

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 14, 1984

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CLERK: — I hereby present and lay on the Table the following petitions by Mr. Young, of Eric Reid, Douglas A. Schmeiser, Clarence J. Kirkpatrick, Phillip Griffin-Warwicke, and Donald W. Somers, all of the city of Saskatoon, in the province of Saskatchewan, and by Mr. Tusa, of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited and Saskatchewan Co-operative Financial Services Limited, both of the city of Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Sixth Report of the Standing Committee On Communication

CLERK ASSISTANT: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Communication, presents the sixth report of the said committee which is as follows: the committee has adopted the Saskatchewan Legislative Library's annual report for the period, November 1, 1982 to October 31, 1983 and the Records Retention and Disposal Recommendations of Sessional Paper 207 of 1983-84.

MR. YOUNG: — I move:

That the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Communication be now concurred in.

Seconded by the member for The Battlefords.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would be interested to know what date that meeting took place that the report is coming out of. Members of the opposition, if it is a meeting that happened this past week, were not made aware of the meeting. In fact, we got a note which was subsequently cancelled by a phone call to our office, and I'd be interested in knowing the detail of that meeting.

MR. YOUNG: — Yes, the meeting was duly called for this morning.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, I move the debate be now adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Tuesday next I shall move first reading of a Bill to amend The Occupational Health and Safety Act.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall, on Tuesday, move first reading of a Bill, an Act respecting Securities in Saskatchewan.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this House, a group 15 grade 12 students from Miller

Comprehensive High School in the city of Regina. They are accompanied by their teacher, Vaughn McIntyre, and they're presently sitting in the Speaker's gallery.

I hope that you find your visit to the legislature this morning both interesting and beneficial. I would like to inform you that I will be meeting with you immediately after question period in the rotunda for pictures and, following that, in the members' dining room for refreshments, and I would ask that the member of both sides of the House join in extending a warm welcome to our guests this morning.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RYBCHUK: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Miller Comprehensive High School borders the constituency of Regina Victoria, I am sure that a number of those students must live in the constituency of Regina Victoria, and being their MLA for Regina Victoria, I would also take the opportunity to welcome them here this morning.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Premier. It's now been 16 days . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. We were still on introduction of guests, and not it's oral questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Health Services in the Athabasca Basin

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question this morning to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, my question is regarding the health services and the plans for hospital facilities in the far North. Can the minister tell the House the status of the Uranium City Hospital? With respect to medical doctors, is the arrangement of bringing doctors to Uranium City through the University of Saskatchewan working; and do you have plans to open hospital facilities of any kind in the nearby community of Fond-du-Lac, Stony Rapids, or Black Lake?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question regarding health services in the Athabasca Basin, at the present time it is the intention to keep the hospital at Uranium City open. We are coming forward with some plans that will certainly supply a constant supply of medical doctors into Uranium City and up the west side of the province in La Loche, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Uranium City.

MR. THOMPSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. The minister will know that both Black lake and Fond-du-Lac fall under federal Department of Indian Affairs jurisdiction. Has his department been exploring the possibility of getting federal funds to help build hospital facilities in either one of those communities or in Stony Rapids?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — The discussions with the federal government regarding health services in the Athabasca Basin, Mr. Minister, have been basically on supply of physicians. And the arrangement that I will be announcing in due course, in the not too distant future, of an assured physician supply for that area, is a joint co-operative venture between the federal government and the provincial government regarding doctor supply.

MR. THOMPSON: — New question, Mr. Speaker, and by way of information, Mr. Minister, and I most certainly urge you to expand hospital facilities in that region. Is the minister aware of a case of Mrs. Albertine Roy of Stony Rapids . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, if the minister from Prince Albert-Duck Lake will just hold his cool for a second here.

Mr. Minister, Mrs. Roy was 40 years old and a mother of nine children, and she had been suffering severe headaches for many weeks and had complained to the doctor who visits Stony Rapids once a week, and also to the nurse. The doctor had booked space in a Saskatoon hospital for her on Wednesday, December 5th. She was to be flown down on a scheduled flight Tuesday, December 4th.

The day prior to that, on Sunday, her headaches became so severe that she went to the public health nurse and asked to be flown out immediately by air ambulance. She went there with her daughter, who I spoke to last night. She was sent home with pain-killers. Later that night, between 5 in the morning and 8 o'clock that morning, this mother, 40-year-old mother of nine children, died.

And, Mr. Minister, I do not blame the nurse. Throughout the North, life and death decisions, which should be handled by medical doctors and which require hospital facilities, are being forced onto the public health nurses in these small clinics.

Is the minister aware of this case, and, if not, will he promise a full investigation and a full report to the Assembly?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I would have to inform the minister I'm not aware of the case. I'm sure he knows that I will do a full investigation of all of the situations surrounding this passing of this lady. I'm sorry to hear of that passing, and I think you know from my past reputation that there will be a very full inquiry, and I'll report back to you on Monday.

MR. THOMPSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister will be aware that I have indicated to you on many occasions in here that health services in the far northern regions were dangerously low, and I urge him to take a serious look at setting up hospital facilities in that region in the Stony Lake area, and I'm sure that the minister will agree that cases like this should never take place. It's a serious situation. And I would also ask him when he is looking into this investigation, would he also investigate — there was a 12-year-old girl who also died en route from Stony rapids to Saskatoon, and I'd ask him if he would also investigate that situation.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm saddened to hear of these cases. of course, there are deaths in Saskatchewan and in other areas also in the transport of people, sometimes inevitable. And we all feel deeply grieved when this happens. Certainly I will look into these situations.

And I think, and I will get back to what I said earlier, the very fact that we have worked out a solution to physician supply in northern Saskatchewan, up the north-west side, which has been a problem for many years in this province — we have come to a solution between the federal government and the provincial government — I think that is an indication of the sincerity of this government to providing the best health services possible for the people of northern Saskatchewan and for Saskatchewan as a whole. And I thank you for bringing this to my attention, and you have my assurance that we will look into it in both cases and report back to you. Thank you.

Waiting Lists in Saskatoon Hospitals

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would direct my supplement to the Minister of Health, related to the question asked by the member from Athabasca. The arrangement that you have with the North is one of doctors flying in, and patients hopefully flying out, when they need attention, to Saskatoon, a system that my colleague is saying and has said continually for the past year is not working because of the lack of doctors, the lack of hospitals, and the lack of air flights out. I would ask you as well, Mr. Minister, if the problem of waiting lists in Saskatoon does not also add to that. And I quote here from the *Star-Phoenix* which says:

Almost 5,000 people are now on a waiting list at the three hospitals, some waiting as long as nine months.

Mr. Minister, I would ask you whether or not you are doing some major readjusting of your budget around the cabinet table to take this into consideration that those waiting lists are brought down?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, in regard to . . . I think he asked two questions there. The first one was about people from the North, if the waiting list was affecting their getting into the hospital. I would just want to reiterate that there's the same number of hospitals in the North that there's always been, and I imagine the flights are the same, if not more. So, therefore, when people come out of the North into Saskatoon — where they usually go — they are emergency cases, and I don't think they're subject to any waiting list in that situation.

I should also point out, in answer to that part of the question, which the member opposite obviously overlooked and his colleague knows well, that we are certainly using Uranium City Hospital for the types of procedures that can be performed there. But the people in northern Saskatchewan, when there is more difficult types of surgery and deliveries, require and would like to have the best services, the same as anyone else in Saskatchewan, and that may mean coming to the University Hospital or a Saskatoon hospital. and that is the type of service that is being provided.

As far as the waiting list, which I think was the second part of the member's question, certainly there are some waiting lists in Saskatoon. I want to congratulate the people in the Saskatchewan hospital management who have worked very co-operatively with our department . . . (inaudible) . . . that the member full well knows — he knows — I explained to him in the last session certain things that have taken place.

Renovations at the University Hospital have been set back a bit, so that people, level 4s could be accommodated there. We're working on using the nurses' residence at City Hospital for psychiatric patients. St. Paul's Hospital did not have their slow-down during the summer — did not have the slow-down during the summer that was the pattern of the NDP. That was their way. We went flat out with the A,B,Cs so more people could be accommodated. So I want to say that their waiting lists are being addressed. They're being done in co-operation, in co-operation, Mr. Speaker, between the Department of Health and the hospitals in Saskatoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a supplement to the minister. And it has to do with the waiting list, which I asked in my previous question. you will know that the waiting list in Saskatoon is now 5,000.

I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, the joint planning committee of the Saskatoon hospitals recommended that renovations take place at the three hospitals — City, University, and St. Paul's — that would include spending of \$250 million of 1982 dollars.

I wonder if you can inform me whether or not you have cut that back to \$50 million, and what was the rationale behind that, when the waiting list of 5,000 was to be partially solved by the spending of 250 million?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I answer questions when the facts are right. The minister — the member — is misinformed. He is totally misinformed. The joint hospitals' planning facility group in Saskatoon never ever recommended \$250 million expenditure.

MR. SVEINSON: — . . . (inaudible) . . . waiting lists. My question is again to the Minister of Health. But the waiting lists are a result of underfunding, and there has been an absolute

underfunding by this government in health care in Saskatoon and in Regina. And I ask the minister if he has any plans for a pay-for-stay system that Alberta has now implemented for hospital care, and if he feels that will improve the waiting lists in this province?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite again is wrong in his facts. He says that the waiting lists are all due to underfunding. He should know that the funding of the hospitals in Saskatchewan has increased over the last two years. He should also know, and if he would do a little more studying rather than talking about the United Appeal and not getting his facts right, that there are many factors that make up waiting lists in hospitals — referral patterns, various things.

But I was interested, Mr. Speaker, I was interested to hear the member come forward with the Liberal solution, and that is to put on fees in the hospitals. And I'm very pleased, I'm very pleased to see the stance of the Saskatchewan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please, order. Order, order. It's impossible to carry on question period with that much commotion in the House.

MR. SVEINSON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health. He indicates that funding has increased in Saskatchewan in the last year, and he's right. My facts aren't wrong. But also, the waiting lists have not improved in this province. Also, the hospitals are underfunded. Just talk to any of them in the city of Regina and I think that will be very well substantiated. The plan that you outlined in Alberta, which is pay for stay in hospitals, is not a Liberal plan, it's a Conservative plan. And there are indications that this government may implement that pay-for-stay plan.

I want your answer, Mr. Minister. Will this government, will this government introduce programs in this province affecting health, which will cost the residents at the hospitals, at the hospitals — not through fund raising efforts — but will cost the residents at the hospitals for their stay in these hospitals?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, to a very noisy question, a simple answer is no. It is the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan who today, who today, have put out very clearly what their plan for health care in this province would be, and that would be charges for people in the hospital. I'm glad, sir, that you finally had the courage to stand up and show your true colours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party has a plan, but it's a plan to fund hospitals, look after patients, waiting lists . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order, please. The member is making a speech. If he has a question, a supplementary question, we'll take that.

MR. SVEINSON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. New question. With respect to waiting lists, I think the simple denominator this government doesn't understand is it creates a great deal of consternation with the patient out there who is in a minority position with respect to our health care system.

At the Plains Health Centre, in fact, if you need surgery, open-heart surgery, you face up to a two-month delay in getting into that ward. I would ask you, Mr. Minister: is there more funding forthcoming for the hospitals in Regina to allay the problems of delay in situations that are not

tonsillitis or they're not a matter of tonsils that are being removed — they're serious surgery that has to be done today, not two or three months down the road?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, again my friend from across the way is misinformed. If he would realize that last year at the Plains Hospital in Regina we put extra funds into the budget to increase the number of open-heart surgeries from 12 to 20 a week, I think that's evidence that we're working together with the Plains Hospital.

And I say, "together." And you can go to any hospital in Saskatchewan, any base hospital, and they will tell you that that's a big change in the last two years, that we are working together to solve these problems. The Saskatoon joint planning facility is perhaps the best example of planning between base hospitals and government in the Dominion of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hospital for La Ronge Region

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, in view of the deteriorating public health facilities in the North and the increasing need for health services, can you advise this Assembly and the people of northern Saskatchewan — particularly La Ronge — what the status is with respect to the proposed hospital and a nursing care home for that particular region?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, first of all, I question the words, "deteriorating service." I mean, you know, let's have some substantiation. I think you'd have trouble finding that.

But as to the La Ronge hospital, yes. As with many hospitals in this province, there was a backlog in hospital construction. I had discussion with someone from La Ronge just not too long ago, a person from La Ronge who came in to see me because he felt perhaps maybe here was someone who would listen to him, a person who had his request fallen on deaf ears for a number of years. That person, Mr. Speaker, was none other than a gentleman I admire in La Ronge, namely, Norm MacAuley.

MR. YEW: — Supplementary, Mr. Minister. I'll just repeat my question to the Minister for Health. I ask the minister again: what is the status of the need, the direr need, of a new hospital in La Ronge? What is the status of his hospital and the nursing care home that was in the development stages that was a priority to the residents of this region some two and a half years ago?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I must say that with people from La Ronge, and the latest was Mr. MacAuley who came in and said for years it was falling on deaf ears — he said, "Perhaps, Graham, you would be the kind of person that would listen to us." I was pleased to have Mr. MacAuley come in the day after the opening of the legislature. I believe Mr. MacAuley still is the true voice of that constituency, and we did discuss this, as I do with any other groups.

And I'd be willing to discuss with the people from La Ronge, with their representative. As we know, if you want to . . . Mr. Speaker, if you would like . . . You know, I've heard many times the people from the other side say something about nursing home construction and special care homes. The member is asking about La Ronge, today.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. the members from both sides of the House have been excessively noisy the last two days. The minister is trying to give an answer to a question, asked by a member from this side of the House. He cannot be heard, the member cannot hear the answer, and I would ask for some decorum.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — And the short answer to the question is that we're . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. It's impossible for me to hear what the minister is answering. You're saying what he asked about. I don't know what the minister is answering because I can't hear.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll try again. The discussions with La Ronge are the same as any other community in Saskatchewan, where communities come in and lay out their case, as one of the members of that community did just the day after the opening of this legislature, and we had a good discussion about it.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, if you would afford me the time, I hear the people opposite wondering about nursing home construction in this province. I would like to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Next question. Order, please. I'll take the next question.

MR. YEW: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell the member, the Minister for Health, that I have fought and raised this particular issue in the House in the course of the last two and a half years, and to this point in time you are still evading the question.

What is the status of this hospital?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I am not evading anything. He raised the question. I went to La Ronge, met with the town council, met with the bands. I've been in discussions, the same as we do with any other community in Saskatchewan that wants to have a hospital, and the status is that we're undergoing discussions, the same as we are with many others.

And I can . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you would just be quiet for a minute I can give you . . . I'd be pleased, Mr. Speaker, to read that complete list of beds that have been approved in Saskatchewan since this government took office, and that is a great difference from a moratorium. And if you would like to hear that, I would be glad to share this with the members of the press, the people of Saskatchewan, and the people from the opposition.

Wild Rice Industry

MR. YEW: — A new question, Mr. Speaker, and I direct this to the Minister for Parks and Renewable Resources.

Last week, on December 6th, Mr. Minister, I questioned you regarding your government's position on the wild rice industry. I asked, Mr. Speaker, if his government's review and study of the wild rice industry, one of our most valuable resources in northern Saskatchewan, would be burdened and disrupted by this government's policy review and recommendations. The minister did not deny or confirm my question.

I ask him now, Mr. Speaker, will he assure this House and the people of the North that he will: (1) support the 5 cents per bushel royalty structure now in place and not increase the rates on the wild rice growers; (2) will he support the orderly marketing of wild rice through the existing northern organizations now living in the northern administration district; (3) will he support the northern wild rice growers' co-operatives and associations who want to promote and market this valuable resource themselves; and finally, will he allow Northerners NAD northern wild rice growers living in the NAD and close to the La Ronge and the Nipawin provincial parks to seed and harvest wild rice within the parks? Will the minister, Mr. Speaker, agree with these points and thereby bring an end to the uncertainty which now grips the wild rice industry and growers in northern Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member asked about seven or eight questions

and I don't know how to reply . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's obvious that you can't count. I know that.

I would just like to indicate to the member from Cumberland that back in 1979 we only had 67 permits in the wild rice industry. Today, or this year, we had 1,700 active permits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Some of the permits are in the development stage, but there are 700 that are active. Now that's an increase, a substantial increase, since 1979. Besides that, I'm pleased to say that the Premier attended the official opening of a wild rice processing plant in the North in 1983.

And as far as northern people, if they're interested in growing rice in the North — anywhere — we would appreciate them coming forward and asking for permits on any lakes or bodies of water. We invite them to do that. As a matter of fact, looking at the numbers that I've just mentioned, that's what we call economic development in northern Saskatchewan in creating jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YEW: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask the minister a question on renewable resources, or if he or his officials attended the grand opening of the wild rice harvesters' processing plant. I asked him specific questions about the about the promotion and the marketing and the encouragement to this valuable resource, to the growers of northern Saskatchewan.

And I repeat my question, Mr. Minister: can you tell this House, and specifically the people in northern Saskatchewan, how much money his government has set aside to help promote and market this important new Saskatchewan product? Doesn't the minister understand that effective marketing, promotion and marketing of this product, could be the key to hundreds of new job opportunities in the North? What is he doing to promote and market this product, Mr. Speaker? How many dollars and cents are you prepared to put into this valuable industry?

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the figures speak for themselves. In 1979, we had 67 permit holders, and we are now up to something like 1,700. Now if that isn't job creation, economic development in northern . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. It appears that the members don't want an answer to the question. We'll proceed down the order paper.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 25 — An Bill to provide for the Postponement of the Tabling of Certain Documents

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to provide for the Postponement of the Tabling of Certain Documents.

Motion agreed to.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! Before orders of the day, I'd like to reply to a point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition raised a point of order with regard to the procedure of a minister taking notice of a question, and responding on a

subsequent day. I deferred my ruling at that time in order to review the verbatim record.

There are no rules or specific parliamentary guide-lines to cover the point raised. I have reviewed the practices of the House with regard to the taking of notice of questions during oral question period. It appears to me that the minister on December 12 did offer to take notice of a question but never clearly stated that he would take notice.

I therefore urge ministers to either answer the question, or in some cases where necessary, clearly state to the House that he will take notice and respond to the member on a later day. It has been the practice of this House when a minister takes notice of a question, that only a few supplementaries are permitted to expand and clarify the question, and the remainder are withheld until the minister has familiarized himself with the facts of the situation, and has reported to the House. I'm sure that this clarification of the practices of this House during oral question period will help to guide members in the future.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SVEINSON: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Privilege that I raised yesterday during a brief intervention and prior to orders of the day, signalling my desire to raise the matter of privilege. I have written you, outlining somewhat the detail of the complaint. The subject matter of my question of privilege came to my attention just prior to question period yesterday so that at my earliest convenience I attempted to raise it, asking you yesterday to waive 6(2) in the rules. While you didn't waive the notice on that occasion, I think you'll agree, Mr. Speaker, that I've taken all possible steps to raise this matter at the earliest opportunity.

My question relates to certain actions on the part of the Minister of Highways through his office in relation to persons that I employ, as an MLA, in my office. The minister's conduct, in my judgement, constitutes a calculated attempt on his part to harass and to intimidate those who are in my employ in my capacity as an MLA, thereby interfering with my ability to perform my duties as an MLA, and violating the privileges of a member.

I am advised that on December 12 the minister instructed a person from his office or staff to call upon my office to determine the exact identity of an individual who works for me as a part-time secretary, and I might outline that that is part, part-time. I only am allowed a part-time secretary. I do have a full-time, part-time secretary, Mr. Speaker. This is a part, part-time secretary. It is significant to know that the spouse of this part, part-time secretary is an employee of this minister of terror who continues to harass people within his . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order, please. This is an opportunity for you to raise a point of privilege. It's a very serious point. If you have a point of privilege, then proceed with it, but it's not a time to make accusations.

MR. SVEINSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My emotions carried me somewhat down the road. It is significant to know that the spouse of this part-time secretary, as I just mentioned, is an employee of the Government of Saskatchewan elsewhere in the public service which, in fact, is the Department of Highways.

The clear implication of the call upon my office is that those in my employ are not looked upon favourably by this minister, or certainly by this government, and that they, or their immediate family members, could well be targets of retaliatory action.

The incident related to above also coincided with certain telephone calls on the same day to my office, from unidentified persons in the building, to identify my part, part-time secretary.

I believe this situation involving attempted harassment and intimidation of the employee of a member constitutes, at very least, a prima facie case of privilege, and I would invite you to so

rule, Mr. Speaker.

I will be pleased to elaborate further before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. I would like the opportunity to call witnesses, Mr. Speaker, and I would like you to consider calling that committee together to consider the grave situation that has arisen.

As further redress, I would also request from the Minister of Highways an apology for his engaging in objectionable conduct through his own ministry.

I would also like to obtain an undertaking from the Premier that no such conduct is acceptable from any minister in his government, and it's not a policy of his government, and will not engage again in any such action by a minister in his government.

I would also like to obtain a firm commitment from the Premier of Saskatchewan and his government that no member of my staff, or any immediate family, will be subject to any form of retaliatory action because of the fact that they have exercised their fundamental freedoms as expressed in the Canadian charter of rights.

I can certainly read that into the record, Mr. Speaker, but I think we're all familiar with the Canadian charter and the outline of rights and freedoms that are included in that document.

I believe it's a serious question, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask you to address it in a very serious manner. And at this time I would leave it in your hands. Thank you, very much.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'd like to thank the hon. member for raising this point. He did have a letter delivered to my office some time early this morning. It was there by 7 o'clock this morning when I came in.

I refer all hon. members to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, page 11, paragraph 16, which states as follows:

Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals.

And:

The privileges of Parliament are rights which are "absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers". They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity.

The role of the Chair is to decide whether sufficient evidence has been produced and whether the point raised by the member is so urgent that the House must set aside all of its business in order to debate this point.

And further from *Beauchesne's* on page 25, paragraph 84(1):

Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a prima facie case can be established.

And 84(2):

It has often been laid down that the speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach

of privilege is limited to deciding the formal question, whether the case conforms with the conditions which alone entitle it to take precedence over the notices of motions and Orders of the Day standing on the *Order Paper*, and does not extent to deciding the question of substance, whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed — a question of which can only be decided by the House itself.

I rule that the hon. member has not presented sufficient evidence to convince me that a prima facie breach of privilege exists. The member may initiate a debate on the matter with a substantive motion with proper notice.

(1045)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce second reading debate today on Bill 18, an Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. And before I move second reading, I have remarks to make about the legislation before us.

The AAIA has become familiar to all of us in the legislature over the years. It's been around for almost 40 years. And when you consider that its basic purpose has remained unchanged, you know it's essentially a good piece of legislation. It was designed back in 1945 and came into line in 1946. Back then, the economic circumstances dictating its creation were different from today's. And back then, it's coverage and benefits were skeletal, Mr. Speaker.

The Act has grown increasingly complex as these 40 years have passed, along with everything else in society. As the need for more comprehensive coverage evolved, so did the Act. However, the essential purpose of what is now the Saskatchewan Auto Fund remains the same as in 1946.

It exists to provide basic, universal, no-fault insurance coverage for the average driver on a self-sustaining basis. It exists to create and provide coverage specifically for the unique Saskatchewan market, and it exists to call Saskatchewan its home base and keep insurance funds here in our province for investment on behalf of all Saskatchewan motorists.

Over the years the AAIA has had success with these goals, but it is imperative that the auto act evolve with the times and respond to changing needs quickly, as necessity and economic conditions dictate. And that is precisely why I am standing before you right now, Mr. Speaker.

The legislation before us today is testimony to the fact that major benefits have not changed for almost four years. Back in 1981, coverage was updated to finally bring weekly indemnity benefits and third party liability coverage into line with minimum benefits available in other provinces across Canada.

In 1981, coverage had some catching up to do. Liability limits were raised from an unacceptable \$35,000 to the more realistic figure of \$100,000, given the fact of higher court judgements. Weekly indemnity benefits for total and partial disability were raised to \$150 per week in most cases, again reflecting obvious economic changes, like inflation.

The primary purpose of the Bill before us is to again increase public insurance coverage. The benefits we are proposing include raising third party liability coverage to \$200,000 from the 100,000. This, Mr. Speaker, may well be expected and praised by all members of the House. The

\$200,000 limit is certainly more in keeping with the trend towards higher court judgements which are an economic reality, recognized by all. For incidental information, only four other provinces have a legal third party minimum of \$200,000, the others being Newfoundland, Ontario, Manitoba, and the Yukon. To the best of my knowledge, all other provinces are at \$100,000.

We also propose to significantly increase death benefits. For example, death benefits for primary dependants would increase to \$10,000 from the current \$7,500, a 33 per cent rise. And in those cases where both parents are killed, payments to primary and secondary dependants would be doubled. If passed, significant changes in coverage regarding deceased children would occur. Everyone in this House would agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is impossible to place a monetary value on human life. And for that reason this area of the Act is very difficult to revise.

But the current schedule badly needs to be revamped, and our legislation would do this. The specific benefits would rise to \$2,500 from the current schedule which varies from \$100 to \$1,000 depending on the child's age. We think this is an important change.

Other increases would raise limits to partly dependant persons by 25 per cent, from \$2,000 to \$2,500. In some other cases death benefits would almost triple by rising from \$1,000 to \$2,500. These provisions, of course, will be examined in greater detail during committee.

We further propose to increase supplementary health allowance from \$4,000 to \$10,000 in a 150 per cent increase. This allowance pays for expenses not regularly covered under health plans — things like prescriptions, and wheelchair rentals, Mr. Speaker — again, an important and much needed change.

And finally in this area, we propose a change that I know many of our senior citizens will welcome with open arms. And that is: we would abolish the current practice of reducing permanent disability payments by amounts received under the Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Security Act. This, quite simply, will put more money in the hands of people who clearly need it, and who clearly deserve it.

Currently there are about 100 people whose weekly disability payments are being reduced and sometimes eliminated by the existing policy. The proposed amendment will restore the full \$150 per week.

Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I mentioned how important it was that the auto Act be able to react quickly to changing economic conditions. I want to stress this point with all members. Being able to react quickly to changing needs is more than just a phrase. It's people. We're talking about people receiving money from a social program. If it is to be an effective program, and we a responsible government, the benefits of the program must change as do people's needs. That, unfortunately, has not been the case with the AAIA.

Death payments have been unchanged since 1972. And the payment regarding deceased children hasn't been touched since the coverage was first introduced in 1947. In their 11 years in office, Mr. Speaker, the NDP increased benefits only twice, in 1972 and 1981. When we look generally at the level of increases we are proposing — 100 per cent; 150 per cent; 25 per cent, 2,500 per cent, in one case — I submit that changes to benefits have traditionally occurred too slowly, and the reason is simple.

As legislation currently stands, all changes and benefits must be brought forward in amendment form for review by this Assembly, which meets only twice a year. Only twice a year for a total of perhaps 12 weeks. Now this, to me, is cumbersome, time confusing, and inflexible. It can even be argued that it does a disservice to the many, many individuals out there who rely on payments from the auto fund.

Well to remedy this, this legislation proposes that, effective January 1st of 1985, changes in AAIA benefits be set out in regulations by the order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. We propose this because we recognize that the Saskatchewan Auto Fund is a social program, and for its recipients it should function the same way other social programs do: by regulation. It can be compared to the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, or the Saskatchewan Income Plan in this respect.

Our paramount concern in making this proposal is to be able to upgrade benefits quickly so that no recipient is forced to wait months, or even years, for us to play catch up. Social legislation that isn't responsive . . . responsive, isn't social legislation at all. I know members opposite will have plenty of comments on this, and I welcome them in due course.

Mr. Speaker, those changes just outlined represent the most important features of the legislation before us, but there are several other provisions I want to mention as well. Several amendments relate to our system of driver surcharges. The principle of these surcharges will not be at issue here, Mr. Speaker. We firmly believe that drivers responsible for accidents should be penalized. The legislation merely proposes to streamline the process, and to make it easier for appeals to be heard. I think all members can appreciate reduced bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker.

Currently, an individual wishing to appeal his surcharge must appear in provincial court and sometimes must wait months to tell his side of the story. These delays are unfair, poorly regarded by all including the courts. We would like appeals to be heard by either the provincial court or the Rates Appeal Board, a body already established under . . . or a body already established under the AAIA. The individual appealing the surcharge would have the choice of the two. Mr. Speaker, this will make the process much more convenient to everybody, especially considering that eventually the Rates Appeal Board will operate out of every claims centre. I don't think my friends opposite should have too much trouble with this one.

Another very positive change we have proposed is something my colleague, the Minister of Justice, and I have advocated for years before we became the government. A recommendation that was ignored, Mr. Speaker. We suggested splitting the deductible recovery when two parties are found equally responsible for an automobile accident. And that is what this legislation will do. It will mean that instead of getting nothing, which is the current situation, each party will receive \$250 — a 50-50 split of the \$500 deductible — Mr. Speaker, long overdue.

This legislation proposes another change regarding the deductible, and that is to apply it consistently to all comprehensive claims. We propose that claims for hit and run losses be treated the same as claims for theft, fire, and claims be made subject to the deductible.

This move, Mr. Speaker, would correct a continuing inequity best described by illustration. Currently the auto fund picks up all damages for hit and runs which exceed the \$500, from zero dollars up. However, damages that are less than \$500, the insured must pay. And the result, frankly, is absurd. The driver with \$499 in damages pays the whole shot. The guy next door with \$501 pays nothing. We think this is unfair, and propose to correct the situation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, an amendment that I am particularly proud of will be the amendment giving the Saskatchewan auto fund authority to reward the safe drivers of this province with substantial cash bonuses. It's a move that gives me great personal satisfaction, and which I'm sure will be supported by all members, even the member from Regina Centre who belittles the tremendous accomplishment of SGI employees and provincial motorists who restored the auto fund to financial health.

The rest of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, is substantially housekeeping, clarifying definitions and provisions, removing references which discriminate between husbands and wives, and things of that nature.

To close, I want to say only that I hope all members will support this Bill. It's important legislation.

that affects the lives of thousands of people. While I realize that it's a large package, I ask all members to appreciate the urgency of its provisions and to act accordingly. I welcome your deliberations, and I thank you for your attention.

Mr. Speaker, I now move second reading of Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, I think we could vote on this Bill. The opposition will not be opposing this Bill.

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

(1100)

Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act.

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

Bill No. 9 — An Act respecting the Transportation of Dangerous Goods in Saskatchewan

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, I would now like to introduce second reading of the Bill respecting The Dangerous Goods Transportation Act for the province of Saskatchewan.

In speaking to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on several important points members of the Assembly should be aware of.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this government is deeply committed to consulting the public sector before bringing proposed legislation to this Assembly. Inasmuch as The Dangerous Goods Transportation Act represents another step towards ensuring the safety of our Saskatchewan families, it also demonstrates this government's commitment to consulting those who assist towards ensuring the safety of our families.

Early this year, every rural and urban municipality, city fire chief, municipal police force, and various transportation industry associates were sent a copy of our blue paper on the transportation of dangerous goods. The blue paper dealt with the intent of the proposed legislation now before us, Mr. Speaker, and we asked for the comments and concerns of those individuals.

As a result, we now have a clearer understanding of the impact of the proposed legislation and those affected now have a better understanding of our intent in working towards this goal.

All of the comments and concerns will be used to everyone's advantage during the implementation of this Act and the regulations that will be adopted following the passage of this very important Act.

One area that came to the forefront from the blue paper affects our agricultural community. As this Assembly is fully aware, Mr. Speaker, our farmers are having some tough times. This government has taken steps to assist with easing the financial burden on our farmers, and the Minister of Agriculture has to be congratulated for his wisdom in dealing with such a very

difficult problem.

The last thing our farmers need now is another unrealistic regulation that will further add to their ability to operate a viable farm.

To that, Mr. speaker, this Act, and the regulations that will follow, address in a practical way how our farming community transports dangerous goods. I can assure our farming community that we will not burden them with massive amounts of paperwork just to transport a five-gallon pail of herbicide from the store back home to the farm.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes the portion of my remarks.

I would now like to turn to the particulars of the Bill. The intent of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to promote the safe transportation of dangerous goods in all vehicles using our streets, roads, and highways. This bill will make it an offence to transport dangerous goods in any vehicle unless it is in accordance with safety requirements, safety standards, and safety markers, which will be prescribed by regulation under the Act.

Mr. Speaker, by no means are we an island unto ourselves when it comes to the transport of dangerous goods. This Bill parallels and is complementary to the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act of Canada. Our Act forms a framework for provincial participation in a national program on dangerous goods movement, and I would like to speak to that for a moment, Mr. Speaker.

The provinces and federal government, in consultation with industry, have been working towards a national uniform set of regulations. These regulations are being developed so that they will provide a single harmonized set of regulations governing the offering of transport, the handling and the transportation of dangerous goods by any means of transport every where in the Dominion of Canada.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the program and legislation has been under development for a considerable time. With a new government in Ottawa, and a new era of federal-provincial co-operation upon us, this process has been given new leadership that was not in evidence before. The federal Minister of Transport is to be commended for his efforts since taking office regarding this legislation. I understand that the federal regulations will be published very early in the new year.

Our participation in this program, Mr. Speaker, is not unilateral action, but rather co-operative effort with the federal and other provincial governments. As I said earlier, we have designed our legislation to apply to transportation of dangerous goods in vehicles using our streets, roads, and highways. For the benefit of all members of the Assembly, and the people of Saskatchewan, the transport of dangerous goods by air, rail, and marine modes, the offering for transport, and the pre- and post-transport handling activities of all modes will be regulated under the federal Act. The result, Mr. Speaker, is a program that will see all aspects of dangerous goods transported under the legislative umbrellas of the federal and provincial governments working together.

To that, Mr. Speaker, the provincial Act allows for the province to enter into an administrative agreement with the federal government and other levels of government as necessary, outlining the various rules and responsibilities under the national program. This will ensure that the program will be applied to all modal aspects of dangerous goods transportation in an effective and efficient manner, and it is my intent to proceed with this administrative agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Bill will result in an increased level of safety for the transportation of dangerous goods on our streets, roads, and highways, and the people that will benefit are all of the people of Saskatchewan and Canada.

No single piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, is going to prevent the occurrence of a dangerous goods accident, short of prohibiting their transportation. However, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this Bill, combined with the excellent level of co-operation and consultation that exists between all parties involved, will benefit our families, our province, and our future, Mr. Speaker.

I invite and request, Mr. Speaker, that all members of this Assembly would unanimously support this very . . . (inaudible) . . . toward the safe transportation system for the future and the safety of our people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the minister mentioned, this is an important piece of legislation regarding the transportation of dangerous goods in this province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a Bill that has to be looked at very carefully, and I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 2 — An Act to establish the Employment Development Agency

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 4

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, what . . . (inaudible) . . . do you anticipate . . . I'm not asking you for your estimates at this point in time. What size of staff do you anticipate being associated with this agency?

HON. MR. LANE: — We are budgeted for 35, but I do not expect that we'll be near that level. But that's the total staff budgeted for.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Will that staff have responsibility for research and development? I still don't have a clear grip on the range of functions. Will your staff be doing research as well, or will it just be a co-ordinating agency? I gather it will not carry . . . it will not be a program agency.

HON. MR. LANE: — It will very much have a research capability in that we may propose new initiatives and then instruct a department to carry them out, or whatever. So it will have a research capability. And, as I indicated yesterday, we will be doing research in terms of establishing either sectoral goals, or defining where we think that the job potential is in the future for different occupations.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Do you anticipate that the agency will be responsible for the delivery of program at this point in time?

HON. MR. LANE: — No.

MR. SCHMIDT: — Mr. Minister, for a considerable long period of time my constituents . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If my learned colleagues to my left have any questions, I'm sure they'll get ample time to ask them.

The question I have is that with respect to Canada Manpower and my constituency . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I'll have to shout so that my colleague, the Minister of Justice, can

hear because there seems to be a lot of noise on this side of the House.

There's been a problem in my constituency with respect to Canada Manpower and the matching of people for jobs. For example, I've gone to the Canada Manpower office, and I've seen three jobs posted. And I've asked the question: is that all there is? And they say, no, there are more. Those are just samples. It makes it difficult for people to find jobs when they can't even have them posted at Canada Manpower.

I'm wondering if you could get in touch, or can give me an undertaking to get in touch with the federal government, as part of the duties of your new employment agency, and have the federal government try to improve the situation with Canada Manpower and with the actual matching of people to jobs.

HON. MR. LANE: — Yes. One of the things the business community has made it clear to us is that there is, in many cases, a lack of confidence in the Canada Manpower centres in their ability to get people employed.

We met yesterday with the Hon. Flora MacDonald who committed to us to a review of the operations to the Canada Manpower for that very purpose. The initiative came both from our request and a request to her from the federation of small business. Independent businessmen had made the same request. So that review is now going on.

MR. SCHMIDT: — Thank you. I'm glad there's some progress being made in that regard.

There's a second area that gives me some concern, and that is that, while jobs are scarce in the western economy these days, there still are some jobs. And we are now considering, and your department is going to consider, training and the direction of training for the jobs that exist. I'm wondering if your department could consider or undertake a study or set up a computer processing system so that people who do have jobs could phone them in. They could be put into a computer so you could get a print-out or a picture of what we should be training people for.

Now I suspect that today there would be openings this very day for technicians who could repair electronic equipment such as computers, electronic typewriters, word processing machines. I know there's always a shortage of those kind of people, yet we don't know how big the shortage is. We don't know how big the shortage is. And I was wondering if your department could get this information together so that we could adjust the technical schools' and the universities' programs to meet the demand that's out there.

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, we can't obviously adjust the university programming because that would be an interference in academic freedom. So that's not under consideration at all.

But in terms of identifying the areas of opportunity for where we project future job opportunities will come, that's very much a part of our function.

(1115)

As I indicated yesterday, the federal government's statistics in this area, which are fairly recently developed, are national. They're not broken down regionally, and they're not broken down by province. We've asked the Government of Canada yesterday to begin to break that down by province so that we're not duplicating efforts. If they're not prepared to do it, we certainly are.

MR. SCHMIDT: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not so direct to the minister, but I want to advise the members of the NDP that as a member I have the rights to ask questions here without . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please. Order. Does the member have a question of the minister?

MR. SCHMIDT: — I think that my rights have been . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Sit him down. He is either asking a question or sitting . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The member can respond to the Chair.

MR. SCHMIDT: — Well I did have a question, but I couldn't be heard, so I won't bother with it today.

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I want to direct a question to the minister for the new Employment Development Agency with respect to this winter works initiative.

Mr. Minister, with respect to the northern administration district, we have communities in the North that have a regular mail service. Communications and tough — is tough, pardon me — in many of the remote and isolated communities. Communications is a big problem. Many communities, as an example, are Wollaston Lake, Kinoosao, Southend, Sandy Bay, Sturgeon Landing, are very hard to get into, depending on weather conditions, road conditions, and so on.

My question to you is this: will there be special consideration or recognition given to those communities pertaining to those circumstance?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well I'll give you the assurance that the North will not be penalized because of either transportation or communication difficulties, and that they will have the access that I assured you of yesterday.

MR. YEW: — With respect to your program, I know it's not going to alleviate or dint the high need for employment, but regardless, there's 140 opportunities for jobs there and a population of approximately 30,000, Mr. Minister.

But with respect to that particular section, in the other section that you had mentioned last evening regarding the total package of this winter works initiative, will those other departments correspond with the question I placed before you?

HON. MR. LANE: — It will all be co-ordinated through this agency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would remind the committee we are on clause 4. Clause 4 is before the committee.

MR. KOSKIE: — Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister of Justice, you realize that the federal government recently put forward their economic statement, and as a result of their actions, some 50,000 — according to the economists in reviewing the federal economic statement — that some 50,000 jobs would be lost across Canada. Some estimates go as high as 100,000 jobs.

And what I'm asking the minister: have you made representations to your counterpart, your friend in Ottawa, the Minister of Finance, and made representations to ask him in light of the severity of the problems in employment, that he change his course of direction; and rather than cut out 50 to 100,00 jobs that he, in fact, work together with the provinces to increase jobs?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, they'd be given us the assurance that they will, in fact, co-operate and work together with the provinces, and we had a meeting to that effect yesterday. With regard to the direct job loss, I believe the argument is the efforts of the federal Minister of Finance to deal with the deficit, there is a counter argument. For example, initiatives announced the other day are projecting 500,000 new jobs as a result of the initiatives.

So there will be the transition. There will be the transition on the federal level, from what I gather. The federal government believes in undue reliance on the public sector and a movement to the private sector. And the objective of the Government of Canada, and I think they've made that clear: public, is the overall objective, and the long-term objective is to create far more employment in Canada that exists today; and secondly, to make our work-force productive in international markets.

There is finally a recognition in the Government of Canada that exists in the Government of Saskatchewan, and it is that we rely on international trade. We have to be competitive, and we have to sell ourselves on international markets. And the federal government is taking that initiative. So I believe the long-term strategy will be one that would be of benefit of all Canadians, and greatly increase employment.

MR. KOSKIE: — Just in respect to the federal direction. Two areas that I raise for your attention: that is the massive cut-backs in the CBC across Canada — \$75 million cut-back in budget — and a massive cut-back in the number of employees. What I'm asking you: in view of the fact that Saskatchewan is facing, as is other provinces, serious problems with employment, whether you have made any representations on behalf of the CBC employees who are scheduled to lose their jobs? And secondly, I note also that there's going to be massive cut-backs in medical research, and that is of a very major concern. And I'm wondering whether you have met with your counterpart and indicated any concern in these particular areas?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, I've had no request for representations from the CBC. It's certainly the Government of Canada, and I can't speak for the Government of Canada. If you're taking the position here today that there should be no cut-backs, no lay-offs in CBC, then I probably would suspect that there may not be much public support for your position.

Having said that, I have made no representations. I have made no representations, nor do I intend to speak for the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada is going to have to make some very difficult decisions. I may agree or may not agree with all of them. I do fully recognize that the Government of Canada is going to have to make some major decisions, some very difficult decisions, to clear up some 15 years of mismanagement.

MR. KOSKIE: — In respect to the thrusts that you're purporting to make in respect to employment, I'm wondering whether, in drawing up a blueprint which you haven't announced yet nor have you made available to the public or to the business community and/or to the interested groups, I wonder, in drawing up this yet-to-be-revealed blueprint of job creation, whether you have, in fact, met with your federal counterpart, whether you have, in fact, got commitments of matching money in respect to any thrusts that you may be taking here?

HON. MR. LANE: — That was one of the areas of discussion yesterday. The federal government is in the process of canvassing. The Minister of Canada Employment and Immigration was in Saskatchewan yesterday on that very point as to what projects are available. She is canvassing all provinces in Canada before they make the federal position. We certainly see an area of great opportunity for some participation in the short term and in the very near future.

MR. KOSKIE: — The minister has indicated he sees a great opportunity of working with the federal government. I would like to ask him: on what basis does he base that statement of great opportunity? Can he be specific as to what his discussions with the federal government has been in so far as commitment of matching funds and working out a unified plan, federally and provincially, together?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, we've certainly had the assurance of the Government of Canada that they are prepared to co-operate. I believe that my colleague, the minister responsible for Advanced Education and Manpower, can give you a lengthy list of areas of co-operation over the past year. And many of the programs that we've implemented — Access Youth, for example

— was administered in many cases by the Canada Employment and Immigration centres. It was a very co-operative effort. We look forward to others.

The Government of Canada has made it clear that it is prepared to put up, generally, approximately \$1 billion on rather immediate projects which will be determined by the end of January, or projects or initiatives. We have indicated that we will respond to the Government of Canada by the middle of January with our proposals. They indicated that they would like them as soon as possible. We're prepared to submit them by the middle of January.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Do you have in mind any advisory committees, or is this section was just here just in case you are smitten with a blinding light sometime?

HON. MR. LANE: — We will be talking to various sectors in the economy, and I would expect that there be advisory committees. And they will be announced — either advisory people or advisory committees — will be announced early in the new year.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clause 8

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Chairman, there's a curious section in 8(1)(c). Is it the intention of the government to establish local employment offices in various centres throughout Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. LANE: — I've indicated at the press conference and otherwise that that is an option that we are very much considering, and that the concern about the ability of the local business community to match up with those seeking work is one that we're very much reviewing.

No decision has been made and we would not look at making a decision until the Government of Canada, which announced yesterday its review of the manpower centres, whether we see a role or not.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just make a comment, Mr. Minister, which is not a criticism of you or particularly of the federal government. But I think it would be most unfortunate if we have both the federal and provincial government. There are many areas in which both the federal and provincial government are providing the same services. It would be most unfortunate if that began to happen here.

I think in many ways it's a service which could better be provided by the federal government than the provincial government. The federal government can co-ordinate job opportunities across the Dominion and not just in Saskatchewan, and I would hope the minister would urge the federal counterpart, your federal counterpart, to maintain and indeed expand the Canada manpower offices and not withdraw into the fortress Ottawa.

HON. MR. LANE: — I would agree with the hon. member in principle. In response to an earlier question, I made it clear that there seems to be some — and I don't know the extent of it — concern amongst the business community that perhaps the manpower centres are not serving their needs in terms of matching jobs and those seeking work.

But I've indicated earlier that, pending the federal government's review, if it perhaps can restore that confidence, then I do not see a necessity. But if it's not there and we're not getting that direct matching between jobs available and those looking for work on a very expeditious basis, I think we have an obligation as a government to try and expedite that process.

But I agree with the hon. member, the preference would be that it remain in the federal government. It's not something that we're looking at as a first option. It's one that would be a latterly option, rather than an early one.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 12

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It has nothing do to with Clause 12. It goes back to Clause 10. If I might, and I assume I have the consent: is it the intention of the agency that you will be making third party grants on any significant scale? I note section 9 and 10 which parallel the sections this Assembly approved yesterday in The Urban Municipality Act, and I was told that section 10 is in order, for the department to make — or the agency, in this case — to make grants and third party payments. And I'm wondering what exactly your agency might have had in mind with respect to section 10 in this case. I'd be surprised . . . Perhaps there are agencies somewhere which are going to be the recipients of this department's munificence, but I just don't know what they are.

(1130)

HON. MR. LANE: — A prime example is the programs we announced the other day and payments to third parties, municipalities, and things of that nature. We indicated yesterday we'll be looking to the private sector for some initiatives, community organizations, so it will be very much part of our mandate.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clause 13 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the minister like to thank his officials? And I certainly thank them for . . .

HON. MR. LANE: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I thank Mr. Siu and Mr. Hewitt and Mr. Wensel of my office, and I thank the members opposite.

Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act

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

HON. MR. McLEOD: —Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have Doug Moen, Crown solicitor from the Department of Justice, to my left.

Clause 1

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask a few questions about the proposed amendments to the Bill. And I would like you to just take a few minutes, if you would, under clause 1, to stand up and just give me an outline. For example, I've been checking

here and I'm not quite through it yet, but section 41, 42, and 43, if you would just, for me, outline the different areas that they would include. And I imagine your colleague from Rosthern who sits there would have those memorized and could give me a little outline. I basically know what you're doing here, but I want to go through each of these, one by one, and get a little list of them from you.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Okay, well, Mr. Chairman, and for the hon. member, the legislation affects the following — and I believe I have the right quotations from the original Bill — the indemnity for members which is in section 41; the sessional allowance for members which is in section 42; the Speaker's allowance which is in section 60(1); the allowance for deputy chairmen, 60.1 (these are the sections, the numbers); the allowance for chairmen of standing committees, section 60.2; the allowance for the House Leaders, 60.3; the allowance for whips, section 61; the allowance for the Leader of the Opposition, section 62(1)(a); the allowance for the Leader of the third party, if that were the case in this House, as it isn't, and I pointed that out yesterday; the salaries to members of the cabinet and the Premier, section 76; and the salary paid to legislative secretaries which is section 80.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, I want to ask that again, and are there any members or any categories that are left out of the so-called freeze that is suggested here? Are there any members, whether it's cabinet, Premier, whips, deputy whips, any groups that are left out of this so-called freeze?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — No, Mr. Chairman, there are no categories left out as it relates to salaries for people in the general . . . in the legislative area here.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister will maybe tell me exactly how this plan will work. I understand that the plan will freeze until the amendment expires, the date that is recorded in here. There is some thought around and about that at the end of the period the payment is made to the members, or that the increase will be lumped together, and there will actually be two increases when the period is over. And I want to get clearly from you that that is not the case; that you're not merely manipulating the rate increases and adding them on to the end of it. That's the question I want to ask you.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I give the member, and the House, the assurance. The way it will work is that with the passage of this piece of legislation, the increase which would automatically have come in under the original Bill — which was based on the composite industrial index, I believe it was, if that's the proper terminology — will not take effect. And so at the end of the calendar year 1985, if we project ahead one more year, that Bill will remain in place.

And unless there is a similar Bill or something to that effect, then the adjusted amount which comes into effect as a result of this Bill will be the base amount at the end of 1985, from which we would move ahead with the industrial index.

That's my understanding. I hope it's clear to the member.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister will know that the opposition, and where these decisions are debated and discussed about increases in the Board of Internal Economy committee . . . make it clear that the members of the opposition will be supporting this Bill.

I want to make that very clear that in a time like this we agree that restraint is in order. And we have scrutinized the government over the last year and pointed out to you very clearly that there are many areas, not only in the salaries of MLAs and cabinet ministers and premiers, that we should be looking at trimming back in order to help the taxpayers.

But I would like to say, as well, at this time, that I believe that this is part of a smoke-screen to

cover off and make it look like the government is freezing spending in the area of MLAs and cabinet ministers, whether they are government or opposition.

But I want you to know, Mr. Minister, that the public is not going to be fooled or lulled into believing that you are people of restraint when it comes to government spending, because we have documented here and outside of the Assembly that the spending on travel out of province by cabinet ministers during this time of so-called restraint is at record levels. We have documented trips by ministers to various parts of the world, whether Bulgaria or China or Austria or San Francisco, Saudi Arabia.

And, Mr. Minister, that Bill is a very, very extensive one. So for you to come here and say that we are now on this track of austerity and saving the taxpayers money is part of a smoke-screen.

And I'm sure that if you were in an honest mood today, as I'm sure you are, you will agree with this statement: that at a time when we have a record number of cabinet ministers — 25 to be exact — at record levels of salary, with record levels of staff in their offices, that you are hard-pressed to stand in this Assembly and say with a straight face that restricting the salaries of MLAs is the only area that you should be restraining.

And I would challenge you to look at this Bill, and if you want to bring in an amendment, or make a statement here that you will cut back the travel allowances paid to ministers and their staff, that you will cut back on the amount of money that is spent by your personal staff in your office, or cut back a person here and there — and we know that there are literally 10's and 20 and 50 people who are working for this government merely to advertise and to promote the ministers and to get them re-elected — that at a time when you're doing that it is unfortunate that you would come here and self-righteously say that you are working in the best interest in cutting extravagance in your government.

Because we believe that a government that increases the cabinet to 25, increases the number of Legislative Secretaries — I believe there are now 12, which is a 100 per cent increase since 1982 — each of those legislative secretaries not only get an extra salary, they get staff, they get an automobile, they get credit cards. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your budgets are far in excess of what you need to carry on your offices. I say to you that you have increased in the area of politics to get yourself re-elected, and then come in here sanctimoniously and say that we're freezing the salary of MLAs.

And I want to make one more point, Mr. Chairman, before I take my place: that the government has a way of giving money and income to their members that the opposition, whether they are from the Liberal Party or for the New Democratic Party, do not have a chance to be involved in. And this is where the increase in the number of Legislative Secretaries and the number of cabinet ministers come into play, because I tell you they filled their own pockets for most of their members in the seats where they are having trouble getting re-elected, while at the same time are leaving out and freezing every member of the opposition.

And I want that to be very clear: that not every member of the government have had their salaries frozen or restricted during the last two years. The people who were promoted to cabinet in the increase, or promoted to legislative Secretaries, or promoted in other ways, have had their income supplemented.

But I want the people of Saskatchewan and the press to know that not one member of the opposition have had their status changed or have had a dramatic increase in salary the way the Legislative Secretaries have, the way the increase in the cabinet has, or the way the jaunts to exotic places that many members outside of the cabinet, as well as the people in the cabinet, have taken advantage of during this high-flying, travel around the world oriented government that we have today.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member asked if I feel in an honest mood today, and the member will know that I am always in that honest mood. I will say to the hon. member, say to the hon. member very sincerely and very clearly: first of all, this Bill is not an attempt at all at a smoke-screen, as the member himself admitted a while ago. It's the Board of Internal Economy knew about this, members from his side. His leader yesterday said they would support the Bill, and we appreciate that. And we recognize that all members of the House — I believe it is, in fact, all members of the House — recognize the times of restraint that we are in, the times of restraint that the public service is being asked to exercise. And there's no question about that, and that are being very co-operative about that for the most part.

What this does, as I outlined before, is that it freezes the salaries of all of us that are here as legislators at exactly the level for 1985 as what they are at 1984. We believe that's a responsible move. and as far as some of the other comments, which are quite unrelated to this Bill, Mr. Chairman, although I really should respond to a couple of them. As far as the member's continual harangue about the use by this government of our members — elected members by the people of Saskatchewan from the various constituencies — use of our members for roles as legislative secretaries, we do not apologize for that, nor will we apologize for that.

I'm reminded of an example in the, I believe it's the Department of Highways and Transportation, where the Legislative secretary, my very competent and a long-standing member of this House, the member from Rosthern is a Legislative Secretary. We're pleased that he is. I believe the Legislative Secretary's salary is something in the order of 6,000-and-some-odd dollars. He does the work in the Department of Highways and Transportation. He does the work in the Department of Highways and Transportation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. Allow the minister to make his comment.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — He does the work in the department of Highways and Transportation. Just for an example, a good deal of the same work in that department at the salary that I mentioned of one who is a former member of the legislature for the constituency which I represent, Meadow Lake, and your former minister of highways, had a defeated MLA from Meadow Lake as a special assistant in the order of 70 to \$75,000.

Don't come into this House or anywhere in this province and lecture this government about restraint. Your colleague sitting beside you, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, as a Legislative Secretary for the former minister of agriculture, was in Africa. Don't tell us about travelling around by Legislative Secretaries. So don't be sanctimonious in your little speeches regarding where your Legislative Secretaries have gone.

We will not apologize, nor should we, nor will the people of Saskatchewan ask us to apologize for value for dollars spent when our ministers, our Minister of Economic Development and Trade, has been various places in this world. There is question about that. We do not apologize for that because the results are very clear, Mr. Chairman. The results are very clear.

That government over there, that left-leaning government could not — could not, I repeat — attract the market in eastern Europe with cattle, very good breeding stock from this province. And we did. And the nation of Bulgaria is just the very first step in terms of the marketing of good breeding stock from this province. And our Minister of Economic Development and Trade worked that deal out, and it's ongoing, and we're on the second deal with Bulgaria.

(1145)

We do not apologize for the value that this province gets — or the people of this province get — for the travel of our ministers. There's no question about that.

Getting back to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, the member from Shaunavon will stand here as he so often

does, and as all of us here day after day will watch him in his sanctimonious way trying to lay out these things and talking about smoke-screens and so on when all of us who have been here for some time understand exactly where he's coming from.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that this Bill is responsible. All members on this side of the House agree with it. All members on this side of the House, and I believe as the member has said in one part of his speech that they will support it. I would urge all members to support the Bill now in committee.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I would say to the minister, first of all, in his comments about the Legislative Secretary from Rosthern, I would never question whether or not that individual does his job because I know he does. In fact, I watched him from 1978 to 1982 work in this Assembly from the benches over here, and I would say to you and to the Premier that I would have put him as one of the 25 in cabinet. I say that he does do his work, and I'm not making any excuse. And I also say to you that you're not giving that individual the just reward that he deserves. Do don't talk to me about the individual from Rosthern as your explanation of have 12 Legislative Secretaries.

But I want to say to you that having a budget for 34 trips out of Canada in the last year, costing the taxpayers \$500,000, shows very little restraint in terms of the personal jaunts that you and your ministers are going on out of country.

And I do call your attempt today to bring forward a Bill prior to the meeting of the Board of Internal Economy — and, Mr. Chairman, I want that to be perfectly clear that this Bill was tabled in this Assembly before the Board of Internal Economy met — makes one wonder whether or not the negotiating in that, that should take place before the Bill is introduced, actually took place.

And I would like to ask the minister whether he based the different clauses of this Bill on a meeting of the Board of Internal Economy, or whether he and his cronies met and decided in advance before the meeting where it was going.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I'm informed that . . . I believe the clauses of this Bill are, in fact, based on at least a discussion in the board of Internal Economy, although I'm not sure of that. I'm not absolutely sure of that. But in any case, Mr. Chairman, . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not sure of that. Okay. But I will ask the member if there are any clauses of this Bill to which members of the opposition do not agree. I would ask them to say so now. Which clauses of this Bill will the opposition not agree with, Mr. Chairman? That's the question.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, you did not answer the question. But I want to point out to you that the clauses of the Bill, like your farm Bill, do not go far enough. But we agree with the points that you raise there. We would have wanted you to have discussed it with the members of the opposition, be they of the Liberal Party or the New Democratic Party. That didn't take place, and I want you to know that the members who were at the Board of Internal Economy meeting met after this Bill was tabled in the Assembly — met after the Bill was tabled in the Assembly. So for you to say that this Bill has come out of compromise and discussion and reasonability, is not true.

And I would also say to you, Mr. Minister, that your attempt to defend that this had been negotiated wasn't very articulate because you started out adamantly saying that it came out of that discussion and ended up by saying you weren't sure. And I would like you to now stand up and tell us whether or not the clauses of this Bill came out of the discussion of the Board of Internal Economy meeting, or where they came from. Because our members on the board did not discuss it prior to the Bill being tabled.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I'm informed that this was discussed some time ago in internal

economy, but not this Bill as it now appears, not all of the clauses of the Bill. But I will go back to it, Mr. Speaker. I don't apologize for the fact that the government is putting this Bill on the table.

And what I will ask the members in committee as we deal with this Bill: if they have problems with any particular clauses in this Bill, I would ask them today to lay them out here. I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan will be interested in what they're against. And what I'm saying is that it's on here. We're into third reading of the Bill. If there's anything that the opposition would like to raise questions about, this is certainly the forum in which to do that.

MR. SVEINSON: — Well, I find it very interesting that the member from Meadow Lake has outlined a position where he's discussed it with the opposition. The first time I heard of the Bill was when it was tabled in the last two or three days. And I will say that I will not support the Bill.

I feel that I'm at least worth the increase that inflation would allow me in this House. And I can appreciate that members opposite — they've got their back benches full of the idle — should, in fact, not accept a pay increase. I can also suggest that as a member of your government, I watched your 12 legislative secretaries. I did so very carefully. And there are a few that do the jobs they are, in fact, assigned to. And the member from Shaunavon alluded to one, and I know that he does his work. His pay should be doubled or tripled. He's here all the time. And I would even support that amendment for that particular member.

But I can also say that there are members who, in fact, receive those increased perks. They're travelling the province at the expense of your government. One such member, the Minister of Health, in his estimates last year, indicated spent \$20,000 in additional expenses over and above the six that he was allocated for income. And I would suggest to you that he would have a difficult time substantiating \$20,000 worth of effort on behalf of that government. I realize that probably his expense accounts were tabled with the department and approved, but I would suggest to you that he would have an extremely difficult time outlining to the public where that money was beneficially spent.

I understand the Bill to mean that we will not get a pay increase . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I didn't say I'd double Link's wages, I said I'd double the member for Rosthern who does his job.

I think also that recently in Ottawa your federal leader took a 15 per cent reduction in pay. I think the front benches of your government should look seriously at that direction. If they feel that they're not worth an increase in 1984, maybe they should look at cutting their salaries.

I could also say that the people in the back benches who have decided to make politics a full-time career, that if you look at the salaries they presently collect, you would have difficulty bringing people into the political forum, who, in fact, expect to be back-benchers, and live on the salaries that they are going to be paid as members of this Assembly.

I believe the back-benchers of this House and the members of opposition deserve an increase relative to inflation. And I think if all MLAs in the House were, in fact, given the increase, it would also increase the salaries of cabinet by only a small amount.

But I suggest again you look at freezing cabinet salaries. The member from Shaunavon alluded to the travel that this government has undertaken. I suppose all governments . . . I don't think that they were angels in respect to travel. I'm sure they were down the — I'm sure they travelled down the rivers of the world as well.

AN HON. MEMBER: — put up the facts, don't think. Sweeping statements, not facts.

MR. SVEINSON: — Well, I can make sweeping statements because I know they're true. I know this government's . . . The NDP government, as a government, probably travelled as widely as this one, but that doesn't make the travel dollar spent by this government money well spent.

I think initially they undertook to bring in industries from around the world. I'm still waiting, and I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan are still waiting, although there may be some indication that this could, in fact, happen . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I see the member from Swift Current suggests it has. I would think that if you look closely at Swift Current, there have also been several business bankruptcies, and I'm not going to get into that area right now because we're talking about the worth of MLAs, and why they should have to take a reduction in pay.

I can appreciate the government and several of their back-benchers and also some of their minister. You've got the minister of co-operatives whose whole department's budget is only \$3 million, and you refuse to give him any extra responsibility.

You've got the minister of crop insurance in the same position. You've got 25. It doesn't really affect your government because 37 of you are either on ministerial payroll or legislative secretary payroll with other perks. So certainly the back-benchers, are they going to get up and refuse to allow your government to move? Absolutely not. Why would they?

So I didn't hear the basic reasons outlined by the minister earlier in the debate as to why they've decided to freeze salaries for 1984. But I would like to ask the minister to rise now and substantiate his reasons for freezing salaries in this House.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as the basic reasons were outlined in the second reading speech, but I will say that we are freezing salaries for 1985, the year that's coming, when anticipating next year.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, there were some interesting comments coming from the lone Liberal in this House. He talks about . . . He says that he . . . He introduces the idea to the debate here of merit pay for what is a member worth, and individual members. And he introduced the idea — the member for Rosthern, the member for Shaunavon, different members — what each one is worth.

The last person in this House, I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, — the last member in this House who should introduce the idea of merit pay, unless he wants to be really a hungry person, would be the member from Regina North West, in terms of being paid on terms of the contribution. And so there's a very interesting argument coming from the lone Liberal member.

He talks about the federal government, the new federal government and the new cabinet in Ottawa, taking a reduction. No question about that. In these times of restraint, that was a good move. We must remember what that reduction was from. That reduction was from the salary level, the level of excesses that were demonstrated by his colleague, the member from Winnipeg, Mr. Axworthy — which has been well documented in the press in recent days — the kinds of things that went on in the last days of that Liberal government in Ottawa.

And the member from Regina North West who represents that group, will come in here and argue on behalf of those excesses of Mr. Axworthy and others of that former Liberal government, and then say in these times of restraint, he says, that the Liberal Party's position is that legislators should not take the lead and force themselves to take the same freeze which we are asking others in our society to take.

We on this side of the House, and I understand the official opposition as well, believes in what we're doing here. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, all people in our society — whether they be in the public service, whether they be in my former profession as teachers, whatever — everybody believes that their particular job is very, very important. And the very hard-working people in any of those certainly are worth what they're being paid. We don't question that. And the member from Regina North West says or talks about what members are worth and so on. That's a point another debate and there's no question about that from our side of the House either.

But I would say that in the times of restraint, responsible people will take responsible positions. I believe that is what the government is doing. I believe that is what the official opposition is saying in this debate. once you get through some of the other posturing that's going on — and I recognize that because of the nature of the forum that we're in.

But I am very, very shocked, Mr. Chairman, at the position taken by the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan — the Liberal part of Saskatchewan's position that legislators, those of us that are elected to lead, should take salary increases while we're asking other people in this society to exercise restraint.

MR. SVEINSON: — Listening to the minister, I find it very interesting that the argument that I presented on merit pay for members would be taken as read. I simply indicated that there are members in this House whose efforts — they are not paid for compared to other legislators who in fact sit with them, and some of them in the front benches of that government.

He talked of level of excesses. I understand that recently the executive assistants to the ministers all received their annual pay raise, and it was of maybe not of an excessive nature, but certainly it wasn't a freeze. it was a pay raise, and these people work directly for the ministers in their offices.

(1200)

I would just like to ask the member from Meadow Lake if he can substantiate those raises. And I would also like to ask him at the same time that one of his employees, one Dan Stephens who lost the federal election this spring as a Progressive Conservative, whether or not Dan's pay has been increased. I understand the level of pay is around the

\$60,000 level. And has his pay increased — been comparable to the other executive assistants who work for the ministers?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if this is related to the Bill. I'm certainly not worried about answering the question as far as the . . . But that is certainly in committee of finance. And I'm sure we can get into that.

The particular questions he asks about Mr. Stephens, though, I will give you the answer just so that you . . . You're misinformed. Once again, Mr. Chairman, he's misinformed, and he's totally out of the league in terms of the salary. And if the answer to the question, "Has there been any increase?" . . . It's no. So there's no . . . The member is once again misinformed or going on some whim which I'm not sure of.

But in any case, it is not related to this Bill in any kind of a direct way. and I'm certainly willing to answer those questions at their proper time in this House, as the member will know. Or at least I would hope he would know that he can ask those in committee of finance. I'd be more than willing to answer those questions.

MR. SVEINSON: — The minister has suggested that the legislators should take a leadership role in pay freezes. I would suggest to the minister that his immediate employees, his executive assistants, have recently received a substantial pay increase. And I would just like to ask the minister how he, in fact, explains that pay increase, and exactly what was that pay increase received by the executive . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. That is a question for committee of finance, and I would ask the member to relate to the Bill.

MR. SVEINSON: — It simply develops, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the argument that it's just window-dressing as far as freezing salaries within the structure of this government's front benches, because their executive assistants did recently receive a pay increase.

And I would suggest that if it's a leadership role they're taking, certainly the people within their own offices should follow that leadership, and maybe even refuse that pay increase.

With respect to Mr. Stephens, maybe my figures aren't accurate. I know in the committee of finance it was raised at one time that the gentleman was being paid 37,000. That was prior to his — that was prior to the federal election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — These questions relate to committee of finance. They do not relate to this Bill. And the bill relates to the members of this Legislative Assembly and their pay increases, and I would ask the member to say on the Bill.

MR. SVEINSON: — I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Basically, the minister was developing an argument of leadership and how, as leaders, we should be willing to freeze our salaries. I would find that very difficult as a Conservative philosophy that leadership, with respect to salaries, should come from a position of no increase.

I would suggest to the minister that, as a free enterpriser out there in the community, I think that any businessman wants to increase his profits — wants to increase the return for the work he does. I mean, I can understand the benches to my right, who stand behind a philosophy that suggests that people should work for the state, and work for the state at the state's given compensation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well who do you work for?

MR. SVEINSON: — I work for the state, certainly. But I'm not of the philosophy that I shouldn't be paid for the work that I do. I'm of the philosophy that I should be paid if I'm in business or in politics. I should be paid in an equitable fashion.

The socialists possibly don't agree with that. Recently in this House one of your own members, the member from Melville, suggested that yes, we're practising socialism. The NDP are now preaching it.

Well, I suggest that your leadership doesn't bode well out in the community. I feel as leaders we don't necessarily have to take a pay increase, but we should at least be honest about why we are not taking that pay increase. And I suggest to the member from Meadow Lake that his only reason for not taking a pay increase is political. It's absolutely political. It's unfounded.

I mean that an increase to this Assembly based on the last year's inflation rate or some other tool that could, in fact, kick in to give us an equitable raise would, in fact, be refused by his membership as a result of his leadership. But I would like to ask the member if he feels that his responsibility as an MLA, and maybe as a part-time MLA — because I don't imagine as a minister he gets back to Meadow Lake that often — whether he feels the compensation received doesn't require, or in fact shouldn't be subject to a non-political review.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, where do you start, as one of my colleague says? I wonder whether it's worth starting. it's a very interesting proposition. I am sure for every member of the public in Canada, not only in Saskatchewan, but in Canada, to think that a Conservative government — the one here in Saskatchewan, any of our colleagues across this country who govern most of the provinces in Canada, and this party which governs this nation today — should in any way shape or form accept a lecture in leadership from a Liberal. There is no one in Canada who would suggest that that should ever take place in these days.

So I would say to the member, while he leaves many, many openings for one to get into a debate, would want to get into a debate with the member from North West. I would just say, once again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask all members to support this Bill. I'm disappointed that the member of the Liberal Party has indicated that he will not support the Bill which is, in fact,

presented in just that way — a sincere attempt at restraint in a time when we're asking all of our citizens to exercise that restraint. We think it is just that, Mr. Chairman, leadership.

MR. SVEINSON: — I hear from my colleague from Shaunavon, he suggests it's a bad political move. It looks self-serving. Well the argument presented here by the minister is that we are, in fact, in a leadership role as legislators. From that leadership role we're going to freeze our salaries, not do it in any structured fashion. We're just going to freeze it for the time being, and when it's politically expedient once again, we'll come into the House, and on the last day of the session we'll again increase our salaries and march on. Well, I suggest to him that it's strictly a political move. If his reasoning was based on anything other than politics, I could maybe accept it. But I know it's not. MLAs in Saskatchewan are not overpaid. Cabinet ministers may be; MLAs are not over-paid.

I think that you should review some of the structures within your own office and possibly, as a minister, start from that posture rather than suggesting that because we are in the public limelight that we are going to be the great leaders, and from a position of freezing our salaries we're demonstrating to the people of Saskatchewan that restraint that's required.

Well I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that that restraint has certainly not been felt by the oil industry in this province. Three hundred million dollars in profits later, and I don't decry that those profits are excessive; I suggest that with respect to that program I find it a very interesting and innovative program that should have been here long before, under an administration of Allan Blakeney that wasn't available.

I'm not suggesting that it's an unacceptably high profit level, but I'm suggesting to you the reason they are in this province is simply because of the leadership in this province. They're here to make money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order. I don't see the relevance between the member's statements, the statement the member is making to the Bill, and I would ask the member to stay on the Bill.

MR. SVEINSON: — Well, Mr. Speaker, . . . Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, the member for Meadow Lake, behind closed doors and with his own cronies, developed a position and came charging into the legislature very politically to freeze the salaries of MLAs.

If the arguments for that freeze were anything other than political I could probably accept it. I could probably accept it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You want more money, eh, Bill?

MR. SVEINSON: — More money? No, I'm not asking for any more money. I'm just suggesting to you that, yes, I would accept an inflationary raise in my . . . I would. And I'm sure that you could go through the back benches of this government and find many people who have, in fact, committed themselves full-time to politics and are in a position where, on an MLAs salary, it's very difficult to live.

I can suggest that there have even been bills paid on behalf of some of your members out of your research funds in your caucus office as a result, as a result of the lack of income paid to the MLA who isn't able, who isn't able to function because he's not paid enough. I don't say the ministers are not earning enough money. They're at a very comfortable income level, and some of them are very hard-worked individuals, and I don't argue that they should be well paid. They should be well paid.

But I do suggest to you that if an MLA were to get an increase that would be relative to the level of inflation, that would be accepted by every minister and every MLA in the House. And it's a

catch-up game. The ministers are all very comfortable. there's 25 of them. Almost half your caucus are ministers. So who's really receiving the penalty of a freeze on legislators' salaries? It's not the ministers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Certainly I am, and I'll accept that. I'll accept that. But I'll tell you, the Legislative Secretaries aren't either. It's the back-benchers. It's that row, that fertilizer row you have back there, those gentlemen who are working just as hard in many areas as the front benches of that government. Those are the guys that have to suffer.

And I see the minister staring me down. he thinks, boy, I'll tell you, we'll make those boys suffer because they'll never go anywhere anyway. And I agree that they won't. They won't go anywhere in your government. And you're going to penalize them once again by giving them less than enough to maybe live on as full-time members of the government, as people out there who are required in their constituencies to go out and carry the message.

Let's fact it, at your recent meeting in Saskatoon it was agreed that the message wasn't getting out there. Maybe the back-bench members of your government need a more full-time position. Some of them undoubtedly are part-timers.

But I'll accept this. I won't vote for the Bill. I'll reluctantly accept the increase. I don't think it certainly affects any of the front benches of your government. I don't think . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — I think he's changing his mind here.

MR. SVEINSON: — I'm saying I'll reluctantly accept the freeze. okay? They're saying, "What increase?"

I see the member from P.A. laughing and giggling at the back of the House. Well, that member looks after a very small department. He's a minister without portfolio, but he's on a minister's salary. He can afford to laugh and giggle in the House when we're talking about salaries that might affect the member for Saskatoon Eastview or the member for Moose Jaw South or North.

Are those people in positions, politically, where they're self-serving if they require an income that can support themselves and their families as politicians? I don't think they are.

I still haven't heard anything other than a political argument from the member from Meadow Lake on why there is going to be a political freeze, and does that translate throughout the government? Does that translate in and out of scope, and can all people in this province expect a political freeze as a result of our leadership?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I think it would probably suffice to say that the member of the Liberal Party is laying out very, very clearly today the position of his party, which is what every member in this House should do. And he's doing that very well today, and we're pleased to hear what the position of the Liberal Party is.

We've always known what it was at the federal level. We've seen the excesses of that former federal Liberal government. We now are given to understand here in Saskatchewan that the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan believes in those excesses and would, in fact, institute them here if they ever came into any position to be able to do that.

(1215)

So what I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, without getting into a long debate with the member from Regina North West, I'm just pleased that he put his feelings on the record.

And I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, once again that the Bill is presented very, very clearly — a Bill of only three clauses which exercises the restraint which we believe is extremely important in these times and is, in fact, a step in leadership which this government will continue to do in this

area and in other areas, as we have done for two and a half years and will continue to do.

MR. SVEINSON: — I'd suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that it demonstrates a lack of leadership, not leadership.

But the question I asked you was not related to the diatribe I just heard. The question is: as leaders, Mr. Minister, can you please outline to this House whether you will expect all employees of this government, in or out of scope, in or out of scope, to expect a freeze on their incomes in 1985 as well?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, that particular position has nothing to do with this particular Bill. What I'm saying to hon. members and to the public of Saskatchewan, that we expect all legislators who are elected to responsible positions to take a freeze in their salaries in 1985 in these times, and we would ask members of the public, whether they be in the public or the private sector, to exercise that restraint. Many in our society have been exercising that restraint in a co-operative way with their government. We appreciate that. We congratulate them for it, and we would ask all members of the House to also exercise restraint and support this Bill.

MR. SVEINSON: — Well, I have no qualms of exercising constraint, but the argument I heard earlier was simply that this Bill — and it relates to the Bill because it was introduced by the minister — was introduced as a form of leadership by legislators. I don't dispute the fact that as legislators we should be leaders, but I think he implicates that because we're going to take a freeze in our income as legislators, that he'll expect others within the government service to follow suit. And I would ask him if, as a minister and as a front-bench minister who makes the decisions in cabinet — will you be requesting, will you be requesting other departments who are under the auspices of your government to accept the freeze in 1985 as well? I didn't hear the answer clearly.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the hon. member will know that we are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, I shouldn't be so . . . I'm a little too generous probably. But I will continue to be generous with the member, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the hon. member would know that we are in a collective bargaining position with the public service and the various unions which public servants are represented by. Collective bargaining goes on and will continue to go on in its normal course.

On the clauses of this Bill, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no reason to be debating what the collective bargaining position of the government will be, and we won't get into that today, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SVEINSON: — I wasn't debating the collective bargaining position. It was just the leadership role that this gentleman indicates as a result of a freeze on our salaries, we are undertaking. I would ask the minister then. I'll rephrase the question.

We all appreciate that many people in -Saskatchewan have had — they haven't had any choice. They've had to take a position of restraint. in order to put supper on the table they've had to take a position of restraint. They don't have ministerial credit cards that they can use for supper every night. In fact, at the end of the month they're digging, they're digging just to put soup in the house.

Now we're taking a leadership role. I've heard from the minister of jobs today with respect to the role he's undertaken, the \$15 million which will not result, I wouldn't think, in a single job, a real job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I don't see where that relates to this Bill. It's a very short Bill, with three clauses, and I would ask the member from Regina North West to stay on the Bill.

MR. SVEINSON: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just trying to establish an argument that has been raised by the minister relating to the Bill that is one of political leadership. And I'm wondering who, in fact, he includes as followers within the structure of this bill if it's being tabled as a leadership attempt by legislators in this House who he's asking to freeze their income.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I said that in a very general way. We have asked all sectors in the province, have been successful at that in terms of the co-operation that's been provided by people in all of the various sectors, both public and private, to exercise restraint; and in most cases that has been the by-word in the last year or two.

All I'm saying is that there is a need for a continuation of that, and all I'm saying in this bill — and it's very clear and very straight forward, Mr. Chairman, — is that we're asking members of this Assembly, elected people who are elected to positions of leadership, to exercise restraint, ourselves, for the year 1985 upcoming.

MR. SVEINSON: — I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, it's almost an admission of defeat. I find it very difficult to understand how that, in fact, is any leadership role that can be undertaken. It is an admission that the economy of this province is in worse shape than maybe any of use care to believe. It has a psychological effect on many people out there when their legislators, and their ministers in the front benches of the government, and their backbenchers, and the whole government, admits that the economy is in extremely serious shape, and that one of the ways we can work our way out of the hole is to freeze the incomes of legislators in this House.

I hear the member from Maple Creek suggesting if I don't like the pay, quit. Now I can suggest . . . I could answer that, but I choose not to, choose not to. I have to stay on the Bill, but I still have not had answers to the questions that the member has, in fact, initiated in the House, the member for Meadow Lake.

This Bill is strictly a political cover-up for the ineptitude of the government, and while I accept that people in this province are required to accept restraint, voluntary restraint in most cases, I do not question the position of freezing our salaries. I question the logic that was arrived at that position on behalf of this government. And I would again ask the member from Meadow Lake if he can substantiate his logic outside the realm of politics. I don't believe he can, but I'll give him another opportunity.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, there is no real reason to attempt, I don't believe, to get into a discussion of logic with the member from Regina North West. He has not brought logic to this argument this morning. This Bill, as I said, is a very straight forward Bill. Everyone in the government benches, all of our people, every member of the official opposition understands what it is.

I believe that the member from Regina North West understands the Bill. I thin it's very straightforward, and I don't think there is any . . . The time and interests of the committee are not served well by getting into a debate with the hon. member for Regina North West on the whole of the provincial economy and etc., etc., etc.

So I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that in the interest of the good workings of this committee that we get on with the discussion of the Bill and its clauses.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Chairman, I rise, not to deal wit the substance of the Bill itself. There's more than one way to look at it. The position of the government's arguable and defensible, and we don't quarrel with it.

I do want to complain about the way the Bill was handled. And its not no much a problem with this Bill, because I don't think it would have affected the outcome, but it is symbolic of a larger

problem. The House Leader and the assistant House Leaders are running this House as if they're driving a bulldozer.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the legislature since 1975. I was associated with its workings for the four years before that. Never has a pay increase been dealt with without prior consultation. and this was not. Nor was there any pretence, apart from the minister's rather weak effort this morning, nor was there any pretence that there was.

This House will not function unless there is a degree of co-operation between the government and the opposition, and that's not going to happen if the government House Leader continues to treat this House as if he were riding a bulldozer. He has got to learn to work with the opposition, or the Assembly is not going to function, and we will all be the losers for it.

As I say, I complain, not so much about this Bill, because I don't think it would have affected the outcome, but it is symptomatic of a larger problem, that the House Leader is running this House as if he were driving a bulldozer. And it isn't going to do much to improve the functioning of the House.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as it relates to this Bill, there has been ample time to relate, to debate this Bill. There's no question. There's no attempt to, as the terminology the member uses, bulldoze this Bill through the House. That's not the case at all. You've had ample time.

The hon. member . . . I just guess I could say, on behalf of the government, we just reject the suggestion that the hon. member's making. It is just not the case, and the record of this House in the last number of days, since the opening of this session, will not bear out his remarks. That has not been the case, and it does not show.

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to get back specifically to the Bill. And I'd like to ask the minister if he could outline the rationale for the introduction of this Bill.

When I ask you to set forth ere rationale, I'm asking you whether it is your view that regardless of what increase there is to public service, regardless of what increases there are to teachers, regardless of what increases there are to other members of society, that you feel that in your austerity program that it will be justifiable that to civil servants, conceivably, if you have some rationale, that top civil servants should be getting 5, or 6, or 5, or 4, or 3 per cent increase at a time when the legislators are reduced to no increase?

So what I'm asking you, in setting forth this Bill here to the House: is it relating to a general strategy of government dealing with the very difficult problems of lack of funds, huge deficits, and waste within your government?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, just in a general answer to the member's question, the rationale for the Bill is as I've said before. We believe it's important for legislators to take a leadership role. As far as relating to the member saying about senior civil servants and increase of 4 and 5 and whatever other percentage points that he cited, you will remember that my seat-mate, the Minister of Finance in last year's budget, froze senior management positions within the civil service at zero. That was the case. Certainly there are people within the civil service who are extremely hard-working people and who believe that a zero was a very difficult pill to swallow.

What we're saying, at the time that we imposed that, that we believe that it's a pill that we ourselves must swallow, and we will, in fact, swallow it. And all members on this side of the House agree with what we're doing.

So the rationale is very simply and very straightforward. We believe in the responsible leadership

role which we were elected to exercise, and we are exercising it in introducing this Bill.

MR. KOSKIE: — I'd like to also ask the minister if indeed you feel it's necessary to have restraint, will it be the government policy that not only MLAs will be a parcel and part of the restraint package, but other civil servants and employees of the government? Is that the consistency of your program? It seems to me that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. If the member wished to get into the broad debate of the Bill, he could have done it in second reading. This is in committee, and I would ask the member to confine his remarks to the Bill.

MR. KOSKIE: — I'm in the general clause, Mr. Chairman, and certainly we have always been the tradition that we can go into a general discussion in detail — general discussion pertaining to the Bill. And I challenge your ruling on that. I certainly do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would just ask the member from Quill Lakes to keep his questions on the Bill.

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your overruling of your previous decision. I will proceed. I want to ask the minister then, in respect to the package here set out in the Bill where you're indicating no increase of salary for the MLAs, could you indicate the estimated amount of savings relative to taking that action?

(1230)

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I don't have the number. I don't have that number here. I can certainly . . . I would be willing to provide it to the member. But I would say to the member, and I think it's important and I believe that all members understand this, the reason that this Bill is here now and, in our view, must be passed in this fall session is because, as the member knows, the increases which would automatically take place, will take place according to the other legislation. It will take place on the 1st of January unless this Bill is passed. I want that to be very clear to all members that that is the case, and that's why the Bill is here now.

And in terms of the numbers, in terms of the exact savings in terms of dollars, I don't have that number. But I can say to the member if you can take your salary and your calculator and work it, by the number of members in the House or whatever. But certainly, it will be significant. And the important thing, once again, is that there is a signal here from all of us who are in leadership roles that we exercise the leadership which is entrusted to us.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, I am very, very surprised that the minister, who is introducing a package here of no increase to the MLAs, cannot in fact indicate to this House . . . He says it's very significant, but I don't know the amount. Now how can he stand up in this House and say it's very significant when he says in the first hand that I don't know how much it's going to save.

And so what I'm asking the minister — he has officials there — I would like him to put forward the amount that this provision is going to be saving the taxpayers. Can you bring that information forward? Can you ask your officials, your Legislative Secretary, your other officials, have you got any idea, a ballpark figure of the amount?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I have said to the member, and I will say once again that I will provide that number to the member. And while I have a great deal of confidence in my colleague from Rosthern, who is attempting to figure it here now, I will give a very accurate figure to the member, and I won't give it to you today. I won't give it to you today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I won't be able to give it to you, let's put it this way, before 1 o'clock. But the leadership I will provide to you is that I will give you exactly that figure early next week.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to suggest that it's hard to believe that the minister would come in introducing a no increase in the salary of the MLAs, indicating that it is a very significant saving to the taxpayer, and we are leading the way in so far as it deals with austerity.

And it's very difficult because I think that what the people of Saskatchewan will say is that if they look at the size of this cabinet, the largest in the history of this province, and we calculated that the increase from 19 cabinet ministers to 25, plus all of the legislative secretaries, that that little package cost the taxpayers of this province over \$3 million.

Now I'll tell you if this government was serious about helping to meet the problem of a deficit, helping to meet the problem of introducing austerity, that what they would do, in fact, is to reduce substantially the size of cabinet and legislative secretaries.

And I would also ask the minister: how does he justify the lack of consistency in the policy? Because it comes to my information that you bring in a Bill here which says no increase for the MLAs and, at the same time in the board of economy, the secretary to the Speaker is reclassified, salary readjusted, and a 10 per cent increase in salary. Where is the logic of the approach of this government? What you are doing is simply window-dressing and why don't you come clean with the public of Saskatchewan?

AN HON. MEMBER: — To China?

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, to China. Mr. Gerich. Ministerial assistant went along. And this is the hypocrisy of this government. This is the hypocrisy of this government. They are bringing out a Bill pretending that they are really putting forward an effort here to save the taxpayers' money when, in fact, all of the evidence indicates clearly that this has been the most wasteful government that this province has ever seen.

I ask the minister who is introducing this Bill to take a look at some of the ministerial staff, and you will find Minister of Health, two legislative secretaries. He has a staff of seven or eight people which runs at \$240,000 a year for a private staff. And what I'm trying to point out here, Mr. Minister, is what you're doing is just putting forth a smoke-screen. You have no sincerity about the taxpayers' money. You have wasted it on 34 international junkets costing over \$500,000. The Minister of Industry and Commerce, when he first got elected, took a little trip down to Europe — \$33,000. He came back with nothing, got kicked out of the department because he couldn't run it. And that's the waste that's going on in this province.

And we have 12 legislative secretaries, the largest cabinet in the province, and they still can't handle it. They've got ministers without portfolio. They've got a minister that's getting paid 65, \$70,000, all expenses paid, and all he does is the crop insurance. And how can you justify that this has any sincerity behind it?

I ask you to justify to the people of Saskatchewan that you are, indeed, sincere in cutting back on the expenses of the government.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, a couple of points to clarify here. The member from Quill Lakes mentions, I believe, the secretary to the Speaker, I believe it was that he mentioned, which is dealt with in the Board of Internal Economy which all members here will know is representatives from the official opposition; representatives from the government are on the

Board of Internal Economy. Members of that official opposition, NDP party, voted for the increase that was given to the secretary for the Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm told that that was the case. I myself, Mr. Chairman, am not on that committee. I was not there, but I am told by one of our members.

But in any case, Mr. Chairman, in another forum at another time, we, as we have been in the past and as we will continue to be, will be very willing to compare any of the expenses of ministers, which are incurred by ministers of this government, with the expenses of ministers of the former government in terms of where they went, the proposes of various trips, and so on. We will be very willing to compare that at any time with the former government.

So without getting into the long debate on that on this particular Bill, but there's no question, there's no question, Mr. Chairman, that we'll be willing to debate that, and I'm sure it come forward in committee of finance later in this session.

MR. KOSKIE: — I asked the minister whether or not he could provide to the House today, the amount of the cost saving in respect to the putting into effect of this Bill. I take it that the minister has that information, but he is embarrassed to bring it forward. I would ask you to ask your officials. And are you saying that you and your officials here do not know the amount of the estimated savings by the implementation of this Bill?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, once again, I have said to the committee, and I will not have that number before 1 o'clock, and I believe, and I'm not absolutely sure of this but I will share this with the House. I believe that the industrial composite index, which the increase if this Bill does not pass, the increase which member would receive was based on — the industrial composite index — I'm not sure if that number is, in fact, available. I'm not sure that that number is, in fact, available right now. Now it may well be, but if it is, it comes out in the month of December and I'm not sure that it is out.

But in any case, I have undertaken to provide to the member what the saving will be once you take the industrial . . . (inaudible) . . . in this. Okay. I don't have it. I'm sorry about that. But I will say just this, Mr. Chairman, the one thing that is very obvious in all of this is that we know if an increase is at 4, or 5, or 6 per cent, whatever, that it would kick in if this Bill did not pass. Anybody would know that that would be a significant number of dollars if you just add your 5 per cent or whatever the salary is, the total sum salaries of all of us in this House. So certainly, regardless of what the exact number is, we know that a freeze in 1985 to the 1984 level will be a saving to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. That's what we're proposing, and I would urge all members to support the Bill in all its clauses.

MR. KOSKIE: — I was wondering if the minister has made any other comparisons that may save the taxpayers' money. Have you taken into account that if you cut back the number of cabinet ministers by five that you would save more than, indeed, cutting back on the individual MLA's increase? Have you taken a look at that possibility of saving money for the taxpayers?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, once again the member will want to debate various expenditures of the government in various areas through the various departments which my colleagues handle very, very well. Those questions will certainly be debated in this forum, in this House, at the proper time in the committee of finance, and the members will have their opportunities.

So in terms of whether this saving to the taxpayers, and how it compares to other savings to the taxpayers which go on in the various departments of this government, is not relevant to this Bill. What I'm saying, the relevant part of this Bill is the fact that there will be — is that there will be a saving to the taxpayers when the salaries are frozen, if — if all members of the opposition will support the Bill or not. The fact is we would like to pass the Bill because we believe it's the reasonable thing to do, and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the public of Saskatchewan that

every member on the Progressive Conservative benches, the government side of this House, will support this Bill because we believe in exercising the restraint which many, many people in our society have been exercising.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up in the questions of my colleague from Quill Lakes, and it would be this, Mr. Minister. I would ask you, sir, whether or not you can confirm or give us an indication whether or not, since you came to government — and you will know because you are in the cabinet — that you have taken in excess of 34 trips, this is your cabinet, out side of the country, costing the taxpayers \$500,000, in excess of \$500,000? And I would be interested to know when you are explaining cost savings for the government, how much you have spent on trips around the world. The saying is out in the country, in my constituency, "Join the Tory cabinet and see the world." And this I say to you, Mr. Minister, is unfortunate that today you would come in here and say that you are saving the taxpayers' money. I believe that the savings to the taxpayers from this Bill, and you can confirm or deny it, is between 50 and \$75,000 — between 50 and \$75,000.

And I would say to you that the minister from P.A., the minister without portfolio from P.A.-Duck Lake would save you more than that if you were to do away with his position, and many people in the province would thank you for it. Not only would you save the money, but many people would thank you for it.

And I would like to say to you, Mr. Minister, whether or not you would consider as well, when you're thinking about this proposal, cancelling any trips that ministers are planning to take this winter out of the province — to travel to New Zealand to study the aboriginal people, whether they're travelling to, oh I don't know, some place in Bulgaria, some place in Saudi Arabia, or whether they're going to Austria for a little skiing trip — whether or not you will take it on yourself to cancel those trips to try to save some money for the taxpayers.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said to you before, the various cost savings which come from the various departments will be debated in the committee of finance. I will not get into that. I will neither confirm nor deny the number of trips. I don't know the number of trips. How would I know that in my notes here today? I don't know the number of trips.

I do know this. I do know this, Mr. Chairman. The member mentions a trip to New Zealand to see the aboriginal people, and so on, and our cabinet had no control on Mr. Hammersmith who went to New Zealand to look at the aboriginal people proposals. We had no control on Mr. Hammersmith, who was a member of their cabinet.

This cabinet had no control on the fact of whether or not a former minister, Mr. Gross, from the constituency of Morse, travelled across North America looking at various hot spots in North America to look at water slides, Mr. Chairman, which was what went on. I mean, those are the kinds of things. So I mean it's really a strange sort of, it's really a strange sort of a debate we're into.

(1245)

But as I said before, to make it very simple, Mr. Chairman, this government and this cabinet will compare favourably — will compare and be willing to compare any trips that are made by ministers here, any expenses which are incurred by ministers here, with expenses which were incurred by the former government any time.

And certainly there will be an opportunity in this forum to make that comparison. And there's no question, Mr. Chairman. We all know it. And we would look forward to the day when the people of Saskatchewan can make that comparison and realize just the kind of restraint that is exercised by people on this side of the house.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, there would be many people in the province who would disagree that having a record-sized cabinet of 25 — having a record number of legislative secretaries, complete with secretaries of their own, and automobiles — is restraint.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, if you were serious, and if the Premier of this province was serious about the spending record and saving the taxpayers' money, the Premier himself would look in his own area. He would look at the increase in the spending in Executive Council, look at his advertising program of some \$12 million, would look at things like the chauffeur that he has, spending on things like that to drive him that whole block from his house to the Legislative Building, which is walking across Albert Street, and I believe we could save a great deal of money.

And I say that this Bill which we are dealing with today will save you between 50 and \$75,000. That is significant. But when compared to the waste in many other areas, it's peanuts, Mr. Minister, and you know very well.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, we are now seeing . . . We heard in the early stages of debate here in committee from the members of the official opposition that they would be in support of the Bill. And now after what appears to have been a very convincing argument by the Liberal member, now it appears that the members of the NDP opposition are joining ranks once again with their bedfellows, and are now arguing that the savings which would be incurred by the people of Saskatchewan and by the taxpayers would not be enough to warrant passing this Bill, because they'd make various other . . . So they're now arguing on behalf of or alongside the Liberal member who argues that he would like to have an increase, and we are now seeing the absolute position of the NDP.

I can't believe what I'm hearing. I did believe them before in the sense that they said they would be with us. I now hear from the member from Quill Lakes, the member from Shaunavon, and others who are arguing against this Bill, and I can't understand the reason. For the life of me I will not ever understand how a legislator in these times can argue for an increase in salary which, as we all know and which I mentioned before, will kick into place automatically on the 1st of January, 1985. That will kick into place in 1985. That piece of legislation came into place under the former government and that will kick into place.

And if this Bill is not passed, and it appears now that the delay tactics that are being put on by the two opposition parties are for just that purpose, to delay this Bill so that the increase will automatically kick into place. And I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, I'm very, very disappointed in members of the official opposition that they would take that stand.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to point out clearly the hypocrisy of the minister and the government — total hypocrisy — and the public will realize what you're doing is hypocrisy. What I can't understand is how the government can justify paying to Dennis Ball, a part-time job in the Labour Relations Board, \$95,000 — more than the Vice-President of the United States.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I don't see where this pertains to Bill No. 11. I would ask the member to keep his questions on the Bill.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that we have a Bill here which they're hoisting before this legislature, putting before this legislature, indicating that they are on a direction of restraint. I certainly can go on to indicate other actions of the government does not support the sincerity of the proposition that they're putting forward. And that is precisely what we're pointing out, that they have no sincerity by putting forward this. You can't even come to this legislature and indicate what amount of money is going to be saved.

On the other hand, what are they doing? They're taking Dennis Ball, a part-time employee, paying him \$95,000, and they say they're on a course of restraint protecting the taxpayers' money. That is total hypocrisy. And exactly the same happens with respect to the personal

services contracts. We have evidence here before that this government introduced and supplied to us, a personal services contracts for up to \$410 a day for political hacks. And here they come forward pretending that they are putting forward a restraint package.

This is total hypocrisy. The size of the cabinet indicates it. The size of the number of legislative secretaries indicates no sincerity. The expenditures and all of the international trips, some 34 international trips sending along the back-benchers, not even legislative secretaries to trips into China, all indicate that this is just smoke and mirrors. There is no sincerity by this government.

They are the most wasteful government that this province has ever had to endure. And I'd like the minister to justify how bringing this here, this Bill, justifies the amount of waste in other areas of government?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I believe I have not only exercises restraint in the introduction of this Bill, I believe that we on this side of the House have exercised some restraint in listening to some of the arguments from that side of the House today.

The hon. member from Quill Lakes, who was much more able to have a family reunion in the days of his government because they all worked for government here in Regina, will know about exercising restraint, Mr. Chairman. There was no restraint in the Koskie family when they were all working for the government.

One of the things that the members continue to raise, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the members continue to raise is about the use and the various jobs and responsibilities that are given to members of this side of the House, all of our elected members, by our Premier. One of the things which we will never apologize for, because the people of Saskatchewan have asked for this, that when we become government, they said be sure that the elected people have the say in the way in which government operates. And that is what happens under this Progressive Conservative government, Mr. Chairman. We will not apologize . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLEOD: — We will not apologize for replacing tasks which were formerly done by socialist planners and planners and technocrats which were a very big and major part of any socialist government with elected representatives of the people from every corner of this province, in every constituency in this province. We will not apologize for putting our members to work as ministers in effecting policy and changing policy. we will not apologize for appointing good members of this legislature to legislative secretaries' positions so they can carry out the wishes of their constituents who sent them here to effect changes in the way in which this province is run.

Those changes, we have seen. The people of this province have seen the results of the work that's been done by members of this side of the House, in every row on this side of the House. And I would like to add, for those people in this province who don't every day come into this legislature, to realize that most of the members on that side of the House, as well, are our Progressive Conservative members.

The reason for that and the reason there are so many so many Conservatives and will continue to be the representatives of our party in this House is because we told people that we would exercise restraint; that we would govern as they asked us to govern; that we would change policy in this province as they asked us to change it; and that we would keep in touch with time through putting their elected members to work in this legislature and throughout this province.

We will never apologize for that, nor should we ever apologize for it, Mr. Chairman, because the people of Saskatchewan have asked us to run this government in just that way.

As a result of just that, this Bill is one more in a long list of bills which have been presented in two and a half years to this House. This is just one more Bill in a long list of Bills which are presented to this House on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and presented by the members on this side of the House, who represent them all very well in every part of this province.

Mr. Chairman, other Bills which are here . . . The members want to talk about what kind of restraint do we exercise? What kind of representation do our legislative secretaries and our cabinet ministers and all of our members from this side of the House — what kind of representation do they give their people?

Our people went out there and listened, and they listened to farm groups; they listened to agricultural people; and they said, "Introduce Bill 1." And it's significant that in this session which we are now in, that Bill No. 1 is just that. An agricultural Bill to save agricultural people out there is number one in this session.

They said to us, "Put some priority on jobs for our people in this province." And it's significant that our ministers which they criticize, our legislative secretaries which those NDP members will criticize, and all of our MLAs from all of the constituencies around this province, in every corner of this province, brought Bill No. 2 to this House.

What does Bill No. 2 deal with? It deals with a jobs agency — a jobs agency. Bill No. 1, agriculture, Bill no. 2, a jobs agency, and here's Bill No. 11, another in a long series of Bills which represent the feelings of the people of Saskatchewan.

And they elected us here to present those. and I can honestly say to you, Mr. Chairman, as I have tried to say to you in a restrained way two or three times this morning in this debate, that this Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, which really deals with the salaries which are paid to all of us who are elected here to positions of leadership . . .

What we are saying by this Bill is that we accept that leadership and the responsibility that's been given to us by the people which we're sent here to represent, and we will continue to represent them that way.

This Bill shows restraint. This Bill shows restraint, Mr. Chairman. It's important that it does. It's important in these times that we . . . It's important in these times that all of our citizens, whether they be in the public sector — people that we deal with directly every day, those of us in government — whether they be in the public sector or people who have come upon some difficult times in the private sector, have been exercising restraint in this province for a couple of years. They've been doing it very co-operatively with out government. They received very, very favourably, the budget which was presented by my seat-mate, the Minister of Finance, last year, and it talked about just those kinds of things — zero increases. And we encourage people to take those for the betterment of all of our society, and the co-operation that was shown by people in the public sector, the private sector, with the government, we appreciate very much.

And what I'm saying now: it's time for us as legislators to reciprocate. It's time for us as legislators to reciprocate, and we would say it's very, very important, Mr. Chairman, that this Bill receives, I would hope, unanimous consent, and I believed — in fact, I was so naïve as to believe, Mr. Chairman, that all members would see this as a reasonable approach.

As we have seen here today by some of the displays, the display of the Liberal member, he has held this Bill up today, for his own greed. We have seen a couple of other examples in this House in recent days and recent debates, where the member from Regina North West, because of his own particular greed in looking at the various clauses and the various books around, and say, "How can I get my hands on some more money?" Now he holds up this Bill, which is a responsible restraint Bill. He holds this Bill up so that he can say, give me more money. Maybe this

Bill won't pass . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Maybe at the beginning of 1986. Maybe at the beginning of 1986. Maybe at the beginning of 1986, says the member from Regina North West and the NDP members who have joined forces with him in the last few minutes here — who at the beginning of this debate said that they were for the Bill, and who now say they're against the Bill.

(1300)

So I cannot believe the flip-flop which has taken place by the NDP. They're more interested in their own well-being and filling their own hip national pocket than they are in the restraint and its exercising responsibility which, because we represent people well and because we exercise the responsibility that they have given to us, that we present this Bill.

We will be voting for it. The members of the opposition of both parties represented over there obviously are going to vote against it, and it will be a sad day for them when the people of Saskatchewan see the irresponsibility they've shown here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I see that it's past one o'clock. I move the committee rise, report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:05 p.m.