

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 17, 1982

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is with considerable pleasure that I introduce to you and through you to the Legislative Assembly, 13 students from the Regina Plains Community College. There are said to be 13 of them. I'm not sure I count 13 in the Speaker's gallery actually. They are accompanied by their teacher, Debra Thomas. Each year about this time we are graced with this group from the independent living for handicapped persons. We've had a good deal to say about the rights of handicapped students, handicapped people. I am delighted to see them here, and hope that they find this morning's proceedings educational and interesting, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government I would also like to welcome the individuals here today, and Mrs. Debra Thomas. You are contributing a great deal to our society. On behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, we appreciate it, and thank you very much for taking the time to come to the Assembly today.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

PCS Layoffs

MR. KOSKIE: — I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labor, the chairman of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, this Sunday some 1,200 employees of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will be without work, laid off for a second time this year. My question to you is pretty simple: will you today tell this Assembly and those 1,200 employees and their families exactly how long you anticipate this layoff to be? I think you owe that at least to those workers and families as to the extent and the length of that layoff.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Minister, today I cannot give you a definite date. The whole part of the layoff revolves around the fact that inventories are building. If the inventories come down, the layoff will be short. If it's longer, you know, we just have no control. We are on the marketing thing right now, and as soon as those inventories are down those layoffs will be rescinded.

MR. KOSKIE: — As a supplemental, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether in fact, in addition to the 1,200 employees whom he is going to lay off, whether, in fact, he has a consultant's report that's gone before the board and cabinet with respect to the decision which will be forthcoming that, in fact, some 25 per cent of the head office staff in Saskatoon will be laid off. Can you indicate whether there is any

anticipated action to lay off some 110 head office staff in Saskatoon?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I can't give you any numbers today. We have done an internal study of the head office in Saskatoon and we have also had an external group do some looking at the department. We'll be looking at that after January 1.

MR. KOSKIE: — Final supplement, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the possibility of a decision with respect to the head office staff, can the minister indicate a time frame within which he will be making a decision?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, it would be within a month.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I would remind the minister that you were warned by the official opposition that when you got into Canpotex it was not in the best interests of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. It is now apparent from an article in the *Leader-Post* that you were also warned by your own officials that it may have disastrous results. We now learn that hundreds of people, hundreds of workers, are without jobs today because of your slavish devotion to big business and your participation in Canpotex.

Will you now admit the stupidity of your slavish devotion to big business and your independent course in Canpotex?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, if the opposition would give me the figures of how it could be improved on the other side, the fact that PCS International was going to be operating, I'd be delighted to hear about it. My understanding is, and I know that I'm right, that the fact that we went back into Canpotex has improved our offshore sales over the same period last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister denying what your own officials are telling the *Star-Phoenix* and that is that your participation in Canpotex has resulted in lost sales? Are you denying that?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, all I know is that our board is meeting. We know what we're doing as far as Canpotex is concerned. We are ahead of the game over last year and the Canpotex thing is not a problem. It's the domestic market in North America and Canpotex doesn't have a thing to do with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are your officials telling you one thing and the *Star-Phoenix* another? Or are you just not listening to the good advice you're getting from your officials?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't see the article in the *Star-Phoenix* and I would have to find out who that official is first. I would suspect that it is not the present management of PCS.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Will the minister tell this House what advice you received from the officials of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan with respect to Canpotex?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker our officials in PCS, along with our board, agreed to go back into Canpotex, and that's the reason that we're there right now. And I said earlier, it's not Canpotex, that's the problem.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker and, Mr. Minister, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. He has impliedly now expressed a good deal of confidence in his officials. A few weeks ago the acting president of PCS, Mr. Harapiuk, was quoted as saying that PCS employees could be off the job for as much as three or four months during the course of 1983. The question I ask is: does the minister share Mr. Harapiuk's pessimistic predictions of layoffs approaching three or four months during calendar 1983?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, the reason that we let the employees know that the possibility might happen (and that was during the summer of 1983) was the fact that the previous administration did not let the employees know until a few days before having to let them off this past summer. We're giving them the notice far in advance, and that's what we did this year. That's not saying that it will happen. It'll all depend on markets, on inventory. If we are filled to the brim, we are going to have to lay people off. If not, they'll be all working.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker and, Mr. Minister, with respect to these layoffs which you say are necessary because of low sales in North America, and which we say could be compensated for by additional sales outside North America, do you agree with the reported predictions by PCS International president Ed Price that as much as 1.9 million tonnes of PCS's potash could be sold within a year had we stayed with PCS International, and not turned over our marketing to Canpotex?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with the statement. We could go out and sell 5 million tonnes of product if we sold it at a loss. We don't think that it's up to us as a corporation to sell product at a loss and take money out of the taxpayer's pocket to pay for the loss.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Minister, are you saying that the previous board of directors, the previous president, and Mr. Price were contemplating selling at a substantial loss when they were using PCS International, and selling at lower prices over any longer period of time than Canpotex sells? Is that what you're saying?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know how I can speculate on what the previous board was saying. All that I know is that the tonnage and the prices that we are charging for potash right now are almost at a break-even point. If we were to go out and reduce the prices some more, it would just wreck the potash market around the world.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, will the minister agree that the decision not to withdraw from Canpotex after notice has been given was a decision not made by the PCS board which he heads, but made by the transition team, so-called?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, it was made by our transition team plus the original four or five members of our board.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker and, Mr. Minister, would the minister

acknowledge that, quote:

Some industry representative approached the transition team members and convinced them that the decision to withdraw from Canpotex was made in haste and should be reconsidered.

Would he agree with that?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I would not agree with that. That was a board decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A further question to the minister in charge of the potash corporation. I'm quoting from the *Star-Phoenix* of December 16, 1982, in which Mr. Andrew says he "is not 100 per cent pleased with Canpotex." You're saying that you are. Now, who is the opposition to believe, the Minister of Finance who says he is dissatisfied or you who express 100 per cent confidence in this con game?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I sometimes wonder if we can believe everything we read in the paper. We, as a board and as management right now, have made the decision that we're staying in Canpotex. We've got the complete industry in with us now to do the offshore marketing and it's our decisions to stay there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the minister in charge of the potash corporation and I wish to quote to him a statement from a leading public figure in Canada, which reads as follows:

The recession has been the result of a weak, pampered, protected economy. We favor head to head competition in the world market. This means forcing protected and subsidized firms to compete and if they can't, we must allow them to die.

Do you agree with that in respect to the potash industry?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I stated originally that our corporation is going to go out and sell potash as competitively as we can to make dollar for the treasury of this government and for the province of Saskatchewan. That's what we're going to do.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. You have conspicuously failed to do that since you have been minister, probably the worst seven months since that corporation has . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order. The member is making statements rather than asking the supplementary that he ask for, and I would ask you to ask your question.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, my question is this: I quoted, as you know, from your colleague, Mr. Andrews: is your position that you do not favor head-to-head competition in world market when it comes to selling potash?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would you please repeat the answer since I did not hear the answer to that question. I heard words, but not the answer.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, We are going to go out and sell potash. It is not my fault that the interest rates have gone to 20 per cent, that the farmers of North America are not buying potash. Even the fertilizer industry is down. The phosphate industry is worse than potash.

We are beginning to see a light at the end of the tunnel. We have moved an office from Atlanta, Georgia, to Chicago, and why it was in Atlanta, Georgia. I'll never know. Chicago is in the middle of the market area. We've made that transition. We're looking at our sales force. We're looking at incentives for our salesmen to go out and sell potash. We're setting up service centres in the United States to have product there when it's needed. I don't know what more you expect us to do, but that is what we are doing.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I ask a new question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Finance of your government recommends a policy as follows: We favor head—to—head competition in world markets. Are you prepared to have PCS sell on a basis of head-to-head competition in world markets in China, in Indonesia, in Brazil, in competition with IMC and other private producers? Are you prepared to do that or not?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We're going to sell potash around the world head to head, just the same as the Canadian Wheat Board is selling grain head to head around the world.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, I take that to mean that you are not prepared to sell in competition with IMC. Do I understand that clearly? You are not prepared to sell potash in competition with IMC. Do I understand that clearly? You are not prepared to sell potash in competition with IMC in Brazil, in China, Indonesia.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We're selling our potash around the world in China, in India, in Brazil, as Canpotex.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary. Would the minister concede that that is not in competition with IMC and Noranda in Brazil and in China and in Indonesia?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We are together in it just like the Canadian Wheat Board. All those companies are in Canpotex and that's the way we're going around the world selling potash.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, do I then assume that he regards the relationship between IMC and PCS as the same as between two farmers in Saskatchewan that are not competing with each other? They have a common agency to sell their product. Is that what you're saying, sir?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, we're head to head with IMC and Noranda and Kalium in North America. In the world we're together as a group all around the world in Canpotex.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — One final question on this matter, Mr. Speaker. We have the spectre of Sask Tel losing money for the first time in almost 50 years. We have the spectre of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan having made bundles of money as the crown jewel among crown corporations until it received the benefit of your management. Is this not part of a larger attack on crown corporations whereby you will take whatever steps are necessary to see that they lose money and then when they're out of favor with the public, sell them? Is this not the plan?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Gilson Report

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question. In the absence of both the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier, I imagine I'll direct it to the Legislative Secretary, if he would stay for just one minute. And I would like to say when secretaries were appointed, I think their appointment was that they would answer on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture. And if the member would again take a seat, I'll phrase my question. The Premier is quoted as saying the school is still out. The Premier is quoted as saying the school is still out. He says, "I know where the Wheat Pool stands." He knows where Fletcher stands, the president of the Palliser Wheat Growers' But he said, "When I get ours figured out, I'll tell you about it." My question to the Legislative Secretary for agriculture is: when are you going to ring the bell on your ministers and get them together and decide what they're going to do about the Gilson report?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, when the farmers of Saskatchewan have decided what they want they will have total co-operation from the Conservative government in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — If I'm to direct my question to . . . If the Minister of Highways is going to stand in for the Minister of Agriculture . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — And the Premier.

MR. ENGEL: — . . . and the Premier, may I just direct some remarks to him? In Sask Wheat Pool's letter addressed to the members of the Saskatchewan legislature, he says that, in summary, 90 per cent oppose the Gilson proposed method of payment. He said:

We will continue to put forward a strong case in opposition to the Gilson proposal, the method of payment, and can be expected to challenge anyone who comes out and supports it. Pool members would welcome a clear indication of your support on this important issue.

In the statement here, my question is this. The farmers have spoken on this issue. The farmers don't want a change. The farmers want government to make up its mind and get a consensus. The consensus isn't that the farmers don't have an agreement. It's that your caucus hasn't. When are you going to come out and support and make your position known?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, there is no consensus to my knowledge to date in

the province of Saskatchewan. Further, for the member's information, I believe this government is working with the farmers of Saskatchewan and is willing to co-operate. We have introduced and we will be going to royal assent of Bill 45 — a farm purchase program that is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I believe the hon. minister is off the subject of the question.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister in the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture. I have a constituent who is quite concerned about the position on the crow of the new government. One George Fletcher, the president of the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association, says that he agrees it's time for a stand by the provincial government. On his behalf, the president of the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association, can you tell us what your stand is on the crow?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, we talked about the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool; we talked about Palliser. This government is willing to listen to all farm organizations in the province of Saskatchewan. When there is consensus, there will be total co-operation from this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

House Adjournment

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the House Leader — the acting House Leader in the absence of the House Leader or the acting acting. There are rumors around, Mr. Speaker, that we will be possibly adjourning today. I'm wondering if the minister can give us an assurance that if we are to adjourn today or early next week, can he give us an assurance that we will be back early in January to resume the estimates of the House? I know there are two ways of moving an adjournment motion — one where you write in a date; one where you don't. We would prefer a date when we are coming back. If you can give us a firm assurance that we will be back on January 12 or 13? I wonder if you could give an indication.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, we are, on this side of the House as concerned about passing the estimates in the province of Saskatchewan, and maybe more so than the members opposite. For the last three days I've had the galleries full of bureaucrats sitting here ready to do estimates. We have moved as fast as we can on this side; that decision remains up to the opposition. We're willing to co-operate totally.

We will allow the opposition to go through the order paper today and depending on how far we get down that order paper, and depending on the work that is accomplished, we're willing to co-operate.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I know that we've had a number of hours in the last three or four days of bills that have been called by the House Leader; earth-shattering bills that are very pressing and must be put ahead of the estimates. For over half of the time in this week so far to date we have been on bills that I know we have to get finished. My question is whether the minister can give us an assurance that we will be back in early January — and I'm saying that we are very flexible — by the 13th of January or earlier. Can he give us that assurance?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any assurance to the House today. It depends on the business being conducted. We've had a filibuster on some bills which

has delayed the work of this Assembly. I have had the officials here in the last few days ready to move ahead on estimates, but I cannot give that assurance.

West Side Community College

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the minister of northern Saskatchewan. Earlier this fall your department awarded a major contract in Buffalo Narrows to install electrical furnaces in the West Side Community College. I wonder if you could indicate to this House who the contract was awarded to?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information with me today. I really don't know but I'll undertake to get the answer for the member and I'll take notice of the question.

MR. THOMPSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When you bring that information back, I wonder if you could bring the total dollar value of that contract, and also was that the lowest tender that was submitted.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to bring back all of the pertinent information regarding the contract the member refers to, or you could ask me in estimates when we get to them.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if that was brought back to the legislature.

Accessibility for the Handicapped

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, this is a repeat of a question on a subject we raised last night with the Minister of Labor. I want to raise it again because I note that the Regina planning and public works committee has recommended that the handicapped be given accessibility to buses in Regina. I want to ask you again and I want your assurance again, Mr. Minister, that we will deal with the accessibility legislation, if not at this session, then at the next session of this legislature.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in estimates last night, that is our intention.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Job Creation for Unemployed in Saskatoon

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to rise in the House on behalf of the Hon. Patricia Smith to advise the legislature that she and the Hon. Lloyd Axworthy of the federal government this morning signed five agreements that will create 352 jobs for unemployed people in the city of Saskatoon over the next 6 to 12 months.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — These agreements, Mr. Speaker, are under the new Canada-Saskatchewan job creation program which is jointly funded by the governments of Canada and Saskatchewan. The two government will provide approximately \$3 million to support various projects in the city of Saskatoon. The

projects are to be administered by the city of Saskatoon, the Saskatoon public and separate school boards, the Saskatoon board of police commissioners and University Hospital. The projects will generate 11,227 job-weeks of employment.

The agreement with the city of Saskatoon is the first agreement in the country, and marks the first tri-government co-operation under the federal new employment expansion and development program. The Canada-Saskatchewan job creation was officially established November 22, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, as a member representing a seat in the city of Saskatoon, I believe it should be made clear to this Assembly the key role that was played in this announcement by Mayor Cliff Wright of the city. Mayor Wright has vigorously supported and pursued this project since it was first announced, and the fact that this first Canadian announcement is in Saskatoon is testimony to the tireless efforts of Saskatoon's mayor. I believe the announcement will be the first of many in this province. I'm quite sure that the entire Assembly will join me in congratulating the mayor of Saskatoon, the Minister of Social Services and the Hon. Lloyd Axworthy on this important announcement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the people of Saskatoon who are on welfare at this time will be pleased to know that there is some effort being made. I think it is also important to note that an announcement like this would not have been possible a year ago because we didn't have near the number of people on welfare in Saskatoon, and so the program wasn't needed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think there are many more important things that should be being done in Saskatoon — things like the geological science building, which has been put on hold, which would have allowed for \$16 million in construction to have been carried out in Saskatoon; construction of a courthouse in Saskatoon, which has been put on hold. Mr. Speaker, I find it very disturbing that we are getting Mickey Mouse operations going to put people to work who are on welfare; and I just would encourage the government to get on with some of the very important projects that they have put on hold, rather than to cancel meaningful projects and come forward with makeshift arrangements to put welfare people back to work.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Votes and Proceedings

MR. SPEAKER: — Before orders of the day, I would like to make a comment about the votes that we had yesterday. I want to draw to the attention of the House that an error which appeared in yesterday's *Votes and Proceedings* on pages 3 and 4. The record should show on the bottom of page 3 that clause 4 of Bill 51 was agreed to on division, and that clauses 2 and 3 of Bill 44 were agreed to on division. Also, the record should show that the recorded division on the top of page 4 was on Bill No. 44, The Department of Finance Act, and not on Bill 51, The Workers' Compensation Act, which was agreed to without a division.

A correction to this regrettable error will appear in today's *Votes and Proceedings*. Also, the proceedings will be correctly recorded in the permanent record of the Assembly in the *Journals*.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Point of Privilege

MR. SPEAKER: — As well, I took notice yesterday of a point of privilege raised by the Attorney General, and I would like to just cite to you paragraph 19(1):

A dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the condition of parliamentary privilege.

So I rule that the member does not have a prima facie case of privilege.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Garner that Bill No. 55 — **An Act to amend The Highways Act** be now read a second time.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments on Bill 55. Bill 55 is one that concerns me some, as do other bills that have been introduced in this House.

We see a bill here that eliminates sections, sections that would ask the department to submit an accounting of their yearly operations. It deletes all those sections. It repeals the section that would allow the auditor to go through the department. Mr. Speaker, we have seen that being introduced in other bills in this House.

I have some great concern on that, because when those sections are deleted, that means that these departments will then be having money put in by OC, no statutory amount that's put into it, no limit on it. They will have money in every department that they can move from one area to another, without the public knowing what is happening, without the department having to account for their expenses of the money that they have received in revenue.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think should be a concern, a concern of the people of Saskatchewan — the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. Because they will not, at any given time, be able to look into the records and say that this is what happened to the money that was in this department or that is what happened to the money that was in the other department. Mr. Speaker, I think the people deserve the right to know what happens in every department, to know how their money is being spent. They should have the benefit of an auditor, having the opportunity to look at those estimates, to look at the funding—the revenues and expenses. They should have the benefit of that, Mr. Speaker, but that is not being provided in here.

I will have a good number of questions on this bill when it gets to committee and I think

we should be going into committees. We should also be going into estimates, which has been totally ignored in this House. We should be going into estimates . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. We're dealing with second reading of a bill; we're not dealing with estimates. I would ask the member to stay on the subject please.

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Bill 55, as I said, I will be having more questions on it. Therefore I will be allowing this bill to go into committee where we can peruse it in detail and make the necessary amendments to it. I'm sure that the minister will agree that there should be some amendments made to that bill, and he will accept the amendments that I'll be putting forward.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and by leave of the Assembly referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 58 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the realignment of the administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan

Clause 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the minister introduce his officials.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I have Ron Hewitt from the Department of the Attorney General.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I obviously know the general purposes of this bill. But more particularly, for example, The Dental Care Act is amended: why is it necessary to include these provisions in this bill? I take it that The Dental Care Act is an act administered by the Minister of Health and that the references there are "minister may" and that these may be provisions previously available to DNS. Could the minister make that a little clearer?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. The intent here of course is that, with The Dental Care Act as it applied under the Minister of Health for the southern portion of the province in the past, we couldn't apply it to northern Saskatchewan and still maintain the provisions that were there under the DNS act for the special circumstances of various remote communities, like a special circumstance for provision of dental care to children where there's no dentist. Under The Dental Care Act, the Minister of Health may then authorize dental care to be provided to people in those remote communities by dentists that are under the employ of the Department of Health.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, that power isn't ordinarily available to the Minister of Health in southern Saskatchewan. It was a special power that DNS had, and you're putting that same special power over into The Dental Care Act.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3

MR. THOMPSON: — In clause 3 we're dealing with the transportation subsidy to the northern communities. I'm assuming we're dealing with the communities of Stony Rapids, Fond du Lac, Black Lake, and Wollaston Lake. Is this right?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with giving the powers to the Minister of Health under the realignment to be able to authorize the transportation subsidy, as the member mentions, as we know it now: the transportation subsidy for perishable foods.

MR. THOMPSON: — It's my understanding from your answer that the responsibility for this transportation subsidy for perishable foods will be in the hands of the Minister of Health. Is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you. That is a good program and I just want to ask the minister today, considering the circumstances that we have in Uranium City right now . . . The cost of food has just jumped up ten- to twelvefold. Is the minister and his department prepared to put that transportation subsidy for perishable foods into Uranium City now and for the Camsell Portage people?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that dealing in clause by clause is what we should be . . . What the intent of this bill is is to give the powers, in line with the realignment process, to transfer the powers that were once under the DNS act to the Minister of Health, so that he, so that transportation subsidies to remote communities can carry on. So it's a matter of dealing with those powers.

The member is asking about a specific community. It could be included in the transportation subsidy which is somewhat of a different issue. It's something you could address to the Minister of Health at some time in question period, probably Monday or Tuesday, or Christmas Eve, or whatever day that you would like to ask that question and we can go from there. I don't think it's really relevant to this particular clause of this bill.

MR. THOMPSON: — Yes, I would like to get an answer to that question very fast because things are getting pretty serious in Camsell Portage and Uranium City. Once that responsibility is turned over to the Minister of Health, I will be approaching him in due course.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — On that issue, when is the date of effect for the transfer to take place? I know that the coming into force of the bill is November 1, 1982, retroactively. When will the transportation subsidies actually change from DNS to health?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — That transfer under the realignment took place on October 1, 1982, So it's in effect now, as a matter of fact. This bill and the reason we had to have it finished before the end of the calendar year was because of that provision, so that it can . . . It's a consequence of the realignment process.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — So then in fact this will be merely confirming something that has already taken place in October, then.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 8

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I wonder if the minister could give us a brief explanation of the effect of this clause when passed.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, the effect in essence is the transfer from what was known as northern housing to the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation: properties, staff housing, all aspects dealing with housing in the North that were administered by northern housing under the former DNA bill. So basically what it is, is in keeping with the realignment process. Sask Housing now has jurisdiction in northern Saskatchewan as well.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, northern housing always had two major planks — the staff housing end of it and then what I might call the citizen housing end of it. It is a fairly large operation that DNS housing advance account — a fair bit. Well, all that now is going to be transferred to Sask Housing Corporation. They are going to undertake all of the negotiations with CMHC and carry out all of the those many joint programs up in the North. Do I have that right?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — In essence that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, this is probably the wrong minister to ask the question of. Is the management also going over to SHC? It's a very considerable managerial problem. I may put it that way. Anyone who tries it will know. My question really is (perhaps the wrong minister and perhaps out of order): does he feel that the management of Sask Housing Corporation and the managerial tier is thick enough to take on this very considerable extra responsibility with a whole lot of problems.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as was the case in the other clause dealing with the amendments to the health act, this is basically retroactive. In fact the transfer took place on November 1. Yes, we believe that the management can handle it. In fact the northern housing staff, which was considerable as the member will know, is transferred into Sask Housing and is now under the jurisdiction of Sask Housing.

MR. THOMPSON: — In clause 8.1(3), Mr. Minister, "For the purposes of this section, the Northern Saskatchewan Administration District does not include any municipalities." I wonder if you can make this clear to me. I am a little confused when it doesn't include any municipalities. Am I assuming it doesn't include the municipal corporation of Uranium City?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — We'll have an answer for that just in a minute. I'm just looking for somebody to tell me.

Mr. Chairman, this clause that the member refers to is a technical amendment and it has to do with the administration of The Public Health Act. Under The Public Health Act there's a public health tax levied by municipalities. Under DNS it was left to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Is that right? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It was left to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan to levy this. As the hon. member can well understand, I don't just really have a handle on this levy of taxes. In fact, there was no tax levied in the municipalities in northern Saskatchewan. So, under the theoretical case of a tax being levied under the The Public

Health Act it now leaves the municipalities (you mentioned Uranium City; Creighton and La Ronge would be the other two) — they then, as communities, would be able to levy a public health tax as do communities in the rest of the province.

This would be covered in The Northern Municipalities Act that was introduced yesterday, where you deal with the individual municipalities and the powers they would have to levy various taxes. So, it's dealt with there as well. But this gives the power to The Public Health Act to apply to the municipalities in the North as it does in the South.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clause 9 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 60 — An Act respecting Prairie and Forest Fires

Clause 1

MR. THOMPSON: — This is pretty well the identical bill, I believe, that was presented by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources last fall. We concur with pretty well everything that's in here. In this act is where the judge has . . . I'm just looking for that in here. Is there a penalty clause in this bill? Could you explain that to me?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Yes, there is, Mr. Chairman. I think the effect of the section dealing with the penalty is that it removes the minimum penalty and leaves more to the discretion of the judge, and maintains a maximum penalty. There is more to the discretion of the judge in cases where fires are set by man and where there can be some prosecution. As the hon. member will know, from the area that he comes from, that can be a very serious problem, and basically then the judge has seemingly more discretion to apply the penalty to the seriousness of the crime.

MR. THOMPSON: — Yes, I agree with that, and that was in the bill. I guess the reason for that was that you do have a minimum. In many cases, the minimum fine was used, and under this new bill there is no minimum and I think that that is a step in the right direction, and we fully agree with that.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Yes, and the hon. member mentioned that the bill is identical to the one that was introduced by my predecessor in this department, by the former administration. That's true, with one exception. It is a very small housekeeping type of house amendment that I would like to introduce into clause 2. I've just mentioned the intent of that and, of course, it's very self-explanatory. Where it talks about municipalities we would like to include "resort villages," within a burning permit area. When we come to clause 2, we'll introduce that House amendment. I believe it is self-explanatory that we want to include resort villages in there.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There is a House amendment to clause 2.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I just have one question on that, Mr. Chairman, to the minister.

Could you define what you mean by a resort village? Maybe you could do that easier by telling me how many will be included as result of this amendment.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, the definition of resort village is under The Urban Municipality Act. A group of residents around a resort area in some cases apply for resort village status, and those who apply for that and, of course . . . I don't know the number. In any particular burning permit area as designated here, if there is a resort village in there, this amendment would allow for the resort village to be included in that burning permit area, as it would for a village or a town or whatever is in the same area. It was an oversight before and we just wanted to make sure it was included in there.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think that clarifies the point that I was raising. It's the same definition for resort village as in The Urban Municipality Act, which would mean a person has the right to vote in that village but not necessarily having to live there as their main residence.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I confess I'm not sure of exactly what the definition is as it's set out in the urban act, but it is the definition as it's set out in the urban act.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 13

MR. THOMPSON: — "13. An officer may require any able-bodied adult to assist in fire fighting." This will be totally . . . Am I right in assuming, Mr. Minister, that the conservation officer or the fire-ranger has the total responsibility of who shall fight fires and who shall not fight them in this act?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — That's basically the case now, as I think the member knows. It did get rid of a couple of provisions that were rather outdated, as I mentioned in the second reading debate, where they talk about telegraphers, and trainmen, whatever, that were exempted from fighting fire. But of course, that's outdated in this society. So this more clearly reflects society as we know it today.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 27 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 28

MR. THOMPSON: — With your permission, could I ask a question on clause 28? I was trying to get your attention . . .

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could explain to me: "Any officer may arrest without warrant any person found committing an offence against this Act or the regulations." How did this read before? Are these new powers that have been give to the officer?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — There is no change whatsoever. It is exactly as it was in the

former act that has been around for a good number of years.

Clause 28 agreed to.

Clauses 29 to 40 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act

Clause 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the minister like to introduce his officials?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to introduce Gerry Kraus, the comptroller, and Shirley Raab, to my right, from the finance office.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Would you explain for the benefit of the opposition, Mr. Minister, the difference between the advance accounts and the revolving funds?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the member's question, my officials inform me that in terms of change there is no change; it is a change in terminology. The operation of the fund will remain the same; the change actually is in accounting for the cash outflow to the fund.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, has your department taken over full responsibility of the economic development branch within the Department of Northern Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, but it's an administration matter. It's a finance and administration matter. It's a finance and administration matter.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 as amended agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want an explanation from the minister for the reason for making this retroactive to April 1 of last year. I realize it's the beginning of the fiscal year but I just want an explanation.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure the member will like the answer. But you apparently agreed to the change, to the retroactivity — your government — and partly to satisfy some of the concerns of the auditor. It was brought to your attention. It was agreed to by your government.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Frankly, I was not a party to that agreement, and your explanation doesn't mean an awful lot. Are you saying this is something the opposition critic to this bill agreed to? If it is, I leave the point alone. If we make an agreement, we stick to it. But I'm just not sure that I understood the comment.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, apparently, it went before the treasury board in January of 1982. It was agreed to by the treasury board at that time and ratified by cabinet.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would appreciate an explanation for its necessity then. Does it serve any useful purpose? If so, what purpose does it serve making it retroactive?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm advised that it was to make the accounting change that necessitated retroactive to April 1, if that answers your question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The comments, if I may repeat them for the member for Regina Lakeview, are to the effect that they went before treasury board. In fact the procedure was changed as of April 1 and they have been operating under this since April 1, 1982. Therefore you, in a sense, are legitimizing something that's been done since April 1, admittedly with the consent of the former administration.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — The answer, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member's question is that the payments have been made under existing authority — legislation. This legislation gives retroactive treatment as if the change had in fact been in effect since April 1.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am going to drop the point and let the thing go.

Clause 6 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act (No. 2)

Clause 1

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, if the member will excuse me for a second, I'll introduce two more officials: Mr. John Yeomans and Mr. Ken Brehm, both from the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services.

MR. KOSKIE: — On second reading, Mr. Minister (I don't know whether you were here or not; I guess you did put this bill through), there are a number of concerns. As we go through it clause by clause, I'll raise it, but I just want to point out a couple of major concerns and whether or not these particular items are covered.

The major concern that we have is that it would appear the main difference seems to be that the revolving funds will not have upper limits set by law on the amount of money they contain, as is now the case in the advance accounts, as stipulated in section 34. That is a concern to us.

The other major concern that we have is that the minister will not be required (it is our interpretation) to provide annual statements in the financial standing of the revolving

fund to be included in *Public Accounts* of the provinces as the current section 38 (which is going to be repealed) really indicates.

Those are the two major concerns. Some of my colleagues may want to raise a couple of other concerns.

The other concern that I want to raise is, it appears to allow for the demise of the Saskatchewan Government Printing Corporation, the crown corporation, and a transfer of some of its capabilities to the office services agency. I wonder whether it is the intention, by the transfer of some of the duties of the Sask Government Printing house to the office services agency, whether it is an intent of the government to eventually phase out the crown corporation. Those are my basic concerns. I wonder if the minister could give me his learned advice on those points?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the opposition as well as the House here. As I said, this is not my bill; I'm carrying it for someone else . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you just wait, I'll give you some answers here. I'll answer your questions one at a time. Is that all right? You had three concerns in the bill, so I'll take one at a time.

On the initial question that you had, I'm told the difficulty now is that the moneys must be provided for approximately five years. This has proven to be difficult over time. In fact, it has proven to be inefficient as well, since they provide a built-in safeguard by asking for more than they in fact need. The second part of that first questions is when the limit has to be increased. Again it is difficult because it requires that we amend the legislation to change the spending limit. And, of course, as the members know, the House may not necessarily be in session at the time.

Your second concern: the cash expenditures to the fund will be included in the *Public Accounts* in the same manner as all other subvotes.

Okay. I'll repeat what I said. The cash expenditures . . . You tell your seatmate to keep quiet and you'll hear me. You can't hear me? Put your plug on. You've got an earphone there. If you can't hear me put it on, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! Will the Clerk get the hon. member an earphone? Page. Would the member for Regina Elphinstone accept one from another member? We are out . . .

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I want all hon. members to participate in this debate. The minister has decided that he will speak in a manner which we can't hear over here. I want them for all of our members, or else I want him to speak up. That's the only answer.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I would advise the hon. member that if his seatmates would listen, or keep quiet, he'd be able to hear me in my normal tone of voice. That is your problem. Not my voice. Ask your seatmates to keep quiet while I'm speaking and you will hear me distinctly without any problem. Fair enough?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! If all the members of the legislature would be a little more quiet, maybe we could all hear.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think the problem is that he isn't speaking loud enough. It's simply that he doesn't know anything about the bill. He's had a very

difficult time understanding it. I would move that we move to estimates, because the minister is not informing us of anything that's going on in this bill, simply because he doesn't know anything about it.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, in response to that question, he's absolutely right. I do not. I am not well informed of the bill or . . . (inaudible) . . . but I have very capable officials with me who can give me the answers to the questions that they are asking. And if they at this time are questioning the competency of these civil servants, let them say so.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, the motion that I moved has nothing to do with the officials. It has to do with the minister who in essence is not responsible for the bill because the minister is not here. And I move that we move to something that we know something about in the government so that we can get on with it.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Negatived. Proceed.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, would the minister try to read that statement which he was attempting to read previously about what the payments, as I understood him to say, to the fund would appear in *Public Accounts*? Would he please read that?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I'd be very happy to repeat what I said earlier. The cash expenditures to the fund will be excluded in the *Public Accounts* . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Included. I'm sorry. Included in the *Public Accounts* as in the same manner as all other subvotes. However, supplementary financial statements on the revolving fund will be published as well.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, no one gives a hoot about whether or not the payments to the revolving fund are likely to be displayed in *Public Accounts* or in our financial statements because there's no other way you can get them out of consolidated funds without showing them. That's not the issue.

The issue is payments out of the fund. Let's take the central vehicle agency now and this will be one of the issues here. Every penny spent by the central vehicle agency is audited by the provincial auditor and I can tell you how much was sent to Mid-West Motors and how much was sent to Meadow Ford Sales and the rest. The question I ask the minister is: does this act require the provincial auditor to publish similar statements, and if so, where is the statutory provision?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to clear it to the hon. member. First of all, I am advised that the expenditures made by the fund, as indicated by the estimates, will be reported in the *Public Accounts* the same as other expenditures.

Secondly, we will continue to publish the commercial and financial statements for these funds and include that in the *Public Accounts* as well.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I'm sorry I did not make my question clear. I did not ask for a statement of policy from the minister, I asked whether there is a statutory requirement that you publish them. There is now, and as we

understand it, this bill strikes it out. If we are misreading this, please tell us. I don't want the minister to tell us that he's going to publish it. I want to know whether he is legally required to publish and have audited statements for the revolving funds, and if so, where is the legal requirement now that you are repealing the one for the advance accounts?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I believe your question related to the financial statements being published and the authority requirement. I'm advised that authority lies in the treasury board financial policy.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I want to ask a very narrow question. Do you agree (and I don't know what the answer is) that if we pass this act there will be no legal requirement that the money spent by the revolving fund be audited and the audited statement published?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I'll try it one more time. The expenditures will be audited as are any other expenditures made by a department. The audit report of the consolidated fund therefore includes these expenditures as well.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I think we should understand what we're doing here. The current revenue, supply and services act provides us as follows:

The minister shall provide an annual statement, in respect of the advance account of each branch of the department, to the Minister of Finance for inclusion in the *Public Accounts* of the province, which statement shall show the standing at the close of the fiscal year of the accounts, setting out the surplus or deficiency resulting from the years operation.

Then it goes on later on to say that these shall be tabled. Now this is being repealed. The bill before us provides, in section 9, that section 38 is repealed. So we know that the minister is not required to provide an account in respect to the advance account. Now that makes sense if you're abolishing the advance account; no one can deny that, provided that there is some provision of similar import which will apply to the revolving fund. If you tell me that it is in the act now, I would ask you to direct me to the provision. It seems to me relatively elementary that we should not be asked to pass an act which says the advance accounts shall go and they will be revolving funds; and the audit provisions for advance accounts shall go, and maybe or maybe not there are provisions for revolving funds.

Right now, with the central vehicles agency, I can look up and see, for example, that Crestview Dodge sold \$70,000 worth; or that Chrysler Canada sold \$154,000 worth; or Lakeview Chrysler Plymouth sold \$725,000 worth of goods to the central vehicle agency. Now I think that this is information which should be available to the public. I can deal with Morrison's Chrysler-Plymouth and others, if you prefer other names . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No? Well Ford Motors of Canada is \$1 million, \$1,046,000.

These are all here, and they are required by section 38, to be published . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Fine: the minister, as I understood the minister, says that when we have the revolving fund, they will be required to be similarly published. I ask the minister, what provision provides for that, having regard for the fact that he is going to

repeal section 38?

If the argument is that these are now going to be “regular departmental expenditures so that they will be included in the regular disbursements of the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services, would they please refer me to the appropriate statutory provision? I’ve got the act before me.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, one more time. We’ll do it two ways. First of all, prior to this change, the advance account expenditures were not shown as a budgetary expenditure of the consolidated fund. Separate legislative provision was, therefore, required. Now, with the change in accounting policy, the expenditures will be shown as expenditure of the consolidated fund. Legislative provisions for audit are therefore included in The Department of Finance Act. We have stated, however, that financial statements will also be included as a supplement to this.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Let me be clear on whether I understand the minister. The minister is saying that once we pass this act, the advance account will be no more; that we will have in its place a revolving fund. The revolving fund will have no separate legal existence separate and apart from the consolidated fund, and, therefore, all expenditures out of it will be money spent out of the consolidated fund. I am puzzled by that. I am puzzled by it a good bit, just from an accounting point of view. But I am asking the minister whether he is saying that expenditures to Ford Motor Company will be deemed to be expenditures out of the consolidated fund, even though they are out of the revolving account.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — The expenditures have always been made out of the consolidated fund. Now with the change, they will be a budgetary expenditure, and will be audited as any other budgetary expenditure.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, we’re using “budgetary” in an odd phrase here. I want the minister to tell me: suppose he took the estimates for revenue, supply and services for this year, and suppose the system were in effect, where would the million dollars for Ford Motors show up in the estimates? In my understanding it won’t. Only the net difference in cash for the revolving fund will show up in the estimates, so don’t please tell me it’s an estimated amount.

And so you are telling me the consolidated fund is going to spend a bunch of money that doesn’t show up in the estimates, and I’m having a little trouble with that. I’m having a little trouble with your telling me that we are going to pass an appropriation bill which adds up to X dollars here — whatever, \$2.5 billion, let’s say — and in that is a revenue, supply, and services estimate, let’s say for next year, which has \$50,000 being the net increase in cash for the revolving funds. Central vehicle agency. Let’s use some figures.

Now then, you are telling me that not the \$50,000 but the several million dollars to \$15 million or \$20 million that the central vehicle agency will spend next year is a budgetary expenditure but doesn’t show up anywhere in the budget. And I’m having trouble with that, and I want you to take me through it.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Let me try an example. This is under revenue CVA, okay? We’ll take an expenditure of \$10 million and take revenue of \$8 million, and that \$2 million will show up under estimates. All right? Now, the breakdown of \$10 million of expenditures (I believe it’s over \$10,000, am I correct?) will show up in *Public Accounts* and in the financial statements, as well as the breakdown of the revenue. The \$8 million

will be broken down and will show up under the statement in *Public Accounts* — two places.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, I have that interesting statement from the minister and that's not what he told me the last time. He said it would be a budgetary expenditure . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That is exactly what we're getting at, that the budget has the \$2 million in it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, all right. But the spending is \$10 million in your example. Now, it's the details of the \$10 million I want, not the 2. Now, the 2 is in the budget; the other 8 is not in the budget. Now you're telling me the budgetary expenditure adds up to more than the budget. Is that what you're telling me? Okay, I'll try again.

Let's take revenue, supply and services on your example. The budget will have \$2 million in it. Yes, indeed, using the ones that are being you — \$3,553,500. All right. But your example, \$2 million. The spending is going to be \$10 million in that example. Now, I am sure that there is probably some requirement that this \$10 million be disclosed, but where?

AN HON. MEMBER: — *Public Accounts*.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — No, no, I'm sorry, I am not asking the right question. Where is the legal requirement? Because up to now we have had budgetary expenditure and advance accounts and that's all. I don't know of any of these revolving funds. If we've had them, perhaps somebody would refer me to them directly — where is the authority? — it's under The Department of Finance Act.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, let's not hesitate a moment, then. Just tell me where it is.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, if I may, just while the two member are . . . My officials are looking it up and the member on the other side is looking it up. I'd like to point out to the hon. member, looking at the new estimates, you will note . . . Take page 81, if you'd like to go to page 81. These budgetary items that are referred to being net, never showed up before. Under your system they weren't there. They were never there. Now we're showing them. Now they're here, which is something you didn't have before. Furthermore, I'm advised that you had agreed to this when you were still the government; that you initiated it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I'm well aware of the idea that we were going to take out of the consolidated fund the net loss of the net income of advance accounts. No one denies that. I am now focussing on how you're gong to account for them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, Mr. Speaker, you conspicuously haven't told me.

I have my own views as to whether this is a good system. I think what we're doing is not a good system. I mean, I think the whole bill, in my opinion, gives (and I will speak a little more broadly, Mr. Chairman), I think it gives the legislature every bit as good, perhaps better, control over the advance accounts than we had before. It gives the Department of Finance every bit as good, and perhaps better, control than we had before. I think it gives the managers very much poorer tools. I think it's going to be much, much better to know what a highway costs you now, or how much the repairs to a highway cost, if

you're not billing out things in quite the same way. You don't have to make that advance account show a profit or a loss.

That's a broader issue. I think that it's a good control tool and a bad management tool, and you pay your money on those. Right now, I'm talking about the auditing, and I'm puzzled by where this stuff is going to show up . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'll listen to the minister and perhaps learn something.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I hope you can. You're never too old, Mr. Member. Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the hon. member to refer to chapter D-15, clause 8, which states that the comptroller's duties will be to:

- (d) maintain or cause to be maintained the appropriation accounts and financial accounts relating to the operations of the consolidated fund;
- (e) prepare the public accounts and any financial statements and reports that may be required by the treasurer or the board . . .

Then I would ask the hon. member to refer to clause 22 of the same act — the accounts relating to consolidated fund:

The Provincial Auditor shall examine in such manner as he may deem necessary the accounts relating to the consolidated fund and to public property, and shall ascertain whether in his opinion:

- (a) the accounts have been faithfully and properly kept;
- (b) all public money has been fully accounted for and properly disposed of, and the rules and procedures applied are sufficient to secure an effective check on the assessment, collection and proper allocation of the revenue;
- (c) money expended has been applied to the purposes for which it was appropriated by the Legislature and the expenditures have adequate statutory authority.
- (d) essential records are maintained and the rules and procedures applied are sufficient to safeguard and control public property.

I trust this will satisfy the member.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I hear what he says and I think we all noted exactly what he read:

The comptroller shall: prepare the public accounts and any financial statements and reports as may be required by the treasurer or the (treasury) board.

But if the treasurer or the treasury board doesn't required them, then there aren't any.

Then we go over to the provincial auditor's duties. The reading of section 8 simply says that the comptroller shall do what the Minister of Finance says, which is all very interesting but not relevant. I was asking for the statutory obligation to prepare and publish, and to say that the comptroller shall do as the Minister of Finance says doesn't advance us very far along that road.

I'm just dealing with section 8 now. Are you in any doubt that that helps your cause? Are you asserting that to say that the comptroller shall prepare reports which are required by the treasury board in any way suggests that the government has an obligation to publish anything? I hope not.

Now we go on to section 22, where there are some obligations.

The Provincial Auditor shall examine in such manner he may deem necessary the accounts relating to the consolidated fund . . .

I guess we have to establish whether these revolving funds are part of the consolidated fund. I suppose that to be true, but I sure don't know.

I'm not sure whether we're going to get any farther than this. But as I say, it appears to me, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, that the only obligation is on the auditor; there is none on any public official. The auditor's obligations are restricted to the consolidated fund and, I know, in another act, the heritage fund, and in various specialized acts, and in the revenue, supply and services act which we have. Well, that's the issue — whether these revolving funds are part of the consolidated fund. It is far from simple to see how this is going to be done. If you look at financial statements of the consolidated fund which are here in any *Public Accounts* I'm darned if I know where they're going to go show up in these consolidated funds . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Go ahead. Just take me through it.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — If I refer the hon. member to the new bill, okay, and clause 3 subject to subsection (13) . . . Just a minute. I've got the wrong one here. Here, I have it here somewhere . . . Bill 56, not 54, clause 28, subparagraph (4):

Subject to subsection (11), the Minister of Finance shall pay out of the consolidated fund on behalf of the revolving fund, any sum of money the minister may require . . .

So it's part of the consolidated fund . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Page 3. Do you have Bill 56 there? All right. Section 28, clause (4):

Subject to subsection (11), the Minister of Finance shall pay out of the consolidated fund . . .

So it becomes part of the consolidated fund. Just one more point: the expenditures from the consolidated fund which these revolving fund expenditures will be (this is what it says) must be reported and audited as required by the finance act.

Any deviation from this practice would result (I'm sure the hon. member knows that) in the provincial auditor reporting this deviation to the legislature.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I won't pursue this further. The minister is saying (and I don't doubt it) that the revolving funds are going to be part of the consolidated fund and that they are going to be accounted for in the same way as the consolidated expenditures. There's got to be some new way because I'm not aware of any subfunds in the consolidated fund.

We are going to see (and I don't say that there's anything wrong with it) significantly higher expenditures out of the consolidated fund than the amounts appearing in the

appropriation act. That follows as the night the day . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, but this book of estimates which purports at the top to say consolidated fund and at the end when we vote, the total will not longer be the total money spent out of the consolidated fund, because there are now going to be expenditures out of the consolidated fund which are not voted by the legislature.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — A final comment, Mr. Chairman. First of all, this change has come about from a request or a direction, I suppose, from your government. The net expenditures, as will be outlined, now have never been shown in the past at all. You never accounted for that before. Now they'll be accounted for, in that sense.

The further accounting, as has been indicated from the authority and the direction and everything else, will show up in your *Public Accounts* as they always have, as well as the revenues from those — the totals not just the nets. Really that's about all I have to say on it. I trust that satisfies the hon. member.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I don't intend to pursue the matter further. It is just that we all should understand that we are using new labels. These estimates which say, "Consolidated Funds, Summary of Budgetary Revenue and Expenditure," will no longer be what we call them. They are not even that this time. It is no longer true to say that in revenue, supply and services, the budgetary expenditure of the central vehicle agency is \$3.5 million. That's the only one you put in the budget. But as the act says, there are a whole bunch of other expenses which are out of the consolidated fund. Fair enough. I understand what's going on. I'm just very, very confused about the terminology which is being used here.

Up to now, the consolidated fund has meant, "This money." In this year, \$2,839,000,000 was the money spent out of consolidated fund. Here it was all listed. In this year, whenever this comes into effect, there will be substantial additional funds out of the consolidated fund, pursuant to 28(4), which will not show up in these figures, but they will be treated in the same way as advance accounts were. Now, advance accounts, we admitted, weren't part of the consolidated fund. We are now in effect lumping some revolving funds which we say, in this hand, are part of the consolidated fund, and, in this hand, are not part of the consolidated fund. Those are not going to show up in these totals.

That is, to put it mildly, a confusing use of the term consolidated fund. I don't object to it, because I suppose we'll get used to it, and we'll figure out that this doesn't really mean consolidated fund without the revolving accounts, but only the nets on the revolving accounts one way or the other, and that we are using in the act, the words "consolidated fund" in a sense different than we are using it over here in the appropriation bill. But, if that's the way you want to go, we'll figure it out in due course. I suppose we'll know what the government has in mind by pursuing the documents they publish.

MR. KOSKIE: — I wonder if he could just, in rather brief, succinct, and precise terms, indicate to us the reasons and the advantages of proceeding this way? I want you to summarize as precisely, succinctly, crisply, clearly, why you are doing it: the advantages of it; and the ways in which it tends to increase the accountability to this legislature.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — It came about as a criticism and a recommendation of the

provincial auditor. His statements: “One, advance accounts are really a means of deferring the recording of expenditures.” I think you’d agree with that. And, “Expenditures for assets, for example, buildings, equipment and machines were being treated as a budgetary capital expenditure even though they are used for program delivery in future years.”

It was in fact an inconsistency in the method of accounting before. I cited some examples. Yet, on the other hand, vehicles, equipment for highways were treated as non-budgetary expenditures.

Now, in addition to that — that was the auditor’s side — on the management side, to gain better control. In the past, neither the legislature nor the treasury board had much control over disbursement of moneys. Budgeted expenditures of advance accounts are not in estimates, therefore budgets are not scrutinized and departments can change expenditure levels during the year without treasury board approval. Finally, the budgets of user departments were scrutinized but by then the advance account had already spend the money.

So that is, as clearly as I can give it to you, the reason for doing it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, it doesn’t matter which way we come at this there will be inconsistencies. I don’t quarrel with the objectives; I think that they will give better control and I think they will make a number of management decisions harder.

I think that the central vehicle agency, for example, which was set up by Mr. Thatcher’s government, was set up to give better control over automobile expenses, and I think it has done that. It’s been a good operation. It no longer is assumed that automobiles are free if you have one. If you got one last year then the only cost of operating a car is the operating expenses, which is a fiction, as we all know. The central vehicle agency has made those types of managerial decisions better, and similarly ones with respect to the use of highway equipment. They now can cost out pretty well what it costs them to run a highway maintenance crew in a way which is important if we’re going to have those managerial controls. Obviously they ought not to be able to run them at a deficit because that’s a way of getting money out of the treasury without ever having it voted. I guess we know that.

The question I ask is whether or not the revolving funds will operate on essentially the same basis as the advance accounts with respect to charging out fees for their services — let us say, for automobiles, for highway equipment, for staff housing, and the other big items that are run through advance accounts.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Very simply, you’re right. It will remain unchanged.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 as amended agreed to.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We have a House amendment.

MR. KOSKIE: — I would just like an explanation from the minister as to the purpose of striking out “or payment was made” as contemplated under amending clause 28.1(c). What is the purpose of striking out ‘or payment was made’?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I’m advised it’s a typographical error. The words in the original bill in 28(c) in the last sentence “or payment” shouldn’t have been there. We just took it out. We refer only to deposits.

MR. KOSKIE: — You never intended to put “on the date of each deposit” or “payment was made”? Is that what you’re saying?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — That’s correct.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5 as amended agreed.

Clauses 6 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act

Clause 1

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two officials from the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services, Mr. Keith Laxdal, and Mr. Murray Schafer.

MR. KOSKIE: — I’ve had an opportunity to review this one. I don’t think that we will be having any problems. There was one minor point that I will be raising in 7.1(1)(a). Just in reference it says, in reference to an act. I’m wondering whether it should be specific to this act, or whether it’s broad in the sense to any act. For instance, in the finance act, the provision provides to any act for the Minister of Finance and here it says, “to an Act.” I am not clear as to that particular revision. So I think we can move along, Madam Minister, and when we come to that clause, then maybe I’ll just ask you for that explanation. But other than that, I think we are in agreement.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

MR. KOSKIE: — Are you clear as to what I am saying, and can you just give me an explanation as to what that means: “imposed pursuant to an Act”? As I say, in The Department of Finance Act, I looked at the provision there. It says, “to any Act.” But certainly that’s the Minister of Finance has the general power to respect to any act, but I don’t think that’s the intention here. And so, should this not be more specific in respect to this act or the acts under the jurisdiction of the department?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The reason for this to refer to “an Act” rather than this act, is

because Department of Revenue, Supply and Services administers grants programs for many other departments. We provide the grants pursuant to other acts particularly in the . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. KOSKIE: — So just to be perfectly clear, what you are really doing is pursuant to an act. It's just any one of those that comes under the jurisdiction which you have to administer. That's what you are saying, eh? Is that correct?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That's correct.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Highways Act

Clause 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Does the minister have some officials to introduce?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, we have Shirley Raab here from finance; Gerry Kraus, comptroller's and finance; and Al Schwartz from highways.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns on this bill. I can understand some of the amendments here may be necessary. But we can see what is happening in this government today in this province. We have just witnessed one other bill that was being dealt with and what was introduced in that bill. We see the same thing happening in Bill 55. And I can remember when the government was in opposition, they continued to holler long and loud that there should be more financial scrutiny of this government and of the expenses of the province.

But what are we hearing today? We don't hear that today. We hear this same government out there saying that we're going to repeal every section of every act in the various departments that says that there will be a requirement for the auditor to scrutinize how they spent their money, or for *Public Accounts* to have any information whatsoever as to how the money was spent and where it was spent.

And they are doing this at the same time when PCs in Ottawa are saying that the federal government should somehow have better and greater financial accountability to the people of Canada. And here in this province they are going exactly the opposite way. They are saying that we want less accountability. The people of this province, they are saying, should not know anything about what is happening in the various departments. And that, Mr. Speaker, I think is a direction that is wrong, a direction that the public is not going to accept and a direction that this government should be changing.

I have a couple of amendments that I am going to be introducing or one amendment, a two-part amendment I am going to be introducing later on. So I think I will allow the House to continue with the business as we don't have that much time on there today to go section by section with the bill. And I will be asking further questions on the bill as we go through it section by section.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Chairman, in this amendment all we are trying to do is assure the people of Saskatchewan that there is going to be some accountability within the departments, and that they are not just going to establish a slush fund there where they can move money from one area to another and from one department to another without the people having the ability to know what is going on. It's a simple amendment. It's one that has always been in. I cannot see the reason why this government should not leave that amendment in place. It is not going to inhibit the ability of the departments to operate. It is just a simple amendment that is going to allow the people to know what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I feel quite confident that the members opposite were not trying to hide anything from the public, that they are prepared to disclose everything as they have always said, and that they are not going to say, "Trust us, but we're not going to tell you anything about what we're doing." If they are really sincere about what they are saying about being open to the public, then they should put this amendment in and let it stand so the public has a way of knowing what is going on with their funds.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, this will be audited by the provincial auditor. This will also be reported in *Public Accounts*. We've gone through this once already by the previous minister. How much more explanation do you want?

MR. LUSNEY: — That's right, Mr. Chairman. They've gone through it with the previous minister, but they didn't really tell us how that's going to be accounted. I can see it saying that it's going to be accountable on the say-so of the minister. If he wants some accountability there, he will ask for it. If he doesn't it won't happen. There will be some accounting by the auditor of the consolidated fund — money that goes to a department. It doesn't say anywhere in this bill that every expenditure within that department will also be recorded.

I am not interested in \$10 million or \$20 million or \$100 million that may go out of the consolidated fund into the Department of Highways. I am concerned, once that money gets into that fund, as to how it's going to be spent and what it was spent on, so there would be some accountability by that department, which won't happen in the audit of the consolidated fund.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, this will be reported in *Public Accounts* the same as any other expenditure in the consolidated funds. Previously, it was an open-ended expenditure of up to \$80 million in the department. Now it will be controlled by a subvote.

MR. LUSNEY: — Are you saying that through the audit of the consolidated fund, you are going to have an itemized audit of the expenditures within the Department of Highways, whether the money was spent for construction, whether it was spent for equipment, whether it was spent to buy a vehicle for somebody, or for a piece of equipment for the department to work with? Are you saying that this is all going to be in that audit, or are you saying that the money that goes into the revolving fund is going to be audited and

there will be a number, a round figure of how much money goes in there, but not real accountability as to how that money was spent, where it was spent, and how much of it was spent out of that department or out of that revolving fund?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Yes, it is going to be exactly as you have stated. It is going to be reported by the Department of Highways in *Public Accounts*.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Minister, you are saying that in the audit of the consolidated fund, the Department of Highways will have a total expenditure itemized as to what they spent, how they spent it, and they will be all contained in the audit of the consolidated fund? The money that was put in, the money that went out, and what money may be left in the fund: is that what you are saying?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Yes.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 53 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 2)

Clause 1

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, with respect to this bill, what is the intention with respect to the payment for Mr. Speaker? Take me through a sequence, if you would, of a change of Speaker, and tell me who gets paid for what.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Okay, in the past, until a new Speaker was chosen, the old Speaker was not paid. Now under the new provisions, the old Speaker will still be paid until a new Speaker is in place, except for maybe one day. This has all gone through the board of internal economy and is a recommendation.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I understood that with some clarity. My problem was with the bill, section 5 and section 8(2). On the face of it, they are contradictory, but with perhaps a saving provision. It's a question of which applies. Section 5 says, the person who holds the Speaker shall be paid until the next session. Section 8 says, when a person is elected Speaker, he shall be deemed to have been Speaker effective from the day he was elected. Obviously, those are contradictory, unless we are going to pay for two Speakers.

Then we have a little provision which says,

... but, when the occupant of the position changes, the member succeeding to the position is deemed to have occupied the position from the day following the day on which is predecessor ceased to occupy the position.

What I am asking you to do is assume that this bill was in place, and take me through who would be paid what in calendar '82.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition, we will bring in a House amendment to clarify that. It should say, “until elected as a Speaker.” We’ll bring in a House amendment. If we can go to some of the others, we’ll bring that House amendment back to you.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — That clears it up a good deal for me. I was confused.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I agree with clause 3, as I have said on second reading. I agree with the proposition that MLAs should get an additional 6.5 per cent, and that cabinet ministers and leaders of the opposition and the like, should get no increase. I agree with it simply because of the symbolic position taken by the government, or the position taken by the government, that the wages of other persons in public office should be restrained. I am by no means convinced that that is adding to our recovery, and I will resist the temptation to get into a little debate on the whole wage restraint program. I don’t want anything I said here to be taken as agreeing with the wage restraint program. But given the fact that other people are going to be restrained, then I most emphatically agree that this should apply to MLAs, and it should apply to those others of us who have offices in this legislature.

I further think, in the same vein, that our money ought not to be forthcoming until some other people get some money in this province, and those people are the people who you’ve heard me speak of before, Mr. Chairman, and that is people who are on minimum wage who have not got anything on July 1 and are not going to get anything on January 1, like we are. And we are going to make this retroactive for ourselves, and that is reasonable since our schedule had run out, as I understand it. But having regard to the fact that we are looking after ourselves during calendar ’82 in a way which I think is quite appropriate, and I’m not suggesting any impropriety on your part or mine, sir.

I think that we ought to have regard to some people in this community who are somewhat worse off than we are, and in many cases a great deal worse off than we are.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Well, two or three points, Mr. Chairman. First of all, right now it is in the bill, and if this amendment doesn’t come in, the industry composite index on January 1 would go to 10 per cent. We’re saying they’ve got to take less, down to 6.5, and no one is really forcing anyone to just have to pay the minimum wage. It’s up to the employer. If he wants to pay them more, that’s his choice.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

Clause 6

MR. LUSNEY: — I have a little question on that one. Clause 6 repeals section 49, and that’s the sessional allowance. Have you got something in place that will replace clause 48 that will allow or indicate to us what the sessional allowance is going to be in the future?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Section 49, with its being repealed, is now moved into section 64.

MR. LUSNEY: — There is no figure, Mr. Minister, as to what the amount is going to be that will be advanced in the sessional allowance. Could the minister indicate what that amount is going to be?

HON. MR. GARNER: — I'll read to the member from our little *Members' Handbook*, page 2, sessional allowance:

Each Member who attends the Session or a meeting of a committee during the Session is entitled to a Sessional Allowance of \$6,579 . . .

The amount of it is set in section 42 of the bill.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, we are now I take it going to be entitled to draw the daily allowance regularly, and I suppose that at the end if it isn't all taken up when the prorogation comes, we'll get what's left.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Also, it's pretty well the same as before. Under section 64.1(3) you have to sign the declaration. So if you aren't here, you don't get it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, what we're doing then is taking the annual allowance and the sessional allowance, rolling them together, saying that they're paid out on a daily basis, and if it doesn't eat it all up then we get what's left. Have I got that right?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Your sessional allowance is \$50, your per diem is 71 for rural, 45 for city. You can now receive that every two weeks as long as you sign the declaration.

MR. KOSKIE: — Just for a point of clarification. In the past we had the option of whether you took the weekly advance or whether you did not take it. Is that same provision or option there?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Yes, that's entirely up to you, freedom of choice — your choice or not.

Clauses 6 agreed to.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clause 8 stood.

Clauses 9 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 13 as amended agreed to.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Clause 15

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I don't want to belabor this

point, but it seems to me that we should understand what we're doing here, in making the Legislative Library a repository of a very, very large amount of written material. If they have to deposit six copies of every government publication, and there are a very large number of them — I don't know whether it includes leaflets put in power bills and these sorts of things or not, that are published — but there's going to be a lot of them over a period of ten years. We are probably going to have to have a look at this and exclude some of it because there's no earthly reason for keeping some of it. I don't have any answer as to which and which, but I make that point and doubtless the board of internal economy will grapple with that years hence.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 15 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 16 and 17 agreed to.

Clause 8

HON. MR. GARNER: — I have the amendment here:

Amend subsection 60(2) as enacted by subsection 8(1) of the printed bill by striking out, "the polling day on which he was elected a member" and substituting "the day on which he was elected Speaker or Deputy Speaker."

Amendment agreed to.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and, Mr. Minister, the arrangement we now have is that the old Speaker will continue to be paid up to the day, or the day before, the new Speaker is elected. Then the new Speaker will commence to be paid. We'll always have one Speaker of the House who will be recognized as such, and paid as such. We'll never have two, and we'll always have one. That's what we're intending to do, is it? Except for one . . . (inaudible) . . . of the day before.

HON. MR. GARNER: — I couldn't have said it better myself, sir.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Clause 18

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to move an amendment to this:

That subsection 18(1) of the printed bill be amended by striking out "on the day of assent" in the first and second lines and substituting the following: "30 days after the effective date of the next increase in the Saskatchewan minimum wage."

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Just a couple of brief remarks. If this is delayed, I don't want to see the MLAs getting an increase more than what we are setting as a guideline in the province of Saskatchewan. That's why we will be opposing this amendment.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, some member opposite is suggesting that this is going to put more money in somebody's pocket. It does nothing of the kind. There is no possible way that that could in any way increase anybody's remuneration. Let me read that amendment again because obviously some people were not listening. What it says is that the increases in this bill are exactly as set out in the bill, but that we shall not get

them until the minimum wage is increased. This just says that yes, we agree with what the government is saying; yes, we agree that 6.5 per cent is an appropriate figure; yes, we are doing our part in the restraint program.

We're just saying that we should continue to do our part with a zero increase until people on minimum wage get an increase, because that is what they're getting — zero. And they haven't had an increase since January 1, 1982. They had not on July 1, 1982, and we got increases and are about to get an increase. They're not going to get one on January 1, 1983, and it's a point that we have made before, and I think a valid point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GARNER: — Just two points, Mr. Chairman. Number one, the provision is already in the act that it would be automatic, that 10 per cent increase on January 1. One other point for the member opposite: it was a unanimous decisions by the board of internal economy, and there are members on that board from both sides of the House.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Blakeney
Koskie

Engel
Lusney

Lingenfelter
Shillington

Nays — 34

Birkbeck
Rousseau
Hardy
Garner
Duncan
Weiman
Sauder
Meagher
Caswell
Embury
Folk
Baker

Taylor
Pickering
McLeod
Klein
Schoenhals
Hodgins
Petersen
Schmidt
Gerich
Dirks
Zazelenchuk

Andrew
Sandberg
McLaren
Katzman
Boutin
Sveinson
Glauser
Hopfner
Domotor
Hepworth
Johnson

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I would like to make a couple of comments on this bill. I think I would like to go back and explain the procedure that we set up in the previous legislature as to how we would handle any increases for members of the Assembly. I think, to lay the groundwork, one has to go back and look at and remember the system that was in place before for a long period of time. And the rules committee that was struck in the previous legislature tried to deal with the question. I believe the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg was on that committee along with myself, and the member for Maple Creek, and the former attorney general. The problem that we tried to address with this type of a system of the board of internal economy was to get away from the previous system by which members set their salaries. And really if we get down to it, the way salaries were set in the past for elected members of the Assembly, quite frankly, was, I believe, very unparliamentary, because I was involved in a couple of those and saw how it worked. And what would happen is, near the end of the session, a couple of senior members from both sides of the House would literally get together in a backroom over a bottle of spirits and try to work something out. And quite frankly, that was, I thought, a very unacceptable system, and I think the members of the committee thought it was an unacceptable system.

As a result, what we did was structure a committee, a referred to as the board do internal economy, that dealt with a lot of problems, as they related to the members of the Assembly generally. We tried to, if we could, depoliticize that whole process. I think it was fundamental. We copied the mechanism in place in the province of Ontario, the mechanism in place in Ottawa, and in some of the other jurisdictions — I believe Alberta. We then struck a committee that was composed of two members of cabinet, two members of the government back benches, two members of the opposition. They then would get together to determine not only the salary of members but the entire budget of the Legislative Assembly. That mechanism was taken out of the Department of Finance, or the traditional budgeting system of government was placed to the members. Their responsibility quite frankly was to account to the Assembly, and to account to the people for the system. The net result of that is that we sat down as a committee, the board of internal economy. The member for Pelly is a member of that committee now along with, I believe, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg who are on that committee as NDP, or as opposition members.

And we through this mechanism, quite frankly, and we decided as a committee to recommend what this bill in fact contained. And that was to freeze the salary of all cabinet minister, to freeze the salary of the Leader of the Opposition. And I might say he concurred in that. It was not something that we did. That's the reason for, and the importance of, this particular system that we have.

We froze the salaries of all the members of the Assembly that make a little more money than the rest of us, the rest of the people: the cabinet minister, the Leader of the Opposition, the legislative secretaries the whips, committee chairmen, the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, committee chairman for crown corporations and public accounts. We did that.

We then went back to address the question with regard to elected members of the Assembly. What we did there was determine that . . . Quite frankly, I think the feeling of that committee was that, while the general public out there might assume that the

politicians are overpaid, make too much money, have it rolling out of their pockets, I think we, collectively in this Assembly, know better. There is a lot of work involved, whether you are an opposition member, whether you are a government member, a backbencher or on treasury benches. It's not peculiar to the present opposition. I think in fairness, probably the present government when they were in opposition tried to score political points out of the mentality out there, or the feeling out there that elected members of the Assembly were paid too much money. And I suppose that's fair game. I think really that's what we're dealing with here today. I think it's unfortunate because that was the hope of the board of internal economy, that we could try in some way to get away from that. So this particular bill was moved by me as a member of the board of internal economy and as a member of the treasury benches of this government. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, it was seconded by the member for Pelly. It was unanimously agreed to by the board of internal economy.

The reason for the amendment quite frankly, was that there is an automatic system that we saw as a proper way of dealing with elected members' salaries in the future. What we did was tie (when I say "we" I mean the previous government but in conjunction with the opposition and talking to the opposition) the salaries of members of the legislature to the industrial composite index. The problem we faced this year, quite frankly, was the fact that our industrial composite index will be coming in anywhere from 10.6 per cent to 12.2 per cent.

We thought it quite frankly unfair, given the downturn in the economy and given the fact that some people of course don't have jobs and those that do are getting a lower increase whether they are with government or with the private sector, for us to go beyond that. It would in fact look bad. As a group of elected members, we all would look bad. As a result, we moved to put it under the guidelines.

I think, as most people know, our guidelines are probably close to 7 per cent for the year 1983 in this province. We moved that down to 6.5 per cent, recognizing the fact that many members of this Assembly do not make a lot of money. I don't think there's one of us that would attest to the fact that we're paid too much. I don't think there's one of us who would attest to the fact that we probably couldn't go out of this place and make more money working for some other institution, be it in the private or the public sector. I think we all probably could, if we put as much work into it as we put into this Assembly.

I would request the members opposite, in keeping with the important principle of the board of internal economy, that when we come to the final vote on section 18 to vote as a group one way or the other — I would suggest, as a unanimous recommendation. I would request, in the interests of the Legislative Assembly and the parliamentary process, that we have a unanimous vote when it comes to section 18.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Is the issue before the House section 18 or that the committee report the bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The issue before the committee is section 18.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I want to respond to what the Minister of Finance has said. I want to say that we intend to support section 18 and to

support the bill, as we had earlier indicated at the time of second reading — that we would be supporting this bill as it stood. We will continue to do. I commend all members of the House indeed for arriving at what is a more effective way of attempting to deal with compensation for members of the legislature. I give full credit to the Minister of Finance and others who have promoted this proposal as it operated in part under our government and now under your government.

It was certainly not our intention to undermine any bipartisan spirit. We have not taken the position that we were departing from that. My colleagues, the member for Pelly and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, briefly advised me that the levels of remuneration had been agreed to by the board of internal economy, but that there had been no particular discussion on the coming into force. I may well have misunderstood the nature of the agreement and accordingly may well have departed in moving my amendment from that which had been agreed, although I must say that was not my information.

In any case, I simply want to make the point, firstly, that we did not move the amendment in order to depart from the bipartisan approach to remuneration by members of the legislature. We did not do it in order to in any way attempt to make any point, other than the one which we have attempted to make on many occasions, not related, by the way, to remuneration of members of the legislature. And accordingly, with that explanation, I will supporting section 18. I suspect my colleagues will as well. As previously indicated, we will be supporting the bill.

Clause 18 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 58 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the realignment of the administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 60 — An Act respecting Prairie and Forest Fires

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

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, by leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act

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

time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, by leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services (No. 2)

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

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, by leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

No. 33 — An Act to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act

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

Motion agreed to and bill red a third time.

Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Highways Act

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

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

Bill No. 53 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 2)

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

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. GARNER: — By leave now, I move this bill be now read a third time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we earlier had a discussion with respect to this bill in committee and it occurred to me when the discussion was over that we might adopt a practice of restricting bills when we provide for remuneration of MLAs to that subject only. It occurred to me that I might have taken an objection to something on the Speaker or somebody else, and would have caused a difficulty which would not have been intended to raise a political issue on the matter of remuneration. I thought I would make that point.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 1:40 p.m. His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the following bills:

Bill No. 30 — An Act respecting the Department of Culture and Recreation

Bill No. 31 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Department of Culture and Recreation Act

Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Lloydminster Hospital Act, 1948

Bill No. 35 — An Act to amend The Land Surveys Act

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act

Bill No. 22 — an Act to provide for the Taxation of Freehold Oil and Gas Production

Bill No. 23 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Freehold oil and Gas Production Tax Act

Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Conflict of Interests Act

Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend The Statutes Act

Bill No. 45 — An Act to establish a Program to Facilitate Financing the Purchase of Farm Land

Bill No. 46 — An Act to repeal The Land Bank Act and to make Certain Temporary Provisions for Lessees

Bill No. 43 — An Act respecting Powers of Attorney

Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act

Bill No. 52 — An Act to amend The Heritage Property Act

Bill No. 44 — An Act to amend The Department of Finance Act

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Election Act

Bill No. 51 — An Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979

Bill No. 57 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 59 — An Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources Act

December 17, 1982

Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act

Bill No. 53 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act

Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Highways Act

Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 58 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the realignment of the administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan

Bill No. 60 — An Act respecting Prairie and Forest Fires

His Honor retired from the Chamber at 1:44 p.m.

MOTION

House Adjournment

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Bob Andrew, Minister of Finance, the member for Kindersley:

That by leave of the Assembly, that when this Assembly adjourns at the end of this sitting day, it shall stand adjourned to a date set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government, and that Mr. Speaker shall give each member seven clear days notice, if possible by wire and registered mail, of such date

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, we are drawing very close to the festive season. I can imagine each and every member of this Assembly, as well as those very talented members from the press gallery and the government officials who are here today, are looking forward to going home and spending Christmas with their families and loved ones. I would like to, on behalf of the government, extend a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to each and every one of you, and especially to you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, with leave, I would like to extend the same greetings to you, Mr. Speaker, and your family, and members of the Assembly, members of the press, and government officials who were waiting for estimates. I'm sure each and every one of you will want to take time during the festive season to be with your families. I'm sure we all appreciate the opportunity to do that and look forward to coming back and carrying on government business early in the new year. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I would like to join with the two members in wishing the whole House a very happy holiday season. I'm sure you have worked hard and you are deserving of rest and time of fellowship with family and friends.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:48 p.m.