is working. We shouldn't, I think, decide, by passing Bill 16,

that all of those appointments are subject to review and termination. We've got something that has effectively dealt with a delicate problem in the administration of schools. And I think, on a little reflection, that the Minister of Education will reach the conclusion that it is unwise to change that situation. He may well say, "Well, pass the act and give me the powers and I will never use the powers." That is a relatively bad way to approach the legislation of problems which are sometimes (not always) easily dealt with.

My submission is, Mr. Speaker, that when members opposite review it they will find that this is a board which could be excluded from the ambit of Bill 16, and probably should be excluded from the ambit of Bill 16, because we have something that works and it took (if he would check the history) a little bit of work to get a board that did work — a little bit of skill. And I digress for a moment, but of the thorny problem of school administration, high on the list are issues of merit rating and teacher tenure. When you have something that deals relatively successfully with that problem, I would suggest that you ought not to upset that unless there is a good reason for doing so.

I move on now and suggest another board which I asked the government to look at to see whether or not it wants to change it. This deals with hospital standards. I don't know all of the people on this board. There is a Brecker from Humboldt .-. (inaudible interjection) .-. I am told by some that if the name is Brecker from Humboldt he is unlikely to be a supporter of our party. I don't know that. I doubt whether we can make those broad statements.

It's a three-man board. This is another difficult area in the field of health administration, and some from rural Saskatchewan will be able to remember some disputes as to whether a doctor could have hospital privileges, disputes which have wracked some particular communities, and I remember one up at, I believe it was Spalding, not too many years ago, where there were hot disputes in the community. We have a board; it is working; it is headed by a chairman, a Mr. R. Harold McClelland. That's retired Judge McClelland, formerly of the district court, who is known as a person who can deal with many of these situations with very considerable skill and delicacy. He was the person, in fact, who headed the Kamsack inquiry, a man of patience, a man of great experience, and a man of human sympathy, if I may put it this way, in being able to put people at their ease and allow these explosive issues to be defused.

I am suggesting to the government that they take a bit of time and look at this, and see whether or not that board should be changed. It may well be that my facts are out of date, and maybe he is no longer chairman, but I believe he is. He certainly was until very recently, and if not, he will have been replaced by someone who is carrying on the same work.

There's no particular call for having persons of a particular political stripe on a board like that. The issues which arise — and there was another one down around Wolseley or a town, I believe, in the constituency of Indian Head-Wolseley, two or three years ago, as I recall it — are difficult, and when we have some organization which works, some body which works, I suggest that it's unwise to amend The Hospital Standards Act and place, in effect, a new termination date on the various appointees to that board. I mention other types of boards. We have a municipal employees' superannuation commission. These are, once again, appointed, so far as I can see, by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but, once again, these are, in effect, nominees of the urban municipalities association, school trustees' association, the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), the rural municipal secretary-

treasurers' association, the Association of School Business Officials of Saskatchewan and the association of rural telephone companies.

These people select members on this board to operate the employees' superannuation commission. I have not studied the act carefully. It may be that Bill 16 will not, in effect, amend this act. My superficial look appears to indicate that it will. It's not always easy to ascertain the full effect of such a broad amendment as is proposed by Bill 16 without some detailed study of legislation.

I look at this list, and I see some people who are not likely to be thought to be adherents of our party. I see Owen Mann of Saskatoon, and I doubt whether Owen Mann is a member of the New Democratic Party; I have not found his name on the list. There are a good number of other people who I recognize because they are prominent citizens of Saskatchewan, and I also recognize them as supporters of other political parties. That's hardly surprising. They were appointed by SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities' Association) and SARM and school trustees, and the people they will select will, I suspect, sometimes turn out to be New Democrats and sometimes Conservatives and sometimes Liberals, because they are not looking for a party label.

And I'm asking the government today to look at this piece of legislation and ask itself whether it is necessary to amend that by Bill 16.

Now I turn to another piece of legislation, and this may well be the reason for it. If this is the reason for Bill 16, I wish some member of the government would tell me. I look at the public service commission, and the appointees to the public service commission, all of whom have some security of tenure, all but the chairman. The chairman is changeable at pleasure by the government, and if Mr. David Bock is not satisfactory to the government opposite I am sure they will change him, and they are at perfect liberty so to do.

Another member is Shirley L. Strutt and she is an employee (I was going to say an employee of the government, but I guess that's not strictly accurate) of the legislature, because I think the same person works with the legislative counsel.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The hon. member is speaking to the amendment, and in speaking to the amendment, which is the six-months hoist, as you have identified, I don't see the relationship between what you are doing and the actual amendment. You are reading to me a list of the names of all of the boards that you happen to have at your disposal, and I don't find that it is pertinent to the question.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling, but may I put it this way? The issue is whether or not this bill should be now read or read six months hence. The issue, as I would see it, therefore, is why we think the government ought not to proceed with the bill now. The argument I am trying to put is that the bill will have an effect on a large number of acts, an effect which, in my humble submission, has not been considered by the government opposite. I am trying to point out the agencies which are going to be affected and the people who are going to be affected by the legislation. I am trying to make the point that in many cases the changing of these acts by Bill 16, and the potential (at least) dismissal of these people, ought to be reconsidered by the government, and my submission considered by the government, since I see no evidence that it has been considered once. That is the reason we are arguing for a delay in the legislation.

**July 14, 1982**

Because of your ruling, I will refrain from dealing with individual members of the boards. But I would respectfully suggest that I ought to be permitted at least to deal with the legislation which is to be amended by Bill 16, and to query, and query as best I can, the wisdom of the government's amending this legislation and to request the government to reconsider the amendments of these particular acts which it has, in effect, put before us.

Once again, I will not, because of what Mr. Speaker has said, deal with the membership of the public service commission, save to ask the government opposite whether or not they wish to change those people and whether they feel that is wise since it will undoubtedly politicize the public service commission. Once again, members opposite, I invite you to look at what happened in '64 and what happened in '71: the members of the public service commission which had been appointed by the previous government (which preceded the new government in '64 and the new government in '71) were left there to deal with issues which might arise because of the change of government. Again, without naming names, I would think that the existing members of the public service commission could be relied upon to discharge their statutory responsibilities in a scrupulous way.

I remind hon. members that it is important that we attempt to keep the classified public service one step away from the political process. As for the order in council public service, we're all familiar with those arguments, but the classified public service is another thing, and the public service commission is the guardian of that particular tradition. It is a guardian which has performed through at least two other changes of government that I am familiar with, and I suspect through others, although I don't know how it was established prior to 1944.

I will give some other examples of acts which I believe the government has not fully considered when it decided to amend them by Bill 16. One of those is the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League, the act concerned being The Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act. There has never been a particular approach here to political appointees on this board, and to suggest that all of these appointments should be set aside, or be subject to being set aside, simply because there is a change of government, is to politicize the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League in a way that has not been done before, and which is not at all necessary.

The Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League is a great tradition of Saskatchewan history, coming, as it did, really out of the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan. And it has always operated without being directly affected by party politics. My respectful submission to the government opposite is that it ought to continue so to operate, and that the basic statute that is The Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act ought not to be amended by Bill 16. The government ought to take some time — the six months that I am suggesting — to look at that and make up its mind as to whether that act and that organization of great tradition in this province ought to be changed significantly by Bill 16, which I suspect was not meant to affect the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League in any way.

There are a number of other organizations which I would like to comment on, and ask the government whether or not it believes that these acts ought to be changed. Certainly a case can be made for a small list of them, and I put one forward now which one might well wish to debate. I mention the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance

Commission, which is certainly an instrument of government policy. Accordingly, it is one the members of which, one would think, ought to be changed by the new government of the day. I suspect the ones who were appointed by the previous government might well resign, if asked to do so. But on the other hand, the membership for that particular commission was the subject of some delicate negotiations which have produced a working commission.

I will invite hon. members to look at the complexion of the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission to see the careful balance that is on there, and ask whether or not that balance ought to be disturbed. Certainly, in due course, there will be many new appointments to be made by the government of the day. As I recall, in 1971, we did not find it necessary to disturb the even flow of that commission because it was doing a good job in an area which was somewhat stressful, because there was (and I suspect still is) some modal degree of tension between the medical profession and the government of the day, whatever it is, because of the fact that there are issues surrounding compensation, which do arise, to be dealt with by the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission.

I now touch upon two other areas — one other area with two branches, the workers' compensation board. I have not had an opportunity analyze fully the law on this. It may be that my views on this will be colored by further analysis. The workers' compensation board is a quasi-judicial board. Security of tenure is provided to the chairman. If Bill 16 affects that security of tenure, then it ought not to affect that security of tenure. If it does, then the Minister of Labor and other members opposite should move to see that this is not disturbed.

The reasons for that are clear. I would ask hon. members opposite to consider, during the period which I am suggesting you take, the issues involved here. I will state them quickly. An injured workman who believes he has a claim against his employer is prohibited from taking that claim to court. His claim has been taken away from him. That, of course, has been done many, many years ago. In place of that, he has been given a claim against the workers' compensation board. The board has been given elaborate trappings of independence from the government of the day so that it will not be subject to the day-to-day direction of the minister. And that is right, because it is dealing with the very valuable claims, perhaps the future livelihood for many, many years, of an injured workman.

If, on analysis, the effect of Bill 16 is to change The Workers' Compensation Act, and place the position of the chairman in jeopardy, then that ought not to be. And I ask hon. members opposite to look at that, and look at it with care, because it is a matter which is exercising the mind of a good number of people who have worked, and worked hard, to make the workers' compensation scheme one which works well, and which has not been subject to political pressures. I think no one will allege that the current Minister of Labor or the past minister of labor or the minister of labor in the Liberal administration, so far as I am aware, ever took the position that he would attempt to influence the chairman on dealing with claims, nor should it be. On policy — fine — that is the role of the government, but on the adjudication of individual claims — no.

In order that the act might reflect the views of employers and employees as carefully as possible without being the subject of substantial political controversy, another committee was set up — The Workers' Compensation Act review committee. It has three members of the trade union movement, three employer representatives and one chairman, the chairman being Judge A. Muir. It has done a number of reviews of

The Workers' Compensation Act, and it has done them very successfully. I invite members opposite, in the time I suggest they take to review this bill, to talk to employers, to talk to Mr. Malinowski, let us say, of the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce who will not be thought to be a New Democrat. Mr. Ray Malinowski I'm speaking of, the president and the former Conservative candidate in Yorkton. Talk to Mr. Binns, for example, of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, or any of those people, and ask them whether they don't think this review committee has worked well, and probably as well as any such operation in Canada.

I'm saying to the members opposite, don't rock the boat .-.-. (inaudible interjection) .-.-. You can't. But I am saying don't rock that boat. Don't bring in a piece of legislation which says that you can terminate those appointments. It's working fine. And many of these are not easy to get working fine. There are many places in Canada, with governments of various stripes, where the workers' compensation board has been the subject of pretty hot controversy between employers and employees. I say we have minimized the controversy here, and we have a measure of agreement on what the objectives of the system should be and how it should work. Much of it is done by this compensation act review committee headed by Judge Muir, and he is a very skilled person in this area.

I say we ought not to be passing Bill 16 which can rock this boat. We don't need to, and it ought to be excluded from Bill 16. My point here is that if members opposite will take some time to review the many, many acts that they are affecting, they will reach the conclusion that some of them ought not to be touched and that the number they need to touch is probably half a dozen. The huge bulk of them .-.-. (inaudible interjections) .-.-. Members opposite I think are suggesting that I am grossly underrating the number of acts which they would wish to change.

I'll take a list from under "L" for example. Labor relations board — you don't need the act for that. Land bank appeal board — you don't need it for that. Land bank commission — you don't need it for that. Land appeal board — you don't need it for that. All those are changeable now without Bill 16. La Ronge Community College Board — you don't need it for that. Law Reform Commission of Saskatchewan — you don't need it for that. All those are changeable. Liquor board, liquor licensing commission, local government board — you can't do it anyway because Bill 16 excludes the board. So all the ones beginning with "L" you don't need the bill for.

The liquor board is dismissible at pleasure; liquor licensing commission, I think not. There may be one where you would wish to change. And so that would be one. I would think that you might find a very, very short list .-.-. (inaudible interjection) .-.-. The member opposite suggests that it is going to be difficult to find. I would think that the acts are in the statute book .-.-. (inaudible interjections) .-.-. I'm being urged to give more detail. I will try the letter "M." Many Islands Pipe Lines (Canada) Ltd. — you don't need it for that because that is changeable by you. Many Islands Pipe Lines Ltd. — you don't need it for that because those are subsidiaries of the power corporation, and you hold all the shares there. Meadow Lake Regional Advisory Board — no; Melfort Regional Advisory Board — no; milk control board — no; minimum wage board — no. All of those are changeable now without Bill 16. On we go until we find one which is the municipal potash tax-sharing administration board. I think a look at that will find that while you technically may need it, those are virtual nominees of municipal governments — of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, and you will not, in fact, change it. The municipal water assistance board you don't need.



I think, if you look at this, you would find that you didn't need this comprehensive legislation. You would find that you could do it with six, maybe seven, eight, nine pieces, a small, small list. I think this is far more preferable.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that the government opposite did not take the time (and that's understandable in the rush of organizing a new administration) to review which legislation it wished to change and which it did not. If it had taken the time, it would have brought in quite different legislation. It is because of that that I am urging the members opposite to take more time. This is why our government — not our government, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, — our party is urging that the matter not now be read a second time, but that some time be taken to study the issue.

I want to be as clear as I can. We are not suggesting in any way that the government of the day should not have power to change the boards which are instruments of government policy. We are not suggesting that the government of the day should not have power to hire its own staff and to discharge other staff. We may quarrel with the way it goes about it, but that's for another forum, or another time.

What we are saying is that the broad words "any board or commission," etc. include a great number of organizations which are in no sense instruments of government policy in the sense that I mean. There are some small number which are quasi-judicial tribunals. I have instanced the workers' compensation board, and I have acknowledged that I haven't fully studied the legal implications there.

There is another category which was at arm's length. I have mentioned the cancer foundation, and I think we should stay away from the cancer foundation. I have mentioned the alcoholism commission and my own recommendation, for what it's worth, is that you stay away from that one, because an attempt was made, and a reasonably successful attempt, to get that as an arm's length organization.

My advice, for what it's worth again, would be not to attempt to change the government appointees on the boards of governors of the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan. Again, these people were appointed not because of their political hue, but because of the particular talents they may bring to bear. There will be some government nominees on there which you will want to change. It has been custom, lately, at least, to have the deputy minister of continuing education on, and you will put your own person in there and he will be on the board. It is also custom to have one financial person from the Department of Finance, or some other person, who will be the financial watchdog on the university boards for the government of the day. Fair enough, put your own person on the board.

As for the citizens who are selected, I question whether it is wise for you to simply sweep them out. That's not because your nominees would not be every bit as good; of course they would. I have no reason to believe otherwise. But the sequence of those appointments over the years has been that when their term expired, the new government appointed who they felt was good. And in this way, there wasn't a suggestion that these people on the boards were in any sense messenger boys or nominees for the government of the day, far from it, except, of course, for the deputy minister of continuing education and the financial man. Messenger boys is perhaps a derogatory term, but they were agents for the government of the day. But the other people were, in a sense, to carry on a tradition of the university education at arm's length from the government — not divorced from the government, but at arm's length

— and I think that's wise and my view is that ought to be continued. So I am asking, in effect, the government to review the list and note the very large number of acts where Bill 16 is not now needed because the appointments are at pleasure or can be made. Note the very small group of quasi-judicial tribunals where it would be inappropriate. Note the number of arm's length organizations (a relatively small number) where it would be a break with tradition and an undesirable break with tradition, and again I've instanced the two university boards, the cancer foundation, and the alcoholism commission. Note a small group of boards which are in a sense instruments of government policy but are arbitration boards or the like, which have established a position sometimes after some difficulty and any change in position would be undesirable because they are serving such a useful public function in a difficult area. I mentioned the board headed by Mr. Clay. In that regard, the education relations board has navigated a difficult area with a good deal of skill. I suggest that the small board under The Hospital Standards Act is in the same category.

I think it undesirable for you to be changing those acts holus-bolus. I think you'll get no good from it and very potentially you will get a good deal of harm from it. I do suggest that the number of acts that you might want to change would turn out to be a relatively small number. I give you our experience in the sense that we found the number to be so small that we didn't bother with it. We invited a few people to resign and they tendered their resignations and that pretty well did it. With respect to others, we simply lived out the appointments as we did on the public service commission — without difficulty, without difficulty. And I have found that Mr. Thatcher's appointments had every bit as much of a political coloration as ours, if I may, and that will not surprise many people who knew that Mr. Thatcher was a person who held strong political views, and I think felt that people of his political persuasion could more effectively carry out his policies.

For all of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have attempted to outline, I am going to ask the government to consider what our basic proposition is. Our basic proposition is to not now read the bill a second time but to take some time and look at it. If the government is unable to accept that then look at it when we come along to committee to see whether a considerable number of acts could not be excluded or, if possible, whether the framework of the bill could be changed so that Bill 16 would apply to a listed number of acts. If the latter is not acceptable, because we may inadvertently exclude something that the government wished was in, perhaps we can at least deal with the converse and identify acts which can be excluded.

I now get farther afield with respect to items I would like to raise in committee. My basic arguments, I think, have been put, and accordingly I say once again before I take my seat: look at your legislation; see if you don't think that the basic thrust of my argument makes sense; see if you can accommodate them either by accepting this amendment, and if that is not acceptable to the government opposite (and I would understand it if this is their position) see if you can accommodate some of the thrust of my arguments otherwise, because many of them, I think, are arguments which are advanced in the best interests of the operation of government in Saskatchewan and for the preservation of some institutions which have worked remarkably well over a good number of decades without the intervention of a bill like Bill 16, which would give the government the power to change a great number of appointments, and, in effect, to indicate that the people whom the Lieutenant-Governor in Council named to those particular boards and commissions were agents of the government in a way that they had not been in the past.

I will not go over the arguments further. From what I have said, Mr. Speaker, you will have discerned that I propose to support the amendment, and support the proposal for a six-month hoist, because I believe that this bill needs to be looked at, and the objectives of it can be achieved by the government of the day in a way which does much less harm to many institutions which many Saskatchewan people have worked hard to build over many years.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**MR. YEW:** — I wish to take part in this debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member has already spoken on this amendment and on the bill, so is not really allowed to speak again.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It was my understanding that at 10 o'clock, when time was called, the member was on his feet. The clock having stopped at that point, he would then have an opportunity to get back in the debate at any time.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — If I could speak to that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the hon. member for Cumberland was in the House today when the debate on the adjournment continued. He was present in his seat and did not take his place to speak.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — That's the citation I am looking for. I just haven't put my finger on the proper citation, but that's the one that I am looking for. I would refer the hon. members to rule 28 where it states in point 1 that no member may speak twice. The member was on his feet at closing time last evening, and, if he had wished to resume his speech, he should have been the first to rise today. He was not the first to rise, and therefore forfeited the right for him to take his place to speak.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I wish to speak.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — When the question was called, you were not in the House. I'm not certain you have the right to speak.

I recognize the hon. member for Quill Lakes.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker,. As it has become, I think, evident, the opposition is very concerned with the power of this bill, I want to say that we have spoken extensively on the principle of the bill. We have raised one amendment to remove a specific reference to agreement from this bill and today, Mr. Speaker, we are addressing a further amendment which would have the effect of hoisting the bill for six months.

I want to say that there are a number of reasons for our taking this course. I think the purpose which we are attempting to achieve in moving this amendment to hoist the bill for six months is, first of all, to give the government an opportunity to review its position. As has been pointed out in much detail, in many of the acts appointing boards

**July 14, 1982**

and commissions it is not necessary, in changing the members of those boards and commissions, to put it under the purview of this Interpretation Act and the amendment thereto.

What I am saying is that I don't think that the government seriously looked at the potential (that was indicated here by the Leader of the Opposition) of making a basic list of those who are not needed within the purview of the amendment. I think it has been clearly and very succinctly put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

First of all then, the purpose of this amendment is to give the government an opportunity to exclude those bills under which they already have full power to remove the members of boards and commissions. Secondly, also, some of the boards and commissions, I think, have been set up through other legislation and, therefore, I suggest this amendment will, in fact, give the government that opportunity.

I want to say, secondly, that the purpose of this amendment is to give members of the public an opportunity to examine the bill, and for them to give some input in respect to how they react to this legislation. I want to say, as I have said before (and I want to keep my remarks low-key and without vindictiveness), it is indeed a very wide-sweeping piece of legislation. So, I say here that if we are going to move to set a precedent of power within one amendment to alter so many acts, surely the public should be given an opportunity to review the impact of that act. I want to say that six months is a reasonable time in order to give the public an opportunity. I want to say, in respect to this, that through our efforts of bringing it to the attention of the public, that more and more members of the public are becoming very concerned with the power of this piece of legislation. So, first of all, it would give the government an opportunity to review it. Secondly, it would give the public an opportunity.

But there is yet another purpose to our amendment. That purpose is to give an opportunity to a large number of backbenchers to absorb it, and participate in putting their case forward. The thing that really bothers me here, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a government moving with what I say is a sweeping piece of legislation. The disappointing part of this debate is that from the government side, to my knowledge, there has been only the Attorney General who has spoken. I want to say that this is a very substantive piece of legislation, affecting over 100 acts, and affecting hundreds (as the Attorney General indicated) of people who have been appointed to boards and commissions. I think that because of the magnitude of this bill, I would have thought that if it was so necessary, many of the other members would, in fact, have come forward, defending and putting forth their case. I want to say that to date, in respect to this major piece of legislation, as I have said, disappointingly, only the Attorney General has spoken.

I want to say that I think there is a fourth reason for wanting to move with this amendment. I think that the fourth reason is that this government has been elected for only a short period of time, and hoisting this bill for a six-month period would give the Premier of this province, the individual who carries the burden of the highest office in this province, an opportunity to become better acquainted with the impact of this bill. I feel that what we have done here is to delegate it to the Attorney General. He is the only one who has spoken on it. So I think it would be chance, because it seems to me that what the Premier has said, I agree with — that there is so much more we can be.

Mr. Speaker, I say that, and I agree with that statement, because I believe that Saskatchewan people are unique. I think that Saskatchewan people are independent-

mind; I think they are industrious; they are wise, and, above all, I believe they have honesty, integrity and fairness. We have an opportunity, I think, here in this province, to build on those principles adhered to by the people of Saskatchewan, namely, honesty, integrity and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this bill is not fair and that it is not a reasonable piece of legislation. I say that it is an affront to the fair-mindedness of the people of this province. Our approach — to hoist this bill — is reasonable. I think it is a fair approach. Our approach, I think, in hoisting it so that all can take time to consider the nature of the impact of it, is reasonable. I think it is in keeping with the traditions of fairness in this province of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the government must earn the respect of its people. This bill, it seems to me, does the opposite. I think it abrogates the rights of its people. I think that the bill must therefore be reviewed in the light of the comments I have made. A six-month hoist will give all an opportunity to rethink the issue, to let the electoral process and victory be examined in the light of reality, rather than in the light of a self-achievement.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, .-. (inaudible interjection) .-. Mr. Speaker, will call me to order if there is order to be called. I believe that the amendment which we have set forward, which would, in fact, hoist this bill for six months, is a reasonable course. I say that because I believe that fairness in approach has been the tradition of this House and also the tradition of the political process in this province. So, I would say that our amendment gives to the government an opportunity to review its position, to move with care rather than (as I might phrase it) vindictiveness. I think that it is bigger for a government to move with care and caution than for it to sweep into law an all-encompassing type of legislation such as we are dealing with here with respect to The Interpretation Act.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, again I urge all hon. members to take a look at what we have said and to realize that many of those acts can be excluded from the purview of what it would include. And I ask that they consider what we have put forward as a reasonable basis (a hoist of the bill for six months) for allowing further examination by the government and by the public, so that unnecessary trampling or abrogation of rights does not take place. I will be supporting the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to get involved in the debate on the amendment proposed to Bill 16, that being an amendment that the bill not be read now a second time, but be read six months from now. I think the point that I would like to dwell on for a little while is that I believe the government which brought this bill in came in here with good intentions, and intentions that were, I believe, honorable, and this amendment gives the government the opportunity to set aside the debate on Bill 16 for six months in order to take time to consult the many people who will be affected by the bill. Possibly it could be set aside into another forum. Hearings could be held; opinions and attitudes of many Saskatchewan residents could be brought forward and could be heard. Then we could take them into consideration in dealing with Bill 16.

I think that it has been recognized by a great number of people that there are a certain number of boards and commissions that the government already has a chance to deal with, and it can dismiss the boards out of hand. But what we are concerned about is the handful of boards (to name a few: the workers' compensation board, the cancer

foundation, the university boards) which are, in some cases, quasi-judicial boards, and where in fact members have to be sensitive to all the people of Saskatchewan, not just the cabinet.

Take another board that I would like to use as an example, the board of nursing education here in the province of Saskatchewan, which was established under The Nurses' Education Act in 1966. It's a board which is based on a long-time feeling of interrelationship with the medical community — the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan appoints one person, and an employee of the Department of Health is appointed by the Minister of Health. Of course, the Minister of Health simply has to put another appointment on that board to take the place of the person who had been appointed by the minister. On the other hand, I think we should stall for six months the implementation of this bill so that the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan can have its say on whether or not the board of nursing education should be changed such that the government will have the power to sweep aside all the appointments and agreements made by a previous government. I think that this handful of boards that we are talking about should be removed from this bill; that debate has been made and made a number of times. But I think the reason for lifting this bill at this time is that it would give the government, the opposition and the people of Saskatchewan time to clear the air on this issue. I think there's a feeling out there in the country that something is going on, but people are not sure what it is. They question that sweeping aside of many, many people who are not New Democratic people, but who are people who have offered of themselves over a long time in community involvement, and that community involvement includes their work and activities on boards and commissions in this province.

I also fail to understand the great urgency and hurry that is involved in getting this bill through at this sitting. The simple fact is that we are not talking about proroguing the House. I think it has been made very clear by the House Leader from time to time during this sitting that we do not intend to prorogue the House, that we intend to adjourn. Therefore, this Bill 16 will remain on the order paper until we come back next fall. It's a very simple matter of leaving it there for six months, going out, finding out what the people think, and possibly setting up a hearing process where we can tour the province, ask people's opinions, and then come back in and make a decision based on those findings .-.-. (inaudible interjection) .-.-.

The member for Arm River says that we got their opinion on April 26, and that's probably true in the instances of the gas tax and the mortgage plan. In the case of Bill 16, what I'm hearing from many, many people is that that opinion of the people does not include the passage of a Liberal-style omnibus bill through this Assembly. I think that by lifting this bill or hoisting it for six months we would give the people of the province a chance to see whether or not the member for Arm River is right — whether they do in fact agree with Bill 16, or whether they, like the opposition, feel that this bill is a trend that we see very dominant in the House of Commons at the present time, where the proposal would be to amend a large number of bills by simply passing one act here in the Assembly, and hide the real issue that is at stake, those people and those boards and those commissions that will be affected.

I think we can avoid that kind of controversy and avoid that kind of domination by the cabinet simply by giving a six-month period, in which time we can get the opinion of the many, many people involved. Go back to the board of nursing education, or to the

College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan, which appoints one person to the board of nursing education. As well, on that board there are six people appointed by the Council of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association.

What I would like to know from the government is whether or not these people have in fact been consulted. If they haven't, then I think the motion to take six months and check with them is perfectly legitimate. I am sure many of the government members would accept the fact that we should be consulting with the people if we are talking about being, or you are talking about being, a people's government. By bringing in this bill you are proving to the people of Saskatchewan that you are doing anything but listening to the people of the province.

As well, on that board there is one person appointed by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, one person appointed by the Catholic Hospital Conference of Saskatchewan, and as well, there is one other person appointed by the Minister of Education. Of course, the person appointed by the Minister of Education you now have the power to replace with your own person.

I want to reiterate that we are not talking about the boards such as the crown investments corporation board — those types of things where definitely political people, politically sensitive people, are required .-.-.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Rule 25(2) — and I'm going to read it to you — says:

Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the Assembly or of the committee, to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetition, either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other Members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if the Member continues to speak, Mr. Speaker shall name him .-.-.

And so on, But you were repeating things that you have used before, and that other members have used before, and I would ask you now to stay strictly to the motion.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Thank you for your advice, Mr. Speaker. I will accept to speak directly to the motion, then, and try to avoid overemphasizing certain points which I am trying to make — basically, on the rights of people that I believe are being eroded by this bill and therefore the amendment that the members in the opposition have proposed.

I would like to speak as well about many other boards in this area, and I'll give you the example of the Palliser Hospital. I'll give you a number of examples here to make the case. First, there is the Palliser Hospital Board of Governors in Swift Current whose statutory authority is The Public Health Act, 1965. Minister responsible is the Minister of Health and the members of the board include names like F. Eric C. Tuplin, Dorothy Burnett, Edward Stepan, Betty Murch, John Marjerison and Vern Wilkins. All these appointments expire in 1983 and 1984.

There's the Parkland Community College Board in Melville whose statutory authority is The Community Colleges Act. Minister responsible is the Minister of Continuing Education. Names like Patrick McNally, Jim Bulych, Ella Smith, Maria Fischer, Delmar Mang, Angie Brabant and William Hlady are on the board. These appointments vary from 1981, which is one which would have expired, to some later date. And the list goes on and on.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate that we are very much concerned that this bill be hoisted now for six months to give an opportunity to the people of the province to have another look at what is included in this bill, so that we can go out and hear from them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I will be supporting the motion. I encourage all members of the Assembly to vote in favor of the motion, and I hope that we are able to set this matter aside — this controversial matter — and take six months, look at it, and come back in the fall.

**MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to join this debate on the amendment, and to add some new information and some new thoughts to the debate. We have heard the government opposite state in defence of this bill that they are a new government and wish to take a new approach. I wish to point out to the hon. members and to the government opposite that they are not the first government to have been elected with that promise, campaigning on that slogan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they are not the first Conservative government to have been elected campaigning on that slogan and taking that position.

I wish to refer to the government elected to this legislature in 1929 because there are specific statements and specific documents illustrating the views of that government that relate to this particular Bill 16, and to the reason for the amendment, that indicate clearly that there is simply a re-emergence here of a pattern that this province has known before, and that is one of the reasons that people are concerned. I know that some members opposite in this debate have stated that the government elected in Saskatchewan in 1929 was not a Conservative government, that it was a co-operative government.

Before I refer to the actions of that government and draw the parallels with Bill 16, I wish to point out that it was a Conservative government, that one or two Independents or Progressives who sat in that government insisted on the other name, "Co-operatives." But every minister of that government, except one or two, was elected as a Conservative. Following the defeat of that government (a government in which every sitting member was defeated), the government which followed, the Gardiner government, then felt obligated to do the same kinds of things which the co-operative government had done. And that was to engage (in what the press of that time referred to as a straight pork barrel operation) in the kind of abuse — perhaps someone less generous than I would say abuse of power — which was popularized in similar circumstances during Huey Long's tenure in Louisiana. That government of 1925, or the Huey Long tenure in Louisiana, was characterized by the old adage, "To the victor belongs the spoils."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the process of governing, in the process of making appointments to the boards, and in the process of deciding under what criteria such boards will be appointed, that old adage is a medieval concept, a concept not deserving of advancement in this legislature or in today's society. Yet, in defending Bill 16, the Attorney General has basically given two arguments. One, "We won the election." That's true. Two, "We want to replace your political hacks with our political hacks."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that paints 2,800 people or more with a broad brush, the brush of the old adage, "To the victor belongs the spoils" — a brush which was exemplified in the Anderson government, and a brush whose application is not fitting



today. Certainly it is not fitting to apply it today without some considerable thought being given. It was precisely to give the opportunity for the government to study the matter more carefully, to give the opportunity to the government to review the matter more carefully, to give the opportunity to the government to consider the matter and the implications more carefully, that the member for Cumberland moved the hoist amendment.

Surely, six months is sufficient time to consider the matter carefully. It is a reasonable length of time within which the government can make the changes and appointments it wishes to make and that it is now free to make the changes that the present legislation permits. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that may involve a great many changes, and that the task of making those changes, combined with the many other tasks of review, and the many other tasks of studying, and the many other tasks of considering matters that the government has undertaken will and should keep the government occupied for the six months called for in the hoist amendment. Following that careful process of review and study and consideration that parallels the process of review and study and consideration involved in deciding on the nature of the minimum wage law in Saskatchewan and the various levels that may be applied through the minimum wage law, in the process of studying job creation and industrial strategy, in the process of studying what the intentions are with regard to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and in the process of reviewing what the intentions are with regard to a variety of capital projects that are on hold.

The government can give careful consideration, if the hoist amendment is passed, to the implications of Bill 16 and can assure that it doesn't fall into the kind of trap indicated in the Regina *Leader* of November 2, 1929, under the headline "Regina Liquor Store Vendors are Dismissed." I quote:

Two liquor store vendors in Regina have been relieved of their duties by the provincial government, according to information obtained yesterday. No official announcement has been made of any changes and no announcement made of successors in office.

That is the kind of power and authority which the cabinet seeks to take unto itself and remove from this legislature — that power to make those kinds of changes without any exposure to public scrutiny or to this legislature. It is identical, I submit, Mr. Speaker, to the kind of power and authority exercised in 1929, and the kind of power and authority that got the government of that day into a great deal of difficulty. This, one would think, is the kind of situation a new government would wish to avoid.

It goes on, Mr. Speaker:

J.O. Smith-Jones, manager of the Albert street store and Thomas M. Bee, the assistant at the Avenue store, both have been removed from office. Mr. Jones commenced his duties in 1925. In 1914 he enlisted for war service and served with the 28th battalion, being discharged in 1918. In that year he ran for alderman but was unsuccessful.

It goes on to point out the fine record of public service of this individual and it is a record of service that, I'm sure, would be matched by many people who might be removed without serious consideration, serious review, from the boards or commissions affected by Bill 16. It resulted in a black mark against the government of that day, a black mark that has lasted to this day.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the present government would wish to avoid such a situation. I refer to a story that might very well have been written over the last month previous to today in 1982, and it's entitled "Saskatchewan Head-hunters" in the November 13, 1929 issue of the Regina *Leader*. The story goes on:

The Premier, speaking at Moose Jaw, attempted to explain the firing and the hiring of civil servants that is being done at present by the co-operative government at the same time the government's commission of three is at work investigating the civil service.

It appears that all the firing that is being done is of employees who are looked upon as guilty of partisan activity while engaged by the civil service. These men are being dismissed, and their places are being filled by others. It appears to be the case that some of the civil servants are so bad that the government must get rid of them at once.

Similarly the argument is made here that some of these people are so bad on these boards and commissions that the government must get rid of them at once. Perhaps there are some who fall into that category. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government should then identify them. The story goes on to say:

No impartial tribunal is permitted to pass on the cases of the men. The government swings the axe, and off go their heads. In the meantime, the commission proceeds with its investigation, and in the meantime the government continues to fire and hire. The government is dismissing men on partisan grounds, and the record up to date indicates that it is hiring purely on partisan grounds. It is hiring active party workers; the more active they have been, the better chance they have of obtaining their jobs. That is how the Premier and the co-operative government proceed to take the civil service out of politics.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we recognize that a major theme in the campaign of the Conservative Party in the Saskatchewan election of 1929 was that it was going to remove politics from the civil service, that it was going to assure professionalism in the civil service. And that sounds very much like the campaign themes we heard in the election of 1982, and the subsequent acts sound very much like what is proposed under Bill 16, particularly the reasons given by the Attorney General for proposing Bill 16 and for insisting that it be passed now, that it takes precedence over raising the incomes of people on minimum wage, or precedence over starting major construction projects that would create jobs, or takes precedence over reducing the interest rates for small businessmen, or implementing the farm purchase program.

The story goes on, and the parallel here is very clear, Mr. Speaker,. It goes on to say:

Its handling of the civil service was the first test of the calibre of the new government. It had made pledges to the people, and the people took it at its word. The government made an auspicious beginning by appointing a commission to investigate and report upon the civil service. This appeared a sensible step. The commission would make a report, and the government would have the basis of a policy on which to proceed in fulfilling its promise to the electorate that it would take the civil service out of politics.

I am unaware of whether the government considers the transition committee that it appointed to be parallel with the commission appointed in 1929 by the Anderson government, but if they do then surely the serious matters in Bill 16 could be given some consideration by the transition committee over the period of the six-month hoist, or are there other parallels, Mr. Speaker? The story goes on to say:

The pressure, however, became too strong. The job hunters were on the government's trail. What, they asked, was the use of supporting a party if they could not share in the spoils? The government weakened, then finally caved in — Conservatives, Progressives, Independents all in a heap. It threw its pledges to the wind and left its commission to go ahead and do some investigating while the government went head-hunting and providing jobs for good Conservatives.

That's a report of the *Regina Leader* of November 13, 1929, and I'm attempting to draw parallels to indicate the dangers to the government and to the people of Saskatchewan of proceeding hastily with Bill 16. The story goes on to say:

Was this what the Conservatives had in mind when they stood on the platform last spring and pledged that the civil service would be taken out of politics? The people who heard the promises and who now see the performance must be the judges.

And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this government has yet an opportunity to avoid that kind of blunder made by the Conservatives in 1929 and to at least increase its chances of not suffering in the next election the same fate the Conservatives elected in 1929 suffered in the subsequent election.

We have, Mr. Speaker, under the government of that day, another matter that parallels some of the things that have happened here in the last couple of weeks. On November 14, 1929, the headline in the *Regina Leader* talking about a public servant is: "Who Dismissed Him?"

You are looking at the clock, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you are giving me a hint or if you wish me to call it 5 o'clock? So, I call it 5 o'clock.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member has asked leave to adjourn debate. Is leave granted?

Debate adjourned.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — State your point of order.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is .-.-. Perhaps it's more of a question as opposed to a point of order. The hon. member asked to call it 5 o'clock. Is it Mr. Speaker who calls it 5 o'clock, or the member who calls it 5 o'clock? He then later asked to adjourn the debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member was still on his feet when he called it 5 o'clock and then asked for leave to adjourn debate. He was still speaking. For that reason, I accepted his request to adjourn debate. The House voted on it and then granted him that request. Then I called it 5 o'clock.

**July 14, 1982**

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.